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ABSTRACT

Academic Dishonesty in Higher Education: Perceptions and Opinions of Undergraduates

by

Stanley Keith Hodges

The purpose of this study was to determine if statistically significant differences existed between identified student demographic characteristics (gender and age), academic variables (classification, GPA, and major), and students’ perceptions of academic dishonesty, as measured by the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey.

A pen-and-paper survey was used to gather the data at the 3 participating universities and college (a 4-year public university, a 4-year private university, and a 2-year public community college). There were 22 items on the survey. There were 328 surveys distributed by the investigator to participating classes at the 3 institutions of higher education. All 328 surveys were returned. There were 116 student responses gathered from the 4-year private university, 103 student responses gathered from the 2-year public college, and 109 student responses gathered from a 4-year public university. All of the responses were valid and fit the perquisites for inclusion in the survey. These perquisites were that each student was at least 18 years of age and each student was registered as an undergraduate.

There were 5 dimensions included in the survey (Dimension 1- Use of Technology, Dimension 2- Perceptions of Policy, Dimension 3- Instructor Consequences, Dimension 4- Student Consequences, and Dimension 5- Student Conduct).
For Research Questions 2, 4, and 6 there were no significant differences found among any of the groups for any of the 5 dimensions. In Research Question 1 the 5 dimensions of the survey were compared among the 3 participating institutions (public 4-year university, private 4-year university, and public 2-year college). Dimension 4 (student consequences) was significantly different between the public 4-year university and the private 4-year university, with students at the private 4-year university scoring higher. In Research Question 4 a comparison of traditional aged and nontraditional aged students was made on the 5 dimensions. A significant difference was found between the 2 age groups on Dimension 3 (instructor consequences) and Dimension 5 (student conduct), with nontraditional students scoring higher in both cases. For Research Question 6 a comparison of criminal justice majors was made to other majors. Only Dimension 4 (student consequences) was statistically significant with other majors expressing a desire for more student consequences as a result of participating in academic misconduct.
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CHAPTER 1

INRODUCTION

Student academic misconduct means different things at different colleges and institutions of higher learning. A possible reason for this is that an exact definition of academic misconduct has not been established. A student may take part in academic dishonesty for a variety of reasons; an emphasis on success, pressure from peers, unrealistic expectations, or lack of preparedness can all lead to student cheating. Another area that can lead to academic dishonesty is a strong emphasis on a high grade point average (GPA) that will lead to glowing transcripts and scholastic scholarships that could result in assistantships at the graduate level (Owunwanne, Rustagi, & Dada, 2010).

Academic misconduct has been defined many ways, “In short, academic dishonesty can be viewed as a range of deliberate, unacceptable behaviors that students use to gain an unfair advantage on tests and assignments” (Bricault, 2007, p. 15). A common definition of academic dishonesty involves students claiming that another student’s work is their own (Educational Testing Service (ETS), 1999). The dishonesty can be in the form of paying another individual to do the assignment, buying a class assigned term paper, obtaining exam questions prior to the date of an examination, or copying the completed work of another student.

There is evidence that a larger number of students regularly engage in academic dishonesty than students who never engage in academic dishonesty. However, there is no known evidence to prove the extent students cheat. Because of differences among teachers, students may cheat more with some teachers than with others, depending on the demands teachers have in their classrooms (Kerkvliet & Sigmund, 1999). According to research findings there are a number of reasons that students cheat including little probability of detection, consequences are
not severe, no stated rules on academic cheating, or if prohibitions are in place they are not clearly stated or articulated (ETS, 1999; Novotney, 2011). Individuals who take part in academic cheating must conclude that it is necessary to cheat. These individuals observe other students taking part in forms of academic cheating and determine that their standing will be impacted because their scores may be lower than those who are cheating. In Bower's landmark 1964 study on student academic misconduct in higher education, he reported that 75% of the 5,000 students surveyed had taken part in one or more acts of cheating. In a 2002-2005 study conducted by The Center for Academic Integrity at Duke University, “70 percent of the 50,000 undergraduate students surveyed during 2002 to 2005, on some 60 campuses nationwide, reported cheating” (Owunwanne et al. 2010, p. 59). According to data from the 1940s, approximately 20% of college students, by their own admission, had cheated while in high school (ETS, 1999; Open Education Database, 2010). In 2010 between 75% and 98% included students participating in types of activities leading up to their entry into college (Open Education Database, 2010).

Staffers at the Educational Testing Service (ETS) (1999) opined that academic cheating does not have the same stigma as in the past. ETS found that a greater desire to be accepted into colleges and graduate-level programs, along with a decreased societal condemnation, has led students at all levels to be more disposed to take whatever action is necessary to gain a higher grade. According to the ETS the grade that a student earns in a course has become more important than the actual knowledge the student would have gained by working diligently and studying during the course of instruction. Previously it has often been the below-average student who took part in acts of academic dishonesty, but in present day standards, it is more likely to be above-average college students who are cheating on scholastic classroom activities (ETS, 1999).
The ETS (1999) reported that in most incidences of academic cheating the offending student is rarely discovered during the act. If the student is apprehended, the penalty is rarely of significance, if there is a penalty given at all (ETS, 1999; Open Education Database, 2010). The ETS (1999) found that with the advancement of computers, student academic cheating had significantly increased. A popular paper-mill website averages approximately 8,000 inquiries on a given day. The percentage of college students who disclose that they have engaged in academic cheating has been reported to be as high as 68%, with undergraduate freshman students being the most likely to engage in cheating (Open Education Database, 2010). Those who took part in academic cheating reported that they did not feel guilty for violating the ethical standards of the university. Most college students (85%) are of the opinion that academic cheating is a necessary aspect in a college-level educational program (ETS, 1999; Open Education Database, 2010). This thought process appears to be held by those who do not take part in academic cheating. According to research findings the general thought is that academic cheating is an asset in obtaining university scholarships, internships, better grades, and scholastic awards (ETS, 1999; Open Education Database, 2010). Almost all university students (95%) are of the opinion that if they engage in dishonest academic practices they will not get caught by their instructors (Open Education Database, 2010). This opinion may add to the problem of academic cheating and give students more motivation to take part in academic misconduct.

To add to the seriousness of the academic cheating issue, updated opinions from a significant number of undergraduate students show that as many as 66% engaged in academic cheating on homework, class exams, and course assignments (Novotney, 2011). Novotney (2011) reported that students who took part in academic cheating such as plagiarism at the college level admitted they were more likely to participate in illegal acts, commit adultery, and
violate their company rules and regulations. Academic cheating further appears to be what could be described as a gateway behavior that can lead to serious misconduct later in life. Untruthful activities like academic cheating have the effect of changing an individual’s understanding of what actions are correct or not correct; a student may discount the belief that academic cheating is a dishonest activity. Students often turn to their peers for indications as to whether or not approaches and actions are permissible. Novotney (2011) found that if students observed another students engaging in academic dishonesty they were more likely to take part in that type of activity. A student with knowledge of another student cheating could very well be foreseeing his or her own cheating. The conduct is likely communicated by the knowledge that another student is taking part in academic dishonesty (Novotney, 2011).

A zero tolerance policy mandates application of a predetermined penalty as the prescribed manner of punishment for violations of policy on academic misconduct. The intensity, the circumstance, and the context of the situation are not taken into account when the penalty is administered. The idea of zero tolerance has its origins in the punishments handed down to individuals who traffic in the sale and distribution of illegal or controlled substances. In the early 1990s, the idea of zero tolerance in school policies and procedures became common-place (American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force, 2008).

These policies are put into place and are founded on the principle that harsh reactions leveled against problem students, or even the removal of these students from scholastic programs, will be enforced by student peers in the school program. Subsequently, student-led punishment will have a positive effect and cause the remaining students to refrain from other illegal or improper acts (American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force, 2008).
When university administrators look at the legal aspects of academic dishonesty, clear avenues of approach can become undefined. The situation is complex in that there is not a universally agreed upon definition of exactly what constitutes academic dishonesty. According to Bricault (2007) university policies on the topic are often not communicated properly to the student body. Furthermore, policies are not always written in a clear manner. Instructors are responsible for deciding whether to address issues of cheating internally or to handle the situation as it has been articulated in university policies and procedures that send the student before a disciplinary committee. The student’s right to due process must be considered by the faculty and administrators of the university. The *Due Process* clause of the 14th Amendment is a key element to consider when studying academic dishonesty from a legal viewpoint. This allows an accused the right to have knowledge of and respond to allegations made against him or her.

Due process in education was established in the 1961 case of *Dixon v. Alabama State Board of Education* that set the precedence for the requirement of an accused being notified and having the right to a hearing as a standard for the minimum set of safeguards for accusations of academic misconduct (Bricault, 2007).

Another point of consideration is whether the academic infraction should be addressed as social or academic misconduct. The courts have generally not intervened in these types of situations, allowing a university to make that determination. If the issue moves into a disciplinary environment, the courts have been more inclined to be involved. In 1975, the Supreme Court decided in *Gross v. Lopez* that a student has the right to due process when there is the possibility of the loss of liberty or property rights. Students who have been accused of academic dishonesty but have been denied their right to due process could have a decision made in their favor in a court (Bricault, 2007).
The process by which an instructor presents class material and the classroom structure may have an effect on academic dishonesty (Owunwanne et al., 2010). If the interest level of the students is low as to the content of the class material, they may be more inclined to take part in academic dishonesty. A student with little respect for an instructor will probably also have little respect for the course of instruction and be more inclined to take part in acts of cheating in the classroom. The student who sees that other students are getting a substantial benefit from academic dishonesty may also be inclined to cheat in the classroom. With evidence that academic dishonesty takes place at many levels of the academic process, thereby making an equal and fair opportunity impossible for all students, some students may commit acts of cheating to gain an equal opportunity for advancement (Owunwanne et al., 2010).

Vandehey, Diekhoff, and LaBeff (2007) revealed that concern for being caught and punished for cheating was a far more effective deterrent to academic misconduct than a student’s internal feelings toward the act. In the study there were six deterrents evaluated as a means of deterring student academic dishonesty. Students were found to be deterred from academic misconduct by external factors. The top four deterrents were embarrassment of being caught in the act of academic dishonesty, being dropped from the course of instruction, the response of the university, and receiving a failing grade for the course. A feeling of guilt ranked fifth, and sixth was what the student’s peers thought about the student being caught in the act of academic dishonesty (Vandehey et al., 2007).

**Statement of Problem**

By deepening an understanding that student perceptions have on academic dishonesty’s effect on the student body, instructors, and university administrators, one could better understand the impact dishonesty has on the long-term decision making processes of future students.
attending institutions of higher learning in Tennessee. The purpose of this study was to
determine if statistically significant correlations exist between identified student demographic
characteristics (independent variables) and the student’s attitude toward academic dishonesty, as
measured on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey instrument, and a set
of demographic (gender and age) and academic variables (classification, GPA, and major). The
purpose of this study was also to determine the perceptions and opinions of undergraduate
students about academic dishonesty. Further, the purpose of this study was to review and analyze
the literature regarding academic dishonesty and to propose a study that would examine the
perceptions and frequency of academic dishonesty among undergraduate college students.

Significance of the Study

Instances of academic dishonesty have been documented in every culture and at all
academic levels from elementary to graduate school; there was evidence of academic dishonesty
2,000 years ago during Chinese civil service examinations. Studies of academic dishonesty have
revealed that 20% of students begin cheating in early elementary school (Bushway & Nash,
1977). Petress (2003) reported that students who are caught in the act of academic plagiarism
made excuses that “everyone is doing it [and] it’s not a big deal” (p. 624).

The issue of academic dishonesty has a detrimental effect on a college or university
because it can damage the reputation of the institution. Academic dishonesty will cause students
who may not engage in academic dishonesty to become discouraged when they witness cheating
and the individuals who cheat are not caught or punished. There is evidence to support the idea
that academic dishonesty is consequential. An act of cheating in a college setting that students
see has had a positive outcome may be acted out in other aspects of life. This is because the
unethical action was successful and rewarded. Academic dishonesty has had such prevalence that it has expanded in its complexity and rate of occurrence (Open Education Database, 2010).

Research findings show that not only do students cheat in US colleges, but at least 10% of international campus populations also cheat (Williams & Hosek, 2003). These students made up 46.7% of the student population who cheated in the colleges. According to Aiken (1991) academic dishonesty is among the top threats to a student’s attainment of growth, emotional and social personalities, and moral standards. Academic dishonesty stunts engagement in the learning process and the positive development of morals for students. Research indicates that even though most students consider it is wrong to cheat, many students engage in academic dishonesty (Davis, Grover, Becker, & McGregor, 1992). In addition, research has shown that students see academically dishonest behaviors to be ordinary behavior for students (Greene & Saxe, 1992).

**Research Questions**

This study is guided by six research questions.

**RQ1:** Is there a significant difference in the mean scores for each of the dimensions on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey (Dimension 1- Use of Technology, Dimension 2- Perceptions of Policy, Dimension 3- Instructor Consequences, Dimension 4- Student Consequences, and Dimension 5- Student Conduct) among participating institutions of higher education?

**RQ2:** Is there a significant difference in the mean scores for each of the dimensions on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey (Dimension 1- Use of Technology, Dimension 2- Perceptions of Policy, Dimension 3- Instructor Consequences,
Dimension 4- Student Consequences, and Dimension 5- Student Conduct) between male and female undergraduate students?

RQ3: Is there a significant difference in the mean scores for each of the dimensions on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey (Dimension 1- Use of Technology, Dimension 2- Perceptions of Policy, Dimension 3- Instructor Consequences, Dimension 4- Student Consequences, and Dimension 5- Student Conduct) among traditional age students (18-24) and nontraditional age students (25-52)?

RQ4: Is there a significant difference in the mean scores for each of the dimensions on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey (Dimension 1- Use of Technology, Dimension 2- Perceptions of Policy, Dimension 3- Instructor Consequences, Dimension 4- Student Consequences, and Dimension 5- Student Conduct) among academic classification (Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, or Senior)?

RQ5: Is there a significant difference in the mean scores for each of the dimensions on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey (Dimension 1- Use of Technology, Dimension 2- Perceptions of Policy, Dimension 3- Instructor Consequences, Dimension 4- Student Consequences, and Dimension 5- Student Conduct) among students grouped by declared major (Criminal Justice or other)?

RQ6: Is there a significant difference in the mean scores for each of the dimensions on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey (Dimension 1- Use of Technology, Dimension 2- Perceptions of Policy, Dimension 3- Instructor Consequences, Dimension 4- Student Consequences, and Dimension 5- Student Conduct) between students grouped by self-reported grade point average (GPA: 2.00-3.00, 3.01-4.00)?
Definition of Terms

Academic Cheating: “Academic cheating is defined as representing someone else’s work as your own. It can take many forms, including sharing another’s work, purchasing a term paper or test questions in advance, paying another to do the work for you” (ETS, 1999, para. 1).

Academic Dishonesty: Academic misconduct is any action or attempted action that may result in creating an unfair academic advantage for oneself or an unfair academic advantage or disadvantage for any other member or members of the academic community (ETS, 1999). Academic dishonesty, academic cheating, cheating, and academic misconduct may be used interchangeably throughout this study.
Limitations, Delimitations, and Assumptions

This study was limited by the appropriateness of the theoretical framework and was assumed to be an accurate reflection of the educational philosophy of the participants and the primary construct (opinions concerning academic dishonesty) being studied. Therefore, the results of this study are limited by the accuracy of the theoretical framework to reflect the phenomena under study. This study is limited by the definition of academic dishonesty and how well the instrument measures the construct. It is also assumed that the methodology is appropriate to the problem being addressed.

The results of this study are limited by the ability of the statistical procedures selected to find statistical significance. Further, it is assumed that the participants in this study are representative of the population of interest. A possible limitation of this study is the sample size and the number of undergraduate students who took part in the survey. To assure the highest level of response, the time required to complete the survey was limited to 10 minutes. A possible limitation could be that over- or under-reporting may be an issue of concern and could distort the results of the study. However, the anonymity of the individuals who take part in the survey should address that concern. Another limitation is that an institution of higher education’s culture and climate plays a key role in how students feel about academic dishonesty. Conducting the same study at other types of institutions of higher learning would allow researchers to learn how results for different types of educational institutions may or may not correlate.

The theoretical framework was chosen after considering previous research in similar studies. Only those questions that were approved by an expert panel were included in the survey. The results of this study may not be generalizable to other populations. This study was further delimited by the theoretical framework that was selected for the research. This study is delimited
to participating undergraduates attending the three schools in Tennessee that were selected for inclusion in the study; the results may not be generalizable to other schools or those in other states. This study was further delimited by the theoretical framework that was selected for the research. An opinion on academic dishonesty was measured by a Likert-type scale with an instrument especially designed for this study.

**Overview of the Study**

This study is organized into five chapters. Chapter 1 contains an introduction to the study, statement of the problem, research questions, significance of the study, definition of terms, and delimitations and limitations. Chapter 2 provides a review of literature pertinent to the issues addressed in this study. The research methodology and design are discussed in Chapter 3 along with the study’s population, procedures, instrumentation, research questions and corresponding null hypotheses, and data collection and analysis. Chapter 4 presents the results of the study. Chapter 5 contains the summary of findings, conclusions, and recommendations for further study.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Academic Dishonesty

To better understand the area of concentration for this literature review, a usable definition of the term academic dishonesty must be included. Academic dishonesty can be defined as any deceit in academic work, which can include cheating, plagiarism, falsification of documents, and giving (or receiving) aid on assignments, tests, or exams. Academic dishonesty has been practiced in almost every educational setting from elementary school to higher educational and graduate school settings. As a point of reference, there was evidence of academic dishonesty 2,000 years ago during Chinese civil service examinations (Bushway & Nash, 1977). The findings from Bushway and Nash’s (1977) study on academic dishonesty revealed that 20% of students begin cheating early in elementary school.

Stephens (2004) studied college students and found that two-thirds of college students have committed an act of academic dishonesty in their college careers. Additionally, there was a study that demonstrated that 56% of students in middle-school and 70% of students in high-school have taken part in some form of academic dishonesty (Decoo & Colpaert, 2002). When university administrators investigate the legal aspects of academic dishonesty, clear-cut approaches can be undefined. This situation is complicated by a universally agreed upon definition of what constitutes academic dishonesty. University policies on the topic are often not properly communicated to the student body. Policies are further not always written in a clear manner. Instructors are responsible for making the decision whether to handle individual issues of cheating internally or to address the situation as it has been articulated in university policies and procedures, which send the offender before a disciplinary committee. Paramount in this
situation is to ensure that a student’s legal due process rights are not violated by university faculty or administrators. Academic dishonesty has been defined in terms of a range of unacceptable, deliberate, dishonest activity that a student uses to gain an advantage on classroom assignments or testing activities.

When looking at academic dishonesty from a legal viewpoint, a key federal law addresses dishonesty; the *due process* clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, which allows an accused the right to have knowledge of and respond to allegations made against him or her. Due process in education began with the 1961 case of *Dixon v. Alabama State Board of Education*. This case set the precedence for requiring that the accused receive proper notification of a hearing as a standard for the minimal set of safeguards for accusations of academic misconduct. Another legal point of consideration is whether or not the academic infraction should be addressed as social misconduct or as academic in nature. Scholastic dishonesty has been defined by the courts as an offense that cannot be defined as either academic or disciplinary. The courts have generally not intervened in these types of situations allowing the university to make judgment. If an issue moves into a disciplinary environment, the courts have been more inclined to become involved. In the case of *Goss v. Lopez* (1975), the courts decided that a student has the right to due process when there is the possibility of the loss of liberty, rights, or property. A student who has been accused of academic dishonesty, but denied due process rights, could have a court decision made in his or her favor (Bricault, 2007).

McCabe, Treviño, and Butterfield (2001) studied honor codes, cheating, and academic dishonesty in academia. They collected data over a decade of documentation and investigative follow-up. The outcome revealed that academic dishonesty is widespread and that variations in academic dishonesty have shown a marked increase over a period of 30 years. McCabe et al.
(2001) found that student opinion of a peer’s conduct has a very strong influence when it comes to academic dishonesty. Institutional honesty policies such as integrity programs can have a positive effect on an individual’s actions. The foundation of the research by McCabe et al. (2001) was based on a moral and ethical choice encountered by college students. Their decision was whether or not to take part in academic dishonesty during their college years (McCabe et al., 2001).

Corruption in education has been a problem in every country. It is particularly present at the university and college level; all educational institutions have issues of corruption. According to Johnson (2012), corrupt acts are unethical; however not all unethical acts are corrupt. Corrupt acts in an educational setting are conduct by an individual that goes against the values that form a basis for educational processes. Another example is serious conduct that is considered criminal, actions of fraud, or the intentional breach of an individual’s prescribed duty. As indicated in the research, dishonesty has occurred since the beginning of established colleges, especially in the US. Student cheating on essays has been found for at least 60 years (Michaels & Miethe, 1989; Whitley, 1998). Scholars warn that the level of cheating has become epidemic, citing several factors as to the reasons for cheating in colleges reported in the research (Robinson, Amburgey, Swank, & Faulkner, 2004).

According to Robinson et al. (2004), cheating is the intent to use unauthorized means or an attempt to use materials, information, or some type of study aid in order to receive academic credit. Robinson et al. (2004) found a concentration on the factors associated with cheating on tests. When surveys were done anonymously Robinson et al. (2004) found evidence that a large number of college students who cheated also committed many sorts of academically dishonest deeds ranging from cheating on exams, writing assignments, and collaboration with others when
completing assignments. Once professors made their views on cheating clear, the students had fewer dishonest episodes, yet many students continued cheating regardless of the professors’ views or actions.

Robinson et al. (2004) suggested another component of cheating includes the perception of good grades. It is possible that college students become better cheaters because of pressure to do well in school. However, it is usually the students with the greatest academic difficulties who are more apt to cheat. With these cheating behaviors, research has shown that seeing someone cheating brings more association with the group because the students’ peers witness little or no obstacle to the dishonesty (Robinson et al., 2004).

**Treatment of Academic Dishonesty**

Carter and Punyanunt-Carter (2006) primarily investigated different treatments that addressed academic dishonesty by college students. Results showed that as much as 40% to 60% of college students have cheated on at least one examination. Furthermore, according to Carter and Punyanunt-Carter (2006), students were more likely to cheat on classroom examinations when they felt that faculty did not show an interest in curbing the cheating activity. Carter and Punyanunt-Carter (2006) found that it was easier to understand the college students’ concept of acceptable treatment when an instructor reacted to a fictional student’s cheating scenario during a classroom examination. The study evaluated the reaction between male and female students to the same stimuli.

Carter and Punyanunt-Carter (2006) found that college students reported that certain responses by instructors were more desirable than other responses. The response gathering the greatest acceptance by students was that of the instructor merely speaking to the student after class ended. The next choice by students was that the student received a failing grade on the
exam but was allowed to retake an alternate exam at a later date. According to Carter and Punyanunt-Carter (2006), the final acceptable response was for the instructor to do nothing. All of these responses were found to be more acceptable than having the instructor take the exam from the offending student and assign the student a failing grade (Carter & Punyanunt-Carter, 2006).

Vandehey et al. (2007) examined university students’ attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors as they related to academic dishonesty. This was an extended student study from data collected in 1984, 1994, and 2004. This research used the same instrument to evaluate academic dishonesty at one university over an extended period. In the Vandehey et al. (2007) study, students were classified as participating in academic dishonesty if they admitted to cheating at any point during their college carrier. All other students were identified in the study as not participating in academic dishonesty. In the 1984 study, 54% of students reported being involved in cheating. The study further revealed an increase in academic dishonesty in 1994 to 61% (Vandehey et al., 2007). One concern of Vandehey et al. (2007) was that it was apparent that academic dishonesty had taken place so much that the action had not been viewed as a negative act by the students.

The most recent data gathered in 2004 revealed similar high academic dishonesty reporting rates of 52% to 90%. The results of this study clearly indicated that students take part in cheating activities at some point in their college carrier. Vandehey et al. (2007) revealed that a student’s concern for being caught and punished for cheating was far more effective as a deterrent to academic misconduct than the student’s internal feelings toward the act. In the 1994 study, students were deterred from academic misconduct by external factors from the top four of six deterrent emphasis areas. The top ranking deterrent was embarrassment of being caught in the act of academic dishonesty; the second ranking factor was being dropped from the course of
instruction, third was the response of the university, and fourth was receiving a failing grade for the course. Student guilt ranked fifth and sixth was what the student’s friends thought of the offender being caught in the act of academic dishonesty. Vandehey et al. (2007) further discussed the issue that most faculty are reluctant to abide by university standards when addressing student academic misconduct; 71% of faculty members reported that confronting a student about academic misconduct is a negative aspect of being an instructor at the college level. The study consistently found that student punishment factors continued to be the best deterrents to student academic misconduct (Vandehey et al., 2007).

In a study conducted by Hamlin, Barczyk, Powell, and Frost (2013) on a comparison of university efforts to contain academic dishonesty, they discovered that cheating affected institutions of higher learning and colleges throughout the nation. The study further discussed six areas that highlight the importance of academic dishonesty. The first is that cheating takes place in every discipline. The second is that there is not a standard method for addressing the issue in the same departments. The third area discussed was that non-tenured faculty had a lesser inducement to address the issue primarily because possible end of semester evaluations had the potential to affect the instructor’s tenure tract. The forth area addressed in the study was that discrepancies in policy or implementation could cause legal ramifications. The fifth area was that the honest student is disadvantaged when students who take part in academic dishonesty are not admonished or punished. The sixth area is the way dishonesty is addressed is of significant importance in obtaining an affirmative outcome from the negative act of academic dishonesty.

A study by Newton (2016) used a questionnaire-based procedure to review the attitudes, ability, and confidence of undergraduates newly enrolled at a university in the United Kingdom. The study’s focus was on impressions relating to written assignments. Students were generally of
the opinion that academic misconduct should be modestly punished as compared to the standard penalties imposed by the United Kingdom higher education sector. Correlations were supported by conclusions that new postgraduates were more assured than new undergraduate students. The researchers recommended more severe penalties and performed better in the simple tests of referencing. The conclusions were discussed in the framework of educational needs recognized for students, educators, and institutions.

In a study conducted by Bowers (1964) on student academic misconduct in higher education, he discovered that 75% of the 5,000 students surveyed had taken part in one or more acts of cheating. In a more updated study conducted by Duke University’s Center for Academic Integrity, 70% of 50,000 university undergraduate students surveyed during 2002-2005 at 60 university campuses nationwide indicated that they had been involved in academic dishonesty (Graves, 2008).

According to Bowers (1964), student academic misconduct does not include a clear definition of cheating. Cheating is associated with an individual’s perception of ethics and individuals values. A student may take part in academic dishonesty for a variety of reasons; an emphasis on success, pressure from peers, unrealistic expectations, or lack of preparedness all have led to student cheating. Another area that has led to academic dishonesty is a strong emphasis on achieving a high grade point average that will lead to glowing transcripts and probable college scholarships that could result in assistantships at the graduate level.

In addition, the process an instructor uses to present class material and the classroom structure can influence academic dishonesty (Owunwanne et al., 2010). If the interest level of the student is low as to the content of the class material, he or she may be more inclined to take part in academic dishonesty. According to Owunwanne et al. (2010), a student who has little respect
for the course instructor will probably have little respect for the course and be more inclined to take part in acts of cheating in the classroom. When students see other students getting a substantial benefit from academic dishonesty, many are more inclined to cheat in the classroom. With proven data collected that show academic dishonesty takes place at various levels in the academic process, which makes an equal and fair opportunity impossible for most students, many eventually commit acts of cheating to gain an equal opportunity for advancement.

Technology has made the process of combating academic dishonesty more of a challenge for instructors; Owunwanne et al. (2010) found that 17% of students polled in recent studies reported that they used the Internet to take part in academic misconduct.

In a study conducted by McCabe (2005) at 23 public and private universities and colleges, 38% of undergraduate students admitted they had participated in Internet academic dishonesty by using the Internet to copy submitted classroom materials. Studies by Brown, Weible, and Olmosk (2010) revealed that 49% of students enrolled in undergraduate classes in the year 1988 were involved in academic misconduct. In the same course, 100% of the students polled in 2008 admitted to cheating on classroom assignments. Brown et al. (2010) reported that the Center for Academic Integrity discovered that nearly 80% of college students polled admitted to academic dishonesty on at least one occasion.

Jones (2011) discussed that 92% of the participants from his study revealed that they had or knew another student who had taken part in academic dishonesty. Forty-one percent of the participants indicated that their moral and ethical standing would prevent them from cheating in the classroom. This further revealed that 59% of the polled student body would participate in academic dishonesty. Student performance was the most documented reason that study participants gave for taking part in academic dishonesty. According to Jones (2011), the data
compiled and evaluated in the study indicates a greater number of students felt that it was acceptable to take part in academic dishonesty.

Olafson, Schraw, and Kehrwald (2014) discussed that in their study of 421 alleged academic misconduct forms from collegiate level students that plagiarism accounted for 49% of reported violations; 35% of the reports addressed students receiving outside help. There was also the finding that 91.5% of the reporting was by undergraduate level university students. The study found that academic dishonesty is widespread among college students, very few are caught, and fewer than that were ever sanctioned.

Gallant and Drinan (2006) identified a theoretical approach to offer leadership possibilities that go further than best practices regarding academic dishonesty. Many of the measures taken to curtail academic dishonesty are by nature organizational. Examples include honor pledges, honor codes, and alterations to university policies and procedures. Gallant and Drinan (2006) addressed the approach of student cheating by applying an organizational theory. They heightened awareness of the problem of student academic dishonesty by outlining a multifaceted organization that could be altered by social forces, time, and individuals; educational institutions are significantly complex because of the many subgroups involved. The organization’s primary goal is to keep the group alive. To accomplish this and get along, organizations are in a constant state of action and reaction to the subgroups and other forces in their group. Problems are often complicated by confusing the characterization of the issue, which requires a series of problem solving actions. If the issue of academic dishonesty is the concept, the response has been a series of practices that were intended to prevent or control patterns of behavior. This method may control cheating on a temporary basis, but the primary factors that make up the act are not addressed.
When academic dishonesty is addressed by using psychological research, researchers accept that a student’s character determines if he or she will engage in academic dishonesty. Examples found through research were that students who engaged in cheating gave excuses for it (Gallant & Drinan, 2006). Furthermore, students had issues with reporting fellow students who participated in academic dishonesty. According to Gallant and Drinan (2006), the student cannot balance the loyalty and friendship of the offender with the integrity needed to report their fellow student. Additionally, Gallant and Drinan (2006) found that most undergraduate students did not want to be involved in the situation because their maturity level did not allow them the capacity to distinguish among their informed decisions, ideas, and responsibility for their actions (Gallant & Drinan, 2006).

Academic dishonesty has been compared to the crime of theft in other studies conducted in economic literature (Bunn, Caudill, & Gropper, 1992; Clotfelter, 1977) (as cited in Mixon, 1996). Mixon (1996) reported that cheating is governed by university honor codes that mirror laws and both university instructors and law enforcement officers have the ability to dissuade cheating. Academic dishonesty, just like other types of criminal conduct, is calculated by the perpetrators on the cost verses the benefits (Mixon, 1996). An instructor who has made a determination of student academic dishonesty and has further decided to punish the offender will, at a minimum, be obligated to be involved in multiple administratively controlled procedures and the possible addition of litigation (Mixon, 1996). Research has shown that there are instructors who believe academic dishonesty can be restricted with ease or at a minimal cost.

Mixon (1996) stated that academic dishonesty is multi-dimensional. One of these aspects is that of the public-good. This dimension, as described in his study, articulates the proposal that academic dishonesty is a crime where there are no victims. The perpetrator of academic
dishonesty receives advancement without any effort on his or her part. This is accomplished by obtaining scholastic advancement through acts of academic dishonesty. This being the case, comprehension is under-produced in the presence of academic dishonesty (Mixon, 1996).

Mixon (1996) found that the determining factors of consistent academic dishonesty actions are very similar to other individuals who admitted to taking part in academic dishonesty on at least one occasion. The alternative is never committing academic dishonesty on any scholastic activity. Mixon (1996) reported that behavior consistent with academic dishonesty is inversely associated with grade point average. However, cheating is related to the individual becoming acquainted with and observing other students who have taken part in academic dishonesty. He also found that student expectation of punishment handed down by a university also deterred student cheating. According to Mixon (1996), belief that cheaters would receive swift and severe punishment lead to a decline in incidences of academic dishonesty.

**Cheating in Higher Education**

The issue of academic dishonesty is a significant problem and has been referred to as “the bane of higher education” (Josien & Broderick, 2013, p. 93). Some of the latest studies have revealed that the trend is ever present (Brown & McLnerney, 2008; Jones, 2011). Jones (2011) conducted a study revealing that 92% of students who were surveyed had knowledge of other students who had taken part in cheating. The study further showed that 52.1% of students reported that academic dishonesty is merely a small issue at their university.

Results of the Jones (2011) study indicated that younger, more immature, students engage in academic dishonesty on a more continuous basis. Higher level courses tend to have fewer incidence of cheating. Jones (2011) also found that single students have a greater propensity to commit academic dishonesty than those who are married. When the risk of punishment was
lower, female students were more inclined to cheat than male students; higher risk of punishment lowered the possibility of cheating by females. Students with lower grade point averages were at a greater risk to take part in academic dishonesty than those with a higher grade point average (Josien & Broderick, 2013).

Josien and Broderick (2013) found that there were fewer incidents of cheating when students concluded that peers would disapprove of the conduct. Academic misconduct was higher among students involved in sororities and fraternities and was elevated when students had knowledge that other students were cheating. Institutions of higher learning with an environment of professional conduct, ethical behavior, and an honor code have a lower incidence of academic dishonesty. Penalties for acts of academic dishonesty also deter such actions from occurring. Josien and Broderick (2013) found that 40% of students who took part in academic dishonesty took part in multiple methods of cheating.

Petress (2003) reported that students who are caught in the act of academic plagiarism made excuses that “everyone is doing it [and] it’s not a big deal” (p. 624). Academic misconduct and plagiarism can take many forms such as taking exams for other students, not citing the work of others, or making up sources in written materials. According to Petress (2003), when the idea of academic misconduct is discussed with students, most do not pay much attention to the issue. When polled, most students stated that they would not identify another student who they knew was engaging in academic dishonesty. When students are successful at cheating, other students know about it and are more inclined to cheat in their scholastic activities. If students are caught cheating, accused, and have a severe admonishment, it seems that the behavior can be curtailed (Petress 2003).
Instructors who were polled had various responses when discussing academic misconduct (Petress, 2003). One response was that it is rather risky from a legal standpoint to allege cheating by a student. Another response by instructors is that there is too much red tape involved in the process and it would take them away from their regular work. Finally, instructors reported that students will merely find another way to take part in academic dishonesty. According to Petress (2003), instructors fear that they will not have the support of administrators, parents, and other instructors if they report academic dishonesty.

There is much debate on the rationale of students regarding academic cheating, but there are multiple factors involved in this dishonesty. Hamlin and Powell (2008) found results similar to other studies discussed here. Many students at the graduate and undergraduate level cheat, while others find it difficult to report what they witness. Both cheaters and honest students get hurt because one commits the misbehavior while the others know they should speak up about the behavior but do not want to get involved. According to Hamlin and Powell (2008), it is imperative that a solution to the problem of academic cheating is found. There is urgency in addressing the dishonest act but the frequency of the dishonesty must first be acknowledged in every discipline. Second, there is not yet a resolution as to the best procedure to use when dealing with dishonesty within a department. According to Hamlin and Powell (2008), professors do not want to deal with cheating in their classroom because of the extra work required by them, which supports the research by Petress (2003). Third, teachers who are on the tenure track do not want to upset students, especially when the professors will be evaluated at the end of the course. Fourth, if there is a discrepancy between the teacher’s observation of the student and the student involved, it could result in legal action that would require a great deal of time and effort and could result in much anguish. Even if the issue of cheating is addressed, the fact stated by the
authors remains the same and more cheating will continue in colleges and institutions of higher learning. According to Hamlin and Powell (2008), professors felt a responsibility to make an effort to lessen the problem.

McCabe et al. (2001) further revealed that academic dishonesty is frequently responded to casually or oftentimes completely disregarded by staff members who do not wish to be involved in an organizational practice whose design is to judge cheating at the university. When students witnessed other students in the act of academic dishonesty and the response was minimal or not punished at all, McCabe et al. (2001) found that students did not receive a benefit for working to earn their grades honestly, which caused them to begin cheating, too.

In a discussion on the implementation of honor codes at a university, McCabe et al. (2001) indicated that the sheer presence of such polices was not sufficient to curtail academic dishonesty. The policy must have a strong presence in the culture of the university. University uprightness can be established in a school without a published code of honor. For this to occur, faculty, staff, and the student body must communicate how important academic honesty is to the university and to everyone associated with the university (McCabe et al., 2001).

McCabe et al. (2001) found that staff members at institutions of higher learning with honor codes and those without honor codes were disinclined to report academic dishonesty and would rather address such incidences themselves. Another strong revelation of the study revealed that students held the opinion that a significant number of instructors did not react harshly to cheating in the classroom. Over half of the faculty at institutions of higher learning without honor codes would simply give the student a failing grade on that particular exam, 9% reacted by giving the student a warning, 7% issued various penalties that amounted to less than the student receiving a failing grade for the exam, and 1% would not impost any form of punishment on the
offending student. Student reaction indicates that students tend to prefer the lesser punishment courses (McCabe et al., 2001).

McCabe et al. (2001) further found that high school students entering a university participated in some aspects of academic dishonesty or witnessed cheating by other students. The results of a survey indicated that when these students observed upperclassmen involved in academic dishonesty and then saw staff members not responding to the cheating, their opinion of the college classroom deteriorated rapidly (McCabe et al., 2001).

McCabe et al. (2001) reported that every campus must commit to strong unfailing communication to the student body that integrity in academia is expected and additionally that academic dishonesty will end in negative consequences. The student must understand that disciplinary actions will not be lenient. Institutions of higher learning must support members of the staff who make allegations of academic misconduct and uphold the prohibition of violations that discourage scholastic values (McCabe et al., 2001). According to McCabe et al., a university must assure the student body that academic dishonesty will be met by a resounding condemnation and further that academic honesty is a rule at the university rather than an exception. For this to become a reality, institutions of higher learning must have the wherewithal to address student cheating and hold the student accountable for all acts of academic dishonesty for which they are involved (McCabe et al., 2001).

**Deterrence**

According to Onwudiwe et al. (2004), a sub-section of deterrence theory is the social contract. The general concept is that mankind is not evil or virtuous; individuals agree to abide by certain standards of living and will continue to abide by the standards as long as all parties in the group adhere to the same set of standards. In order for society to function well, the
punishment for one who violates the rules set up by the group must be greater than the reward that the person receives from the violation of the group rule (Onwudiwe et al., 2004).

Tittle and Rowe (1973) studied the effectiveness of the threat of deterrence on cheating at academic institutions. They found that a college student is considerably dissuaded from academic dishonesty when there is a real threat of being caught and penalized. According to Michaels and Miethe (1989), if an individual were to understand the likelihood of penalty and the severity of punishment at a university with an honor code in place, then they were less likely to be associated with academic dishonesty.

Nagin and Pogarsky (2003) used an experimental study of students regarding the variation of the severity and certainty of the threat of punishment for academic misconduct. They found students who were allowed to take part in academic dishonesty with the promise of financial gain. The research also considered the influence of situational dynamics and singular individualities in a controlled sterile environment (Nagin & Pogarsky, 2003). The study participants were randomly placed into four certainty-severity arrangements.

• In the high certainty situation, the students were advised that the instructor would at all times be present in the room during the testing procedure. These students were also advised that anyone caught in the act of academic dishonesty would immediately forfeit the compensation fee for taking part in the study.

• The students in the low certainty situation were advised that the instructor would not be present in the room during the entire exam but would check in periodically. These students were not advised of any penalty if caught cheating. (p.190)
At the conclusion of the study, there was a determination that the certainty of a student caught for cheating was more significant and stronger as related to the effect of severity. The results also showed that the probability of academic misconduct was 16 points more significant in the student section marked as a low certainty situation (Nagin & Pogarsky 2003).

**Are Students Reticent about Cheating?**

Malgwi and Rakovski (2009) described what they identified as an academic fraud triangle. Perceived pressure, perceived opportunity, and rationalization are the three aspects of their idea with perceived pressure as the most important of the three emphasis areas that describe why fraud occurs. This three pronged idea includes that dishonesty occurs when people in a position of authority experience pressure. The way to relieve this pressure is to violate trust and become involved in academic dishonesty.

Malgwi and Rakovski (2009) identified a concept with no academic fraud. To accomplish this, university students, staff, and faculty must share in the responsibility. Deterrence is reactionary and usually implemented after an incident while punishment is different; if an individual is punished and the reason for the punishment is well published, there should be a deterrent effect. Punishment should send a message to others contemplating a similar act. Academic dishonesty has had such prevalence that it has become more complex and is a regular occurrence for students. This issue has also been found at institutions of higher learning with honor systems. The effect of social differences, situations, and cultural ideas are all reasons why a student cheats. Employing various measures aimed at combating academic dishonesty does not ease the problem but has the opposite effect. Malgwi and Rakovski (2009) found four actions that were the most relevant in deterring academic dishonesty, “stronger penalties, parental notification, an anonymous tip line, and administering a uniform penalty” (p. 207).
Huang & Chen (2015) conducted a correlation analysis with 431 university students and discovered that, compared to other students, the study participants who possessed a mastery methodology and willingness to report academic dishonesty among other students, were less likely to disclose ineffectual feelings as a reason for taking part in academic dishonesty. These same students further stated that they would engage in academic dishonesty for self-interest or self-promotion purposes. Students in the study reported that those with a less mastery approach and an enhanced acceptance of cheating were more likely to take part in differing types of academic dishonesty.

**Crime and Punishment**

The abundance of available electronics to students, reporting by instructors, reporting by the student body, and the profound consequences for acts of misconduct all add to the issue of academic misconduct (Robinson-Zañartu, Peña, Cook-Morales, Peña, Afshani, & Nguyen, 2005). Academic misconduct such as plagiarism has long been considered academic deception and the punishment for such actions vary from reprimands to expulsion. According to Robinson-Zañartu et al. (2005) cultural and academic pressures are important factors in the decision to take part in academic dishonesty. Student social pressures, achievement rewards, and demands on time and organization all cause an individual to become involved in academic misconduct.

When academic misconduct is identified, the instructor must evaluate several concerns including what punishment is appropriate and to whom the instructor reports the incident. Mathur and Offenbach (2002) (as cited by Robinson-Zañartu et al., 2005) wrote that 10% of instructors reported that they could not turn in a student for academic misconduct because of fearing retaliation. The percentage increased to 27% when the instructor was asked if they would turn in a colleague for misconduct (Robinson-Zañartu et al., 2005).
The purpose of Burrus, Graham, and Walker’s (2011) study was to evaluate faculty ideas regarding the frequency of academic misconduct, what is generally considered academic misconduct, and what procedures could reduce cheating. Most institutions of higher learning make public their policy that covers issues of academic dishonesty; honor codes are relevant in the molding of students toward a positive culture. McCabe et al. (2001) found that institutions of higher learning with formal honor codes were integral to the university culture. Academic dishonesty will not be part of the student’s academic make-up as long as it is not introduced during the early stages of an academic career. Kidwell, Wozniak, and Laurel (2003) conducted a study of college students and found that 70% reported plagiarism and academic dishonesty. In addition, there were those who reported multiple acts of cheating.

Kerkvliet (1994) and Whitley (1998) (as cited by Burrus et al., 2011) revealed that a greater focus on grades, grade point averages, working more hours outside of class, and student alcohol consumption all had a determinative effect on academic dishonesty. Research revealed that students do not get involved in academic misconduct because they lack an understanding of what cheating is. Instead, they cheat because of the low possibility of being detected or the insignificant consequences of being caught (Burrus et al., 2011).

In a military school setting, expulsion is common practice for academic dishonesty. Certainty and severity of punishment for academic dishonesty are important factors for curtailing academic dishonesty. Mixon (1996) and Burrus et al. (2007) (as cited by Burrus et al., 2011) found that the severity of the punishment is an important determinant in the likelihood of academic dishonesty.
Levels of Threat and Punishment

Heisler (1974) conducted a study focused on whether an instructor imposed a harsh, moderate, or meek punishment against a cheating student, and if that punishment prevented college students from cheating. The results of the study indicated whether or not a student who received a penalty for taking part in a dishonest activity could influence other students not to participate in cheating (Heisler, 1974). In Heisler’s (1974) study, participants were divided into eight groups, given an exam, provided with different directions, and treated in different ways.

1. The first group was given the exam. During the last section of the exam, the students were told that they were to grade their own exam to expedite the process.

2. The second group was treated exactly the same as group one with the exception that the students witnessed a student being confronted by the instructor and accused of changing answers. This confrontation was carried out early in the grading process. After being told not to cheat any more during the grading process, the student was allowed to continue with the exam.

3. The third group of students was given the same course of action that group one received with the exception that the participants were advised prior to grading the exams that being caught cheating would result in the student being expelled from the university.

4. The students in group four received the same guidelines as the students in group three with the exception that the students were allowed to see the instructor catch a student cheating at the beginning of the grading process.

5. Group five participants went through the same procedure as group four but prior to grading the exams, the instructor told the students that if they were caught
cheating they would be required to repeat the Cooperative School and College Ability Test.

6. The procedure concerning group six was identical to group five except that these students were allowed to witness a student caught cheating.

7. Group seven students were subjected to the same procedure as group six but prior to the grading process the students were advised that if they were caught cheating there would be a mandatory deduction of 12 points from the students’ final grade.

8. The students in group eight were subjected to the same procedure as the students in group seven but also witnessed a student caught cheating. (Heisler, 1974, p. 580)

Students who were given a stern threat but were not subjected to the student caught in the act of cheating, tended to cheat much more than other students. The students who were given a stern threat and also witnessed the student caught cheating had the fewest cheating incidences. The students who observed the student caught cheating scenario and the instructor giving a lenient punishment to the offending student tended to take part in cheating activities at a drastically higher percentage than the students who had observed a student caught cheating after the students were strongly or mildly admonished (Heisler, 1974).

Classical Perspective

Any discussion about the classical prospective on criminal theory should include the subsection area identified as scenario research, which can be identified as an individual’s perception of certainty and severity in terms of punishment that depends on the situation. Furthermore, that perception is altered as time passes. The Tibbetts (2012) study focused on participants given the opportunity to engage in illegal or improper activity. Tibbetts (2012) found that an increased
number of participants carried out the acts, even though they were certain of the punishment they would receive; there was also little concern for the severity of the punishment.

A sub-section of deterrence theory is the *rational choice* theory that emphasizes the significant amount of decision making power that an individual considers when deciding whether or not to carry out an act. Rational choice is guided by an expectation of rewards. One example is the euphoria experienced when one is able to perpetrate an illegal or improper act without discovery. Rational choice has its origins in the concept that knowing an act is illegal, immoral, or (more specifically) bad should be the foundation of deterrence (Tibbetts, 2012).

According to Reynolds (1998) the Wolfgang Group studied two groups of males and concluded that males who committed illegal or improper acts and received a lesser punishment were more likely to re-offend or commit further illegal or improper acts; the males in the two groups who were given a more severe punishment were less likely to commit further illegal acts. Reynolds (1998) also cited a 1979 study by Murray and Cox involving 317 participants who had carried out acts that were known to be illegal or improper. The researchers found that those who received severe punishments were less likely to commit the acts again than the participants who received a lesser punishment (Reynolds, 1998).

Bentham (1780), who was an 18th century crime intellect, wrote *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*. The body of his paper discussed deterrence theory and included information that the power of the theory was in the clarity of a prescribed punishment, the certainty of a prescribed punishment, and the severity of a prescribed punishment. Additionally, Bentham stated that the sooner punishment was enforced after an offense occurred, the better the possibility that the perpetrator would understanding that he or she should not have carried out the offensive act (Onwudiwe et al., 2004).
Zero Tolerance

The American Psychological Association established a task force to determine and recommend zero tolerance policies (American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force, 2008); according to the APA, a zero tolerance policy mandates application of a predetermined, severe penalty as the prescribed manner of punishment for severe violations of policy. The intensity, the circumstances, and the context of the situation are not taken into account when the penalty is administered. The idea of zero tolerance has its origins in the punishments handed down to individuals who traffic in the sale and distribution of illegal or controlled substances. In the early 1990s, the idea of adding zero tolerance to school policies and procedures became common-place (American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force, 2008).

These policies were founded and enacted on the idea that harsh reactions leveled against problem students or the removal of these students from scholastic programs would be enforced by student peers. Subsequently, this student-led punishment would have a positive effect and discourage remaining students from participating in illegal or improper acts (American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force, 2008).

There is little data that examine the idea of zero tolerance policies when evaluating school discipline. The American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force (2008) report detailed ideas in two areas. The first is the reformation of zero tolerance policies that deal with use of alternative practices, and second is an alternative procedure to take the place of zero tolerance where a more suitable approach is appropriate.

In the early 1990s, school discipline was dominated by the idea of zero tolerance. The concept became an appropriate policy that articulated the carrying out of prior agreed upon
punishments. The punishments were punitive and severe in their design and were carried out against the individual with no regard to the situation. Without a good singular definition of zero tolerance, it is somewhat difficult to determine the helpfulness of the idea. The study made the determination that, for some offenses, a mandated punishment increases the consistency of discipline in the school and communicates a very clear discipline message to the student. The study further found that the certain and swift aspect of punishments contained in the zero tolerance idea had a definite deterrent effect on students (American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force, 2008).

**Zero Tolerance and Student Choice**

Levy and Rakovski (2006) performed research to determine student reaction to an instructor using a zero tolerance academic dishonesty policy. Each participant was asked about their reaction to classroom penalties for various types of academic dishonesty, which acts of cheating were considered more severe than others, and how many times they cheat. Findings revealed that acts of academic dishonesty were less common at institutions of higher learning with a strong academic code of honor (Levy & Rakovski, 2006). Some students who participated in academic dishonesty placed the blame for their cheating on instructors who do not act against prior acts of academic dishonesty. The findings revealed that students participated in academic dishonesty less when they knew the cheating would be discovered.

Studies indicated that the primary issue is punishment for dishonest behavior (Levy & Rakovski, 2006; Nuss, 1984). In 1984, Nuss found that 39% of the instructors surveyed reported academic misconduct to the appropriate educational authority, 34% lowered the offender’s grade, and 26% gave a simple warning to the student. The response by the instructor depended on the type of misconduct committed by the student.
In the survey distributed by Levy and Rakovski (2006), the questions gauged student’s reactions based on two scenarios. The first scenario (the “other professor”) involved an instructor who employed a strict interpretation of the school academic dishonesty policy, reported students to the administration, and handed out discipline for cheating. The second scenario (the “zero tolerance” instructor) involved an instructor who employed a zero tolerance policy for academic dishonesty and failed all offenders in the class. The survey choices included that the student would avoid the course, register for the course, try to avoid the course, or be indifferent about whether or not to register for the course. Most participants reported that honest students would have an indifferent opinion when selecting the instructor. The survey further revealed that individuals who took part in dishonesty would avoid both types of instructor and 13% of the students indicated that they would avoid zero tolerance instructors (Levy & Rakovski, 2006).

**Strategies for Reducing Academic Dishonesty**

According to research, academic cheating has increased over the years (Williams & Hosek, 2003). In 1941, there was less cheating in colleges than today with percentages ranked from 21% to more than 50% (Williams & Hosek, 2003). According to Williams and Hosek (2003), academic dishonesty increased from cheating in colleges to cheating on income taxes, politics, and athletics. They also found that cheating occurred among pre-med and medical students and the dishonesty continued into their “subsequent careers.”

Research findings show that not only do students cheat in US colleges but there are at least 10% of international campus populations who also cheat (Williams & Hosek, 2003). These students made up 46.7% of the student population who cheated in the colleges. Aside from a moral and ethical imperative, the assumption is that students were rational when they chose to cheat because they expected to benefit from the behavior (Williams & Hosek, 2003).
Creating Environments that Foster Academic Integrity

Higher education has become a high stakes environment due to the student’s desire to be successful. Some rewards include but are not limited to scholarships, student loans, parental approval, and other significant factors. These pressures influence students to cheat, plagiarize, misreport research data, test security breeching, and other such similar instances. As stated by Tippitt, Ard, Kline, Tilghman, Chamberlain, and Meagher (2009), there should be an environmental change that brings about academic integrity. This environmental change will also have to become a significant culture change and the goal of a higher level of academic integrity would have to be pursued.

Cole, Swartz, and Shelley (2014) discussed the results of a 4-year study probing 553 collegiate level business students’ views of academic dishonesty and the aspect of technology in e-learning. More than a third of the participants indicated that they did not believe academic integrity applied equally online and in the classroom. The researchers used Independent-samples t-tests to reveal statistically significant differences based on gender, but not by age group or level of study. Of the replies submitted, 200 discussed what made the two learning environments different. Participants indicated that nowadays where retrieving information from multiple available resources to solve a problem is the standard, instructors should be familiar with that and determine what is and what is not suitable behavior in their courses.

According to Tippitt et al. (2009), a commitment is the responsibility that one must morally abide by a code of ethics and professional standards. This is to have resolute involvement by faculty when dealing with issues of academic integrity. One way for faculty to assist with students refraining from cheating is to have more than one proctor in the room and prohibiting the use of personal items (Tippitt et al., 2009).
Controlling Cheating in the Classroom

Unethical behavior is difficult to control and occurs not only inside the traditional classroom but has also grown in magnitude in the on-line educational classroom. A study by Ercegovac and Richardson (2004) showed that males younger than 24 years old were the demographic most likely to participate in academic misconduct. Ercegovac and Richardson (2004) also found that students who were further along in their education process were more likely to be involved in academic cheating.

In the fall of 2009, Troy University deployed something not used before with online classes (Kitahara, Westfall, & Mankelwicz, 2011). The Proctor U service was launched to proctor online students; each student was required to pay a $25 fee included in their tuition to pay for using the service. Proctor U staff members are available to provide real time assistance for student testing but a webcam is required for monitoring the student during the testing. Although the service was designed to deter cheating, Ercegovac and Richardson (2004) foresaw no effective way to stop cheating no matter the student, school, or place because students will always find ways to cheat.

As research indicated, academic dishonesty in college is a widespread issue and academic integrity has been an issue that is mostly overlooked in the field of criminology, which could be due to the perception of harm. There is evidence to support the idea that academic dishonesty is consequential (Smith, Langenbacher, Kudlac, & Fera, 2013). An act of cheating in college that results in a positive reinforcement will be revealed in other aspects of life because the unethical action was rewarded and successful in the past. It is important that investigators look at ideas of controlling academic dishonesty from a wide array of disciplines.
One emphasis area from the field of criminal justice is Agnew’s (1997) general strain theory. This theory explains that misconduct is started by the inability of the individual to cope in moral and ethical ways. The individual’s reaction is in response to events that provoke negative results. An example could be one who expects a good grade on an important exam but does not receive the expected grade, which results in academic dishonesty on future exams. Strain can result from the absence of stimuli an individual deems as a positive value; the presence of negative stimuli can also produce strain. Students in the process of experiencing strain are more inclined to be involved in academic dishonesty because of college pressures. Smith et al. (2013) revealed some support for strain theory. The aspect of academic shortcomings was shown to be in direct relation to academic dishonesty (Smith et al., 2013).

Research findings show that cheating happens more often than not (Kerkvliet & Sigmund, 1999). Evidence has been found that more students cheat regularly than students who never cheat, however there is no known evidence to determine the extent to which students cheat. Because of the rigorous techniques used by classroom teachers, some students cheat more with certain teachers than they do with others; it depends on the demands of each teacher.

According to Kerkvliet and Sigmund (1999), Becker theorized that criminals are rational decision-makers who determined the expected benefits and expected price of committing a crime. Kerkvliet and Sigmund (1999) determined that others have adapted Becker’s model on academic dishonesty. First, an increase in cheating occurred when it was undetected. Second, imposing a more severe punishment tended to deter cheating. Finally, measures taken to detect cheating also assisted in discouraging cheating. With controlled measures in place to prevent cheating, attempts at academic dishonesty were less likely to occur during classroom exams (Kerkvliet & Sigmund, 1999).
Pulvers and Diekhoff (1999) reported that between 40% and 90% of college students have committed academic dishonesty. His 10-year study on academic dishonesty at one educational facility revealed an increase from 54% in 1984 to 61.2% in 1994. He examined two broad categories on the issue of academic misconduct in college classrooms. The first was internal personal variables and the second was external situational variables. Internal variables were identified as differentiating between individuals who participated in cheating activities and those who did not. These variables included cheaters who are less mature than non-cheaters and cheaters with a lower moral development than those who do not cheat. Individuals who participated in academic misconduct were more likely to have pre-conventional levels of moral development; those who did not participate in academic misconduct were more likely to function from post-conventional levels of moral development.

In pre-conventional moral development, choices were made by avoiding punishment and looking for personal gain; post-conventional choices were moral decisions made by the student. These choices where internal ethical principles and outweighed regard for personal benefits that might have been gained by the individual student. Students who reported a higher level of work ethic were less likely to engage in unethical educational behavior.

Pulvers and Diekhoff (1999) found that a student’s attitude regarding justifying or neutralizing cheating played a significant role in their decision whether or not to cheat. According to Pulvers and Diekhoff (1999), external variables greatly affect the student’s decision to participate in academic misconduct. Faction association and pressure placed on the student to achieve a high grade point average were shown to contribute to academic dishonesty by students (Pulvers & Diekhoff, 1999).
Academic integrity has a fundamentally high educational value but does not prevent the occurrence of student cheating on exams and assignments. Schmelkin, Gilbert, Spencer, Pincus, and Silva (2008) found that estimations of student cheating exceed 50% at the college and high school level. Schmelkin et al. (2008) stated that even when instructors said academic dishonesty would not be tolerated in their classes, their actual response was little or no consequences for students caught cheating. Schmelkin et al. (2008) evaluated data taken from a poll of students showing that they were given no clear definition of academic dishonesty.

Roberts and Rabinowitz (1992) held the opinion that the way to change an environment that is conducive to academic dishonesty is by clarifying the understanding of faculty and students’ perception of academic dishonesty and the seriousness of the act. The rate of academic dishonesty remains high. Numerous causes and correlations have been studied but most researchers have looked at definitional issues of cheating by using self-report or direct measures. An indirect method of evaluation may reveal a reasonable answer to the concerns of academic dishonesty. The process does not confine the responder; instead, it gives several translations of ideas on the topic. Multidimensional scaling gives a better comprehensive evaluation of underlying ideas by college students related to cheating (Schmelkin et al., 2008).

Payne and Nantz (1994) identified best practices and initiatives that contribute to higher education academic honesty. Immoral and unethical behavior by students occurs at many higher education facilities. Students who participate in academic dishonesty cause the educational process to be unsettled. These actions are tolerated by the faculty of institutions of higher learning whose moral and ethical standing have been compromised. Faculty at these institutions of higher learning soon become stressed and disconnected from the educational process and eventually become discouraged and lose interest in education altogether.
Payne and Nantz (1994) found that 67% to 86% of undergraduate students had participated in academic dishonesty while in college. A study by McCabe and Treviño in 1996 revealed that one out of three students participated in academic dishonesty. The World Wide Web has given students a handy tool for use in college level plagiarism.

In a study conducted in 2002 by Hughes, Christian, Dayman, Kaufman, and Schmidt (as cited in Boehm, Justice, & Weeks, 2009, p. 47), the results indicated that “80% of college and university-bound high school students have cheated at least once.” Most of these students reported that they viewed cheating as a regular occurrence and further did not see academic dishonesty as a serious offense.

Institutions of higher learning, according to Boehm et al. (2009), are often lacking fixes and giving insignificant penalties for academic dishonesty. Higher education has been negatively impacted by the rise in academic dishonesty by the loss of production time, money, and the reputation of the affected university. Boehm et al. (2009) found that university administrators need to give their faculty training, provide the most current research on academic dishonesty, and develop a university honor code that defines and provides examples of academic misconduct. Institutions of higher learning should also develop specific penalties for students who are found guilty of taking part in academic dishonesty; students must consider a zero-tolerance response when it comes to academic dishonesty (Boehm et al., 2009).

Moberg, Sojka, and Gupta’s (2008) research identified the cheating strategies college students are most likely to use and who is most likely to use them, (men versus women, business majors versus other majors, and students with higher GPAs versus students with lower GPAs). In a survey of 372 undergraduate students at a large midwestern university, students self-reported on 18 cheating behaviors ranging from minor infractions such as “copied a homework
assignment” to more serious activities such as “taken a test for someone else.” The results suggested that business majors and students with lower GPAs were more likely to engage in dishonest academic behavior (Moberg et al., 2008).

Studies have found that in a typical situation, undergraduate students, male students, students with a lower grade point average, students associated with fraternities and sororities, students who take part in intercollegiate sports activities, and students who see cheating that is not properly punished are more inclined to take part in academic dishonesty (eg: Bowers, 1964; McCabe & Treviño, 1993, 1997; Storch & Storch, 2002; Whitley, 1998).

Gallant (2008) discussed a teaching and learning strategy to address academic misconduct as another way to view the current rule-compliance and integrity strategies. This strategy suggests that the quality of students’ academic work is impacted via their learning environment. Gallant (2008) addressed misconduct by suggesting the need to also understand the impact of societal forces on the learning environment.

Clement (2001) conducted research on a 10-year follow-up investigation at one university, which revealed that, in 1984, 54% of polled students admitted to academic dishonesty; in 1994 the percentage had increased to 61.2%. A study by Eskridge and Ames (1993) found that when criminal justice students were polled and the results compared to other students, there was no statistical difference related to academic dishonesty. The study results showed that criminal justice students were more strongly influenced by their peer’s actions and non-majors were more motivated by the possible consequences (Clement, 2001). In a study by McCabe, Butterfield, and Treviño (2003), there were findings that academic dishonesty was lower at institutions of higher learning with an honor code. An honor code, in and of itself, is not sufficient to bring academic dishonesty under control (Clement, 2001).
The problem of academic dishonesty is pervasive nationwide in virtually every college and university at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Hamlin, Barczyk, Powell, and Frost (2013) found that between 50% and 75% of college students have participated in some form of academic dishonesty. Undergraduate students in colleges and institutions of higher learning have reported that they committed acts of academic dishonesty and did not report other students who they witnessed cheating in the classroom (Hamlin et al., 2013). These students also reported that they thought it was permissible to cheat if the result was positive enough to justify the action, which helped generate more cheating behaviors. Cheating has a negative impact on the individual as well as the non-cheating student who witnesses the improper behavior.

There is no known universal idea or method for addressing the problem of academic cheating within a particular department. Faculty instructors are usually the ones who address academic dishonesty. According to Hamlin et al. (2013), some instructors do not wish to address the issue because of the added responsibility of prosecuting a suspected case of academic misconduct. A non-tenured instructor has even less of an interest in getting involved in the pursuing of sanctions against students, as student end of semester evaluations have a direct impact on the tenure track of an instructor. Students who do not participate in academic dishonesty are at a disadvantage when students who cheat are not punished for their actions. How the action is addressed is important because of a positive result from a negative incident (Hamlin et al., 2013). A clearer understanding of this is that when a student is disciplined for acts of academic dishonesty the offense has a negative impact. The punishment itself has a positive effect because the student learns a valuable lesson from the incident and other students see that the university and the instructor are not going to sit idly by with no response to dishonest acts.
McKibban and Burdsal (2013) found that academic dishonesty in the classroom is increasing and troublesome for instructors. The cheating process has developed into something like a business for individuals who are particularly talented at deception, just as the need for higher test scores has led administrators and instructors to report false test data. This, along with the rise in academic dishonesty, may give a false impression that society is more interested in outcomes than learning.

Academic dishonesty is a motivational behavior of students. According to McKibban and Burdsal (2013), a student must make a decision whether or not to take part in academic dishonesty. A student’s decision to become involved in cheating is based more on the situation than on ethics. Typically, a student will go through a series of decision-making concerns before taking part in academic dishonesty: What are the odds of being caught? Can the student actually carry out the dishonesty? What is the purpose of the unethical act? According to McKibban and Burdsal (2013), academic dishonesty has increased over the past 30 years and it is estimated that 80% to 95% of students have participated in at least one incidence of academic dishonesty.

Classroom Practice: Are Teachers Creating Classroom Cheaters?

Lang (2013) stated that strategies put in place to stop academic dishonesty are centered on a combination of fear, technology, and subterfuge. Institutions of higher learning employ anti-plagiarism technology and a threat of severe ramifications for those caught cheating. According to Lang (2013), another tactic used by instructors is to assure that class examinations are secured until the time of the exam. Lang (2013) found evidence to suggest that the instructor should evaluate the classroom environment. Gathering data on cheating is somewhat difficult because a clear definition of academic dishonesty is nonexistent; an instructor’s discretionary response to incidences can further have an effect on data collection (Lang, 2013).
Economist Ariely (as cited in Lang, 2013) has written what has been identified as “the structure of their daily environment.” In his writings Ariely makes the point that the most relevant factor in the determination of whether academic dishonesty will be carried out by a student is directly controlled by the instructor by way of the design and structure of the learning environment (Lang, 2013). The instructor’s daily practices can also affect a student’s decision to cheat. There are additional factors that occur in a learning environment that influence academic dishonesty such as instructors giving multiple low-stakes examinations, instructors implementing multiple ways to share learning with the students, and instructors offering multiple opportunities for the students to have knowledge of their academic standing in the class (Lang, 2013).

The Educator’s Role in Promoting Academic Integrity

Research on academic dishonesty has been conducted for years; the earliest research was conducted in schools of education and educational psychology. According to Hulsart and McCarthy (2009), a study conducted in 1941 revealed that the intense competition for higher grades is a significant motivator for academic misconduct. Honor codes were created as a response to the existing issue of academic dishonesty. The probability of cheating was greatly affected by a student’s self-evaluation and ideas on his or her ability to succeed academically. Students with high confidence levels were less likely to engage in academic dishonesty.

The most creative means of addressing academic dishonesty occurs when an instructor maintains a learning environment that gives students minimal opportunities to cheat. Open book exams, collaborative assessments, and in-class writing and research assignments are used in a setting where students are less inclined to take part in academic dishonesty (Hulsart & McCarthy, 2009).
The Theory of Planned Behavior

Coren (2012) conducted a study focused on educators who responded to academic integrity violations and made use of the theory of planned behavior model that predicts the decision of whether or not educators had a face-to-face meeting with a student accused of cheating. The study showed that dishonesty at colleges and institutions of higher learning is a major problem across the US. Inappropriate conduct and the nature of the problem have been detailed by newspapers such as in the *Kansas City Star* article “High-Tech Tools Assist Today’s Student Cheaters” (Fussell, 2005). Fussell (2005) identified plagiarism at an Ohio university and in other colleges. He stated that earlier theory indicated the intent to cheat was the best predictor of behavior and the intent could be predicted by examining attitudes and the subjective norms. According to Coren (2012), the theory of planned behavior predicted that 43% of faculty members had the intent to speak face-to-face with a student suspected of cheating.

The Role of the Code of Conduct

Results of a survey by Rezaee, Elmore and Szendi (2001) revealed that college codes of conduct tended to gravitate toward a “low road” approach. Rezaee et al. (2001) found that there were plausible changes that could be made to university codes of conduct including a greater emphasis on stopping academic fraud, scientific fraud, and financial fraud; faculty involvement in the processes; and the establishment of procedures for employing a code of conduct. Codes of conduct are mostly generated with a “high road” or a “low road” design. A high road design is proactive in ethics and focuses on the idea of doing the right thing; the emphasis is centered on organizational and personal behaviors that are made up of self-respect. The low road design addresses ethical issues that adhere to faculty rules; low road codes are reactive, legal, and administrative ways to avoid improper activities. Direct approaches to improper activities
involve acts that focus on the improper acts, make clear what improper acts are, and make attempts to curtail it. The act is then punished by the imposing of sanctions. Indirect sanctions aim for an ethical response and an eventual outcome in an indirect manner by trying for proximate and attainable goals (Rezaee et al., 2001).

**Honor Codes and Other Contextual Influences**

McCabe and Treviño (1993) conducted a study regarding honor codes and academic dishonesty. They addressed the effectiveness of a university’s honor code at deterring academic dishonesty. The study compared institutions of higher learning with honor codes in place to institutions of higher learning that do not have honor codes in place (McCabe & Treviño, 1993). With other variables taken into account, there have been numerous studies that documented 13% to 95% of college students engaged in academic dishonesty at some level. The difference in each of the studies was the stage of the analysis conducted by the researchers. One approach addressed differences on an individual basis that appeared to predict academic dishonesty behaviors. These areas included self-esteem, a competitive striving for achievement, work types concerning ethics, grade point average, and sexual category (McCabe & Treviño, 1993). Other studies into academic dishonesty emphasized institutional levels of an analysis. These studies evaluated context facts such as sanction threats, responses of staff to academic dishonesty, and honor codes (McCabe & Treviño, 1993).

The use of an honor code at a university could have an impact on dishonest activities because the addition of an honor code system allows administrators and staff a way to mold student behaviors throughout the student population. Other studies have shown that an honor code has had an impact on student academic integrity (eg: Bowers, 1964; McCabe & Treviño, 1993; McCabe, Treviño, & Butterfield, 1999). There is little research on the individual’s feelings
and ideas about an honor code and how the application of such a code could help the student decide on academic honesty.

The application of an honor code in an educational environment helps mold and enhance the student’s values and ethics (McCabe et al., 1999). McCabe et al. (1999) revealed that the character, general attitude, and overall behavior of students are positive and remain with them throughout their college career. Students at institutions of higher learning with an honor code in place, have less chance of using outside pressures to justify reasons for academic dishonesty; students are more inclined to refer to the honor code at their institutions of higher learning as a very important aspect of their integrity (McCabe et al., 1999).

Gallant (2008) addressed the issue of academic dishonesty and suggested new ways to approach it. Gallant also included an overview of how responses to misconduct have evolved over time. She outlined the rise of honor codes and the ways rules have been implemented to confront the issues of academic dishonesty. Gallant (2008) included ways academic misconduct has been handled and suggested a duty to intervene that uses a strategy involving honor codes. These codes have a great emphasis on the consequences of committing academic dishonesty and the principles of academic integrity as an important mission for the institution.

**Implications for Practice**

According to Aiken (1991), academic dishonesty is among the top threats to a student’s attainment of growth, emotional and social personalities, and moral standards. Academic dishonesty stunts engagement in the learning process and the positive development of morals. Genereux and McLeod (1995) found a connection involving student desire for high grades, carrier opportunities, and academic dishonesty. Students placed academic dishonesty on a cost reward platform and decided to cheat based on the cost of getting caught as weighed against the
benefits of enhanced performance. Academic misconduct policies that are strict, well publicized, and enforced on a consistent basis may be an effective deterrent for students not to cheat.

In qualitative interviews, the most common excuses given for cheating were uninteresting assignments and the student’s belief that the teacher did not care about the subject being taught. If the student perceived that the teacher was not helpful or if the student had trouble understanding the teacher, the student was more likely to become involved in academic dishonesty (Hensley, 2013).

As an individual goes through life he or she has multiple opportunities to be involved with communally unaccepted rules of conduct (Hollinger & Lanza-Kaduce, 1996). Hollinger and Lanza-Kaduce (1996) defined dishonesty as a violation of an ethical and moral expectation. Educational settings provide a societal body that tests a person’s predisposition for academic dishonesty (Hollinger & Lanza-Kaduce, 1996). Studies in academic dishonesty have been conducted as far back as the year 1928. Hollinger and Lanza-Kaduce (1996) conducted an investigative study that determined that dishonesty does not rely on the power of the participant’s moral nature in and of itself; social context was also found to have an effect on dishonesty (Hollinger & Lanza-Kaduce, 1996).

Hollinger and Lanza-Kaduce (1996) chose to study self-reported occurrence and frequency of cheating in an academic setting. The participants were attendees at a public university in the southeast and the study was over a single semester. Another aspect of this investigational study was to assess the professed efficiency of numerous countermeasures regularly used to curtail cheating. Results were determined by comparing the judgment of the participants who reported being involved in academic dishonesty and the other participants who failed to report such actions (Hollinger & Lanza-Kaduce, 1996). At the conclusion of the study,
the researchers found that 68.1% of the participants had taken part in academic dishonesty on at least one occasion during the semester (Hollinger & Lanza-Kaduce, 1996). A total of 21.7% of the participants disclosed that they took part in numerous forms of academic dishonesty on six or more occasions during the semester (Hollinger & Lanza-Kaduce, 1996).

Psychologically oriented writings on academic dishonesty focus on the student who is involved in academic dishonesty and their individual traits (Hollinger & Lanza-Kaduce, 1996). Studies that are defined as sociological or educational have their reliance on institutional or situational factors. Teachers who trusted their students to not participate in academic dishonesty saw a higher rate of cheating in their classroom. A moral plea had absolutely no positive deterrent effect on students participating in academic dishonesty. The study further revealed that academic dishonesty decreased when the instructor gave a credible threat of punishment and exposure for cheating (Hollinger & Lanza-Kaduce, 1996).

**Summary**

Academic dishonesty has been an issue in society for several thousand years. The earliest documented instances were in China with individuals taking employment exams (Bushway & Nash, 1977). Over the years, studies have shown that students in educational settings ranging from elementary to graduate school frequently participate in academic dishonesty. Research studies further indicate that students do not have the opinion that such actions are inappropriate. Studies that were carried out in the middle part of the 20th century showed that if certain parameters were present, an individual would be less inclined to take part in illegal or inappropriate activities. Studies on academic dishonesty have revealed a wide variety of reasons that students cheat. The percentage of college students who engage in academic dishonesty ranged from 9% to 90% in cited studies.
CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH METHOD

The purpose of this study was to determine if there is a relationship between undergraduate students’ attitudes toward academic dishonesty as measured by responses on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey, a set of demographic (gender and age), and academic variables (classification, GPA, and major). This chapter provides the research method selected for the study and provides an overview of procedures and data collection methods. The quality of the research design, data management, data collection, and data analysis.

Study Design

This quantitative study used a survey design. Quantitative research is a formal, objective, systematic procedure for obtaining quantifiable information about the situation that is being investigated; the information is presented in numerical form and analyzed using statistics. Students from three institutions of higher education participated in this study; a 4-year public university, a 4-year private university, and a 2-year public college. The two participating universities and the college were located in the Southeastern United States.

To attain a more considerable perspective of the possible connection involving college student demographics, it is important to measure their perception of punishment on academic dishonesty. As such, a quantitative non-experimental research design was selected for this study. The information produced through quantitative research emphasizes labeling and calculating an occurrence, while “maximizing objectivity by using numbers, statistics, structure, and control” (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010, p. 21). This research design is typically known as non-experimental research. Non-experimental research designs “examine [the] relationship between different phenomena without any direct manipulation of conditions that are experienced”
For this study, a non-experimental research design was used with a pen and paper handout survey instrument having Likert-type responses.

Research Questions and Corresponding Null Hypotheses

Six research questions defined this study. The six research questions and five corresponding null hypotheses were:

1. Is there a significant difference in the mean scores for each of the dimensions on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey (Dimension 1- Use of Technology, Dimension 2- Perceptions of Policy, Dimension 3- Instructor Consequences, Dimension 4- Student Consequences, and Dimension 5- Student Conduct) among participating institutions of higher education?

$H_{o1}$: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 1- Use of Technology on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among participating institutions of higher education.

$H_{o12}$: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 2- Perceptions of Policy on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among participating institutions of higher education.

$H_{o13}$: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 3- Instructor Consequences on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among participating institutions of higher education.

$H_{o14}$: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 4- Student Consequences on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among participating institutions of higher education.
Ho1s: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 5- Student Conduct on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among participating institutions of higher education.

2. Is there a significant difference in the mean scores for each of the dimensions on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey (Dimension 1- Use of Technology, Dimension 2- Perceptions of Policy, Dimension 3- Instructor Consequences, Dimension 4- Student Consequences, and Dimension 5- Student Conduct) between male and female undergraduate students?

Ho21: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 1- Use of Technology on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey between male and female undergraduate students.

Ho22: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 2- Perceptions of Policy on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey between male and female undergraduate students.

Ho23: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 3- Instructor Consequences on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey between male and female undergraduate students.

Ho24: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 4- Student Consequences on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey between male and female undergraduate students.

Ho25: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 5- Student Conduct on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey between male and female undergraduate students.
3. Is there a significant difference in the mean scores for each of the dimensions on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey (Dimension 1 - Use of Technology, Dimension 2 - Perceptions of Policy, Dimension 3 - Instructor Consequences, Dimension 4 - Student Consequences, and Dimension 5 - Student Conduct) among traditional age students (18-24) and nontraditional age students (25-52)?

Ho3_1: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 1 - Use of Technology on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among traditional age students (18-24) and nontraditional age students (25-52).

Ho3_2: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 2 - Perceptions of Policy on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among traditional age students (18-24) and nontraditional age students (25-52).

Ho3_3: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 3 - Instructor Consequences on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among traditional age students (18-24) and nontraditional age students (25-52).

Ho3_4: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 4 - Student Consequences on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among traditional age students (18-24) and nontraditional age students (25-52).

Ho3_5: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 5 - Student Conduct on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among traditional age students (18-24) and nontraditional age students (25-52).

4. Is there a significant difference in the mean scores for each of the dimensions on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey (Dimension 1 - Use of Technology, Dimension 2 - Perceptions of Policy, Dimension 3 - Instructor Consequences,
Dimension 4- Student Consequences, and Dimension 5- Student Conduct) among academic classification (Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, or Senior)?

Ho4₁: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 1- Use of Technology on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among academic classification (Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, or Senior).

Ho4₂: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 2- Perceptions of Policy on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among academic classification (Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, or Senior).

Ho4₃: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 3- Instructor Consequences on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among academic classification (Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, or Senior).

Ho4₄: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 4- Student Consequences on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among academic classification (Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, or Senior).

Ho4₅: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 5- Student Conduct on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among academic classification (Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, or Senior).

5. Is there a significant difference in the mean scores for each of the dimensions on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey (Dimension 1- Use of Technology, Dimension 2- Perceptions of Policy, Dimension 3- Instructor Consequences, Dimension 4- Student Consequences, and Dimension 5- Student Conduct) among students grouped by declared major (Criminal Justice or other)?
Ho5₁: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 1- Use of Technology on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among students grouped by declared major (Criminal Justice or other).

Ho5₂: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 2- Perceptions of Policy on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among students grouped by declared major (Criminal Justice or other).

Ho5₃: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 3- Instructor Consequences on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among students grouped by declared major (Criminal Justice or other).

Ho5₄: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 4- Student Consequences on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among students grouped by declared major (Criminal Justice or other).

Ho5₅: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 5- Student Conduct on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among students grouped by declared major (Criminal Justice or other).

6. Is there a significant difference in the mean scores for each of the dimensions on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey (Dimension 1- Use of Technology, Dimension 2- Perceptions of Policy, Dimension 3- Instructor Consequences, Dimension 4- Student Consequences, and Dimension 5- Student Conduct) between students grouped by self-reported grade point average (GPA: 2.00-3.00, 3.01-4.00)?

Ho6₁: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 1- Use of Technology on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey...
between students grouped by self-reported grade point average (GPA: 2.00-3.00, 3.01-4.00).

Ho62: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 2- Perceptions of Policy on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey between students grouped by self-reported grade point average (GPA: 2.00-3.00, 3.01-4.00).

Ho63: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 3- Instructor Consequences on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey between students grouped by self-reported grade point average (GPA: 2.00-3.00, 3.01-4.00).

Ho64: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 4- Student Consequences on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey between students grouped by self-reported grade point average (GPA: 2.00-3.00, 3.01-4.0).

Ho65: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 5- Student Conduct on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey between students grouped by self-reported grade point average (GPA: 2.00-3.00, 3.01-4.0).
**Instrument**

The data collection tool was a survey developed by the researcher that was distributed to undergraduate college students over 3 weeks (see Appendix A for the survey instrument). There are five (5) noted dimensions listed on the survey instrument: (Dimension 1 - Use of Technology, Dimension 2 - Perceptions of Policy, Dimension 3 - Instructor Consequences, Dimension 4 - Student Consequences, and Dimension 5 - Student Conduct) among traditional age students (18-24) and nontraditional age students (25-52) (see Appendix B for dimension and survey information). The survey instrument further has a set of demographic (gender and age) and academic variables (academic classification, declared major, and GPA).

Approval for the study was received from the three institutions where data collection occurred. Permission to conduct the research was obtained from the 4-year public university's Institutional Review Board (IRB). The private 4-year university and the 2-year public college granted written permission to conduct the research on their respective campuses.

Questions on the survey were created from consultation with dissertation committee members and a review of sample questions from related survey instruments. The questions were formulated and structured to fit the investigated topic. A 6-point Likert-type scale was used to measure agreement with each statement; the scale ranged from 1 to 6: (1) strongly agree, (2) somewhat agree, (3) agree, (4) disagree, (5) somewhat disagree, (6) strongly disagree.

There were 22 items on the survey instrument (see Appendix A). Individuals responding to the survey instrument indicated one of the listed responses under each item. The survey had five dimensions.
Dimension 1- Use of Technology (addresses advancements in technology and opinions as to whether such advancements have made student involvement in academic dishonesty more prevalent in institutions of higher learning)

Dimension 2- Perceptions of Policy (addresses students’ ideas and understandings of their institution of higher learning’s policy on academic dishonesty)

Dimension 3- Instructor Consequences (addresses instructors’ response to incidences of academic dishonesty that occurred at institutions of higher learning)

Dimension 4- Student Consequences (addresses what will befall the student should he or she be caught in the act of academic dishonesty and which consequences will best curtail academic dishonesty in institutions of higher learning)

Dimension 5- Student Conduct (addresses how the conduct of one student can have an effect on other students in a classroom setting whereby one student taking part in academic dishonesty and another student having knowledge of this action could cause the second student to become involved in academic dishonesty).

Survey Development

The survey was developed by the researcher. However, the literature played a prominent role in the selection of items. Activities that contributed to the development of the survey included having a group of experienced researchers review the items and using a group of undergraduate students to review the survey for grammar, spelling, and overall understandability of the items. As the data collection instrument was created by the researcher, there was a form of survey development conducted on the document. An assessment of the survey instrument was accomplished by allowing several individuals who are considered experts in the field to evaluate the items and provide constructive criticism prior to distribution of the instrument. The survey
was also pre-tested with a group of students to evaluate it for grammar, spelling, and overall understandability of each question. These steps were done in lieu of a pilot testing process.

Validity

Face and content validity were established by using a panel of experts in survey development to review the questionnaire for appropriate items. Content validity was also evaluated by reviewing the literature on academic dishonesty. This review of relevant literature guided development of the items that were included. After data collection, a factor analysis helped establish construct validity of the instrument.

Internal validity is defined as a means of how well conclusions match reality and how well they portray the issue at hand (Blake, Heslin, & Curtis, 1996; Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2000; Creswell, 2003; Denscombe, 1998; Merriam, 2001). Internal validity can be strengthened by several actions including peer examination and management of biases in the beginning stages of the study (Cohen et al., 2000; Creswell, 2003; Denscombe, 1998; Merriam, 2001).

Reliability

Reliability can be defined as dependable, consistent, replicable, and also accurate over time (Cohen et al., 2000; Merriam, 2001). “Reliability includes reliability to real life, simulation and content specificity, comprehensiveness, authenticity, detail, depth of response, and meaningfulness to the respondents” (Cohen et al., 2000, p. 120).

Internal consistency reliability is a measure of reliability used to evaluate the degree to which different items that probe the same construct produce similar results. Split-half reliability methodology was used to measure internal consistency reliability. The process of obtaining split-half reliability was begun by splitting in half all items of the survey that were intended to probe the same area of knowledge and form two sets of items. The entire survey was administered to
all participants, the total score for each set was computed, and the split-half reliability was obtained by determining the correlation between the two total set scores. Two internal consistency estimates of reliability were computed for the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty scale: a split-half coefficient expressed as a Spearman-Brown corrected correlations and the coefficient alpha. For the split-half coefficient, the scale was split into two halves so that the two halves was equivalent as possible. Values for the coefficient alpha and the split-half coefficient were .68.

The format for study participants to respond during the data collection process was accomplished by the individuals completing the document on the day that it was distributed. This distribution and collection model ensured that a significant number of the surveys were completed and remitted for evaluation.

**Sample**

The sample for this study was derived from the students enrolled in classes in the participating departments (Criminal Justice, and others including education, political science, biology, accounting, business, computer science, nursing, social work, psychology, and undecided) at the chosen institutions of higher learning. The population was not known or identified prior to the distribution of the survey. Each student who agreed to participate in the survey was part of the population based solely on the fact that he or she registered for a particular course. The size of the population surveyed was based on six sub-sections of the target population and the major characteristics of the identified target population:

1. Each student was at least 18 years of age;
2. The students indicated either male or female;
3. Students were classified as an undergraduate, meaning that they were classified by university standards as being a freshman, sophomore, junior, or senior;

4. The survey sample was defined by the student’s major department inside the university;

**Data Collection**

The survey contained questions selected by the investigator. These questions were developed during multiple face-to-face meetings with the investigator’s dissertation chair and approved by the dissertation committee. Survey questions were also reviewed by a professional thesis and dissertation reader employed by East Tennessee State University. After some modifications, the survey was reviewed by an instructor at the private 4-year university and a class of students who evaluated the survey and made notations on each question as to understandability, clarity, proper grammatical presence, and punctuation. Upon receiving the evaluations, the investigator altered the survey document and met with several college instructors to evaluate the survey questions. The educational professionals were all asked to evaluate the document for understandability, clarity, grammar, and punctuation. By design, none of the questions could identify the participants in any way. Use of a pen and paper handout-style survey augmented the privacy and confidentiality of the participants because the researcher had no way to identify individuals or their responses.

Survey packets were hand delivered to each of the classes by the investigator. This method was effective in reaching the targeted population. A letter describing the intent of the study, a description of the survey, and the rights and privileges of the participating students was either attached to the front of the survey or read aloud to each student chosen for the survey (see
Appendix D). Surveys were distributed to participants in each class and collected by the investigator after the surveys had been completed.

Data Analysis

The independent variables were gender, age, academic classification, academic major, self-reported GPA. The dependent variables (five dimensions measured on the survey (Perceptions of Policy, Student Consequences, Instructor Consequences, Student Conduct, and Use of Technology) used Likert-type scales measured on an approximate interval level to provide scores for each dimension.

One of the six research questions and the related null hypotheses were analyzed using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). ANOVA is most appropriate to use when the independent variable is measured on a nominal level and the dependent variable is measured on an interval or ratio level. ANOVA is a two-tailed test and any significant differences found using the ANOVA statistic were analyzed with the Tukey Honestly Significant Differences (HSD) post-hoc test to determine exactly where significant differences occurred within the independent variable attributes. The remaining five research questions were analyzed using an independent samples t-test. An independent samples t-test evaluates the difference between the means of two independent groups. Each case must have scores on two variables – the grouping variable and the test variable. The grouping variable divides the cases into two mutually exclusive categories.

A statistical package (IBM-SPSS) was used to analyze the data. Answers on the survey instrument were coded and entered into SPSS and subjected to univariate frequency distribution analysis and ANOVA. Depending on the return rate of the sample of respondents and range of variability of responses, some variable attributes were re-coded and collapsed into smaller variable attribute categories. All data were examined at the .05 level of significance.
Chapter Summary

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the research method and further discuss the design of this study. This chapter includes an explanation of the sample selection, the procedure used to design the instrument and collect data, and the statistical procedures used to analyze data.

The chapter began with a statement of the six research questions that guided this study. It continued with a detailed description of the selected data set and a general description of the research design and methodologies used throughout the study. Chapter 4 of the study presents an analysis of collected data as well as a description of the methods used to evaluate data. Chapter 5 contains the summary, conclusion, and recommendations for practice and further research.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

In this chapter, data are presented and analyzed to answer the six research questions and their five corresponding null hypotheses. A pen-and-paper survey was used to gather the information that was later transformed into numerical code and entered as data. There are 22 items on the survey instrument (Appendix A). The response format for most questions consisted of listed items having six possible responses ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Individuals responding to the instrument indicated one of the listed responses under each item. Data were retrieved following the execution of an in-person survey. The sample for this study was derived from the students enrolled in a class in the departments that chose to participate (Criminal Justice and others) at three participating institutions of higher learning. Each student who agreed to participate in the survey was part of the population based solely on the fact that he or she registered for a particular course. There were 328 surveys distributed and collected by the investigator to chosen courses of instruction. There were 116 student responses gathered from a 4-year private university, 103 student responses gathered from a 2-year public college, and 109 student responses gathered from a 4-year public university. All of the responses were valid and fit the perquisites for inclusion in the survey. These perquisites were that each student was at least 18 years of age and each student was registered as an undergraduate.
Research Question 1

Is there a significant difference in the mean scores for each of the dimensions on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey (Dimension 1- Use of Technology, Dimension 2- Perceptions of Policy, Dimension 3- Instructor Consequences, Dimension 4- Student Consequences, and Dimension 5- Student Conduct) among participating institutions of higher education?

Ho1: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the Dimension 1- Use of Technology on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among participating institutions of higher education.

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine if there was a significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 1 among the three types of institutions. The factor variable – type of institution – included three levels (4-year private, 2-year public, and 4-year public). The dependent variable was the mean score on Dimension 1 of the survey. The ANOVA was not significant, $F(2, 325) = .46, p = .632$. Therefore, Ho1 was retained. The scores on Dimension 1 for the three types of institutions were similar. Effect size was assessed by $\eta^2$ was <.01. The means and standard deviations for the groups are reported in Table 1.
Table 1

*Means and Standard Deviations for Type of Institutions for Dimension 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private 4-Year</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>19.10</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public 2-Year</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>18.83</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public 4-Year</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>18.68</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ho$_{12}$: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the Dimension 2 - Perceptions of Policy on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among participating institutions of higher education.

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine if there was a significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 2 among the three types of institutions. The factor variable – type of institution – included three levels (4-year private, 2-year public, and 4-year public). The dependent variable was the mean score on dimension 2 of the survey. The ANOVA was not significant, $F(2, 325) = .58, p = .560$. Therefore, Ho$_{12}$ was retained. The mean scores on Dimension 2 for the three types of institutions were similar. Effect size assessed by $\eta^2$ was <.01. The means and standard deviations for the groups are reported in Table 2.

Table 2

*Means and Standard Deviations for Type of Institutions for Dimension 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private 4-Year</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public 2-Year</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>10.92</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public 4-Year</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ho1₃: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the Dimension 3-Instructor Consequences on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among participating institutions of higher education.

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine if there was a significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 3 among the three types of institutions. The factor variable – type of institution – included three levels (4-year private, 2-year public, and 4-year public). The dependent variable was the mean score on Dimension 3 of the survey. The ANOVA was not significant, $F(2, 325) = 2.59, p = .076$. Therefore, Ho1₃ was retained. The mean scores on Dimension 3 for the three types of institutions were similar. Effect size assessed by $\eta^2$ was .02. The means and standard deviations for the groups are reported in Table 3.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private 4-Year</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public 2-Year</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public 4-Year</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>7.55</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ho1₄: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the Dimension 4-Student Consequences on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among participating institutions of higher education.

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine if there was a significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 4 among the three types of institutions. The factor variable – type of institution – included three levels (4-year private, 2-year public, and
The dependent variable was the mean score on Dimension 4 of the survey. The ANOVA was significant, $F(2, 325) = 3.67, p = .027$. Therefore, $Ho_{14}$ was rejected. The mean scores on Dimension 4 for the three types of institutions were not similar. Effect size assessed by $\eta^2$ was .02. Because the overall $F$ test was significant, post hoc multiple comparisons were conducted to evaluate pairwise difference among the means of the three groups. A Tukey procedure was selected for the multiple comparisons because equal variances were assumed. There was a significant difference ($p = .027$) in the means between Private 4-year and Public 4-year universities. However, there were no other statistically significant pairwise differences between the other institutions. The means and standard deviations for the groups are reported in Table 4.

Table 4

Means, Standard Deviations, and 95% Confidence Intervals for the Types of Institutions for Dimension 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Public 2-Year</th>
<th>Public 4-Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private 4-Year</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>19.88</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>-.18 to 1.90</td>
<td>.10 to 2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public 2-Year</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>19.02</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public 4-Year</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>-1.32 to .79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$Ho_{15}$: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for the Dimension 5- Student Conduct on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among participating institutions of higher education.

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine if there was a significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 5 among the three types of institutions. The factor variable – type of institution – included three levels (4-year private, 2-year public, and 4-year public).
4-year public). The dependent variable was the mean score on Dimension 5 of the survey. The ANOVA was not significant, $F(2, 325) = .05, p = .949$. Therefore, $Ho_{15}$ was retained. The mean scores on Dimension 5 for the three types of institutions were similar. Effect size assessed by $\eta^2$ was <.01. The means and standard deviations for the groups are reported in Table 5.

Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations for Type of Institutions for Dimension 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private 4-Year</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>13.96</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public 2-Year</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>13.88</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public 4-Year</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>13.83</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 2

Is there a significant difference in the mean scores for each of the dimensions on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey (Dimension 1- Use of Technology, Dimension 2- Perceptions of Policy, Dimension 3- Instructor Consequences, Dimension 4- Student Consequences, and Dimension 5- Student Conduct) between male and female undergraduate students?

$Ho_{21}$: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 1- Use of Technology on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey between male and female undergraduate students.

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to evaluate whether the mean scores on Dimension 1 (Use of Technology) of the survey were significantly different between male and female undergraduate students. Dimension 1 was the test variable and the grouping variable was
male or female. The test was not significant, \( t(326) = 1.52, p = .129 \). Therefore, \( H_{02} \) was retained. The \( \eta^2 \) index was .01, which indicated a small effect size. Males (\( M = 18.59, SD = .51 \)) and Females (\( M = 19.16, SD = 3.19 \)) tended to score about the same on the use of technology dimension of the survey. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was -1.29 to 1.17.

\( H_{02} \): There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 2- Perceptions of Policy on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey between male and female undergraduate students.

An independent-samples t test was conducted to evaluate whether the mean scores on Dimension 2 (Perceptions of Policy) of the survey were significantly different between male and female undergraduate students. Dimension 2 was the test variable and the grouping variable was male or female. The test was not significant, \( t(326) = 1.24, p = .215 \). Therefore, \( H_{02} \) was retained. The \( \eta^2 \) index was .01, which indicated a small effect size. Males (\( M = 11.14, SD = 2.39 \)) and Females (\( M = 10.84, SD = 2.04 \)) tended to score about the same on the perceptions of policy dimension of the survey. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was -.18 to .79.

\( H_{03} \): There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 3- Instructor Consequences on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey between male and female undergraduate students.

An independent-samples t test was conducted to evaluate whether the mean scores on Dimension 3 (Instructor Consequences) of the survey were significantly different between male and female undergraduate students. Dimension 3 was the test variable and the grouping variable was male or female. The test was not significant, \( t(326) = 82, p = .410 \). Therefore \( H_{03} \) was retained. The \( \eta^2 \) index was .01, which indicated a small effect size. Males (\( M = 7.80, SD = 2.28 \))
and Females (M = 7.99, SD = 2.06) tended to score about the same on the instructor consequences dimension of the survey. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was -.70 to .27.

Ho24: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 4- Student Consequences on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey between male and female undergraduate students.

An independent-samples t test was conducted to evaluate whether the mean scores on Dimension 4 (Student Consequences) of the survey were significantly different between male and female undergraduate students. Dimension 4 was the test variable and the grouping variable was male or female. The test was not significant, \( t(326) = 1.28, p = .203 \). Therefore, Ho24 was retained. The \( \eta^2 \) index was .01, which indicated a small effect size. Males (M = 19.00, SD = 3.34) and Females (M = 19.46, SD = 3.25) tended to score about the same on the student consequences dimension of the survey. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was -1.78 to .25.

Ho25: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 5- Student Conduct on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey between male and female undergraduate students.

An independent-samples t test was conducted to evaluate whether the mean scores on Dimension 5 (Student Conduct) of the survey were significantly different between male and female undergraduate students. Dimension 5 was the test variable and the grouping variable was male or female. The test was not significant, \( t(326) = 1.63, p = .105 \). Therefore, Ho25 was retained. The \( \eta^2 \) index was .01, which indicated a small effect size. Males (M = 13.64, SD =
3.02) and Females (M = 14.14, SD = 2.64) tended to score about the same on the student conduct dimension of the survey. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was -1.12 to .10.

Research Question 3

Is there a significant difference in the mean scores for each of the dimensions on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey (Dimension 1- Use of Technology, Dimension 2- Perceptions of Policy, Dimension 3- Instructor Consequences, Dimension 4- Student Consequences, and Dimension 5- Student Conduct) among traditional age students (18-24) and nontraditional age students (25-52)?

\( H_{o3_1} \): There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 1- Use of Technology on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among traditional age students (18-24) and nontraditional age students (25-52).

An independent-samples \( t \) test was conducted to evaluate whether the mean scores on Dimension 1 (Use of Technology) of the survey were significantly different among traditional age students (18-24) and nontraditional age students (25-52). Dimension 1 was the test variable and the grouping variable was traditional age students (18-24) or nontraditional age students (25-52). The test was not significant, \( t(326) = 1.65, p = .100 \). Therefore, \( H_{o3_1} \) was retained. The \( \eta^2 \) index was .01, which indicated a small effect size. Traditional (M = 18.76, SD = 3.41) and Nontraditional (M = 19.64, SD = 2.96) tended to score about the same on the student conduct dimension of the survey. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was -1.95 to .17.

\( H_{o3_2} \): There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 2- Perceptions of Policy on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among traditional age students (18-24) and nontraditional age students (25-52).
An independent-samples t test was conducted to evaluate whether the mean scores on Dimension 2 (Perceptions of Policy) of the survey were significantly different among traditional age students (18-24) and nontraditional age students (25-52). Dimension 2 was the test variable and the grouping variable was traditional age students (18-24) or nontraditional age students (25-52). The test was not significant, \( t(326) = 1.12, p = .262 \). Therefore, \( H_{032} \) was retained. The \( \eta^2 \) index was .01, which indicated a small effect size. Traditional (M = 10.93, SD = 2.19) and Nontraditional age students (M = 11.33, SD = 2.44) tended to score about the same on the student conduct dimension of the survey. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was -1.10 to .30.

\[ H_{03}: \text{There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 3- Instructor Consequences on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among traditional age students (18-24) and nontraditional age students (25-52).} \]

An independent-samples t test was conducted to evaluate whether the mean scores on Dimension 3 (Instructor Consequences) of the survey were significantly different among traditional age students (18-24) and nontraditional age students (25-52). Dimension 3 was the test variable and the grouping variable was traditional age students (18-24) or nontraditional age students (25-52). The test was significant, \( t(326) = 2.81, p = .005 \). Therefore, \( H_{033} \) was rejected. The \( \eta^2 \) index was .01, which indicated a small effect size. Traditional Students (M = 7.76, SD = 2.12) tended to score lower than Nontraditional age students (M = 8.73, SD = 2.30). The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was -1.65 to -.29.

\[ H_{034}: \text{There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 4- Student Consequences on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among traditional age students (18-24) and nontraditional age students (25-52).} \]
An independent-samples t test was conducted to evaluate whether the mean scores on Dimension 4 (Student Consequences) of the survey were significantly different among traditional age students (18-24) and nontraditional age students (25-52). Dimension 4 was the test variable and the grouping variable was traditional age students (18-24) or nontraditional age students (25-52). The test was not significant, $t(326) = 1.83, p = .068$. Therefore, Ho3_4 was retained. The $\eta^2$ index was .01, which indicated a small effect size. Traditional (M = 19.10, SD = 3.30) and Nontraditional age students (M = 20.07, SD = 3.17) tended to score about the same on the student conduct dimension of the survey. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was -2.00 to -.07.

$Ho3_s$: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 5- Student Conduct on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among traditional age students (18-24) and nontraditional age students (25-52).

An independent-samples t test was conducted to evaluate whether the mean scores on Dimension 5 (Student Conduct) of the survey were significantly different among traditional age students (18-24) and nontraditional age students (25-52). Dimension 5 was the test variable and the grouping variable was traditional age students (18-24) or nontraditional age students (25-52). The test was significant, $t(326) = 3.68, p < .001$. Therefore, Ho3_5 was rejected. The $\eta^2$ index was .01, which indicated a small effect size. Traditional Students (M = 13.67, SD = 2.83) tended to score lower than and Nontraditional age students (M = 15.31, SD = 2.47). The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was -2.52 to -.76.

Research Question 4

Is there a significant difference in the mean scores for each of the dimensions on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey (Dimension 1- Use of Technology,
Dimension 2- Perceptions of Policy, Dimension 3- Instructor Consequences, Dimension 4- Student Consequences, and Dimension 5- Student Conduct) among academic classification (Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, or Senior)?

Ho4: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 1- Use of Technology on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among academic classification (Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, or Senior).

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine if there was a significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 1 among class standing. The factor variable – class standing – included four levels (Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, and Senior). The dependent variable was the mean score on Dimension 1 of the survey. The ANOVA was not significant, \( F(4, 323) = 1.58, p = .179 \). Therefore, Ho4 was retained. The scores on Dimension 1 for Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, and Senior students were similar. Effect size assessed by \( \eta^2 \) was .01. The means and standard deviations for the groups are reported in Table 6.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Standing</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>19.10</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>18.20</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>19.45</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ho4: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 2- Perceptions of Policy on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among academic classification (Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, or Senior).
A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine if there was a significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 2 among class standing. The factor variable – class standing – included four levels (Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, and Senior). The dependent variable was the mean score on Dimension 2 of the survey. The ANOVA was not significant, \( F(4, 323) = 1.45, p = .218 \). Therefore, Ho42 was retained. The scores on Dimension 2 for Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, and Senior students were similar. Effect size assessed by \( \eta^2 \) was .02. The means and standard deviations for the groups are reported in Table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Standing</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>11.09</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>11.02</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>10.83</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>11.08</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ho43: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 3- Instructor Consequences on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among academic classification (Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, or Senior).

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine if there was a significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 3 among class standing. The factor variable – class standing – included four levels (Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, and Senior). The dependent variable was the mean score on Dimension 3 of the survey. The ANOVA was not significant, \( F(4, 323) = 1.50, p = .201 \). Therefore, Ho43 was retained. The scores on Dimension 3
for Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, and Senior students were similar. Effect size assessed by $\eta^2$ was .02. The means and standard deviations for the groups are reported in Table 8.

Table 8  
*Means and Standard Deviations for Class Standing of Dimension 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Standing</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\text{Ho4}_4$: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 4- Student Consequences on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among academic classification (Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, or Senior).

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine if there was a significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 4 among class standing. The factor variable – class standing – included four levels (Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, and Senior). The dependent variable was the mean score on Dimension 4 of the survey. The ANOVA was not significant, $F(4, 323) = .32, p = .863$. Therefore, $\text{Ho4}_4$ was retained. The scores on Dimension 4 for Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, and Senior students were similar. Effect size assessed by $\eta^2$ was <.01. The means and standard deviations for the groups are reported in Table 9.
Table 9

*Means and Standard Deviations for Class Standing of Dimension 4*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Standing</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>19.37</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>19.02</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>19.16</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>19.44</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ho45: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 5- Student Conduct on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among academic classification (Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, or Senior).

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine if there was a significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 5 among class standing. The factor variable – class standing – included four levels (Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, and Senior). The dependent variable was the mean score on Dimension 4 of the survey. The ANOVA was not significant, $F(4, 323) = 1.73, p = .143$. Therefore, Ho45 was retained. The scores on Dimension 5 for Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, and Senior students were similar. Effect size assessed by $\eta^2$ was <.01. The means and standard deviations for the groups are reported in Table 10.
Table 10

Means and Standard Deviations for Class Standing of Dimension 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Standing</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>19.37</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>19.02</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>19.16</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>19.44</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 5

Is there a significant difference in the mean scores for each of the dimensions on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey (Dimension 1- Use of Technology, Dimension 2- Perceptions of Policy, Dimension 3- Instructor Consequences, Dimension 4- Student Consequences, and Dimension 5- Student Conduct) among students grouped by declared major (Criminal Justice or other)?

Ho51: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 1- Use of Technology on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among students grouped by declared major (Criminal Justice or other).

An independent-samples t test was conducted to evaluate whether the mean scores on dimension 1 (Use of Technology) of the survey were significantly different among students by major. Dimension 1 was the test variable and the grouping variable was the declared major (Criminal Justice or other). The test was not significant, $t(326) = .04$, $p = .971$. Therefore, Ho51 was retained. The $\eta^2$ index was .01, which indicated a small effect size. Criminal Justice ($M = 18.87$, $SD = 3.49$) and Other Majors ($M = 18.88$, $SD = 3.24$) tended to score about the same on
the student conduct Dimension of the survey. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was -.72 to .75.

**Ho5₂**: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 2- Perceptions of Policy on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among students grouped by declared major (Criminal Justice or other).

An independent-samples t test was conducted to evaluate whether the mean scores on Dimension 2 (Perceptions of Policy) of the survey were significantly different among students by major. Dimension 2 was the test variable and the grouping variable was the declared major (Criminal Justice or other). The test was not significant, *t*(326) = .10, *p* = .921. Therefore, Ho5₂ was retained. The η² index was .01, which indicated a small effect size. Criminal Justice (M = 10.98, SD = 2.33) and Other Majors (M = 11.00, SD = 2.05) tended to score about the same on the student conduct Dimension of the survey. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was -.46 to .51.

**Ho5₃**: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 3- Instructor Consequences on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among students grouped by declared major (Criminal Justice or other).

An independent-samples t test was conducted to evaluate whether the mean scores on Dimension 3 (Instructor Consequences) of the survey were significantly different among students by major. Dimension 3 was the test variable and the grouping variable was the major (Criminal Justice or other). The test was not significant, *t*(326) = .16, *p* = .875. Therefore, Ho5₃ was retained. The η² index was .01, which indicated a small effect size. Criminal Justice (M = 7.88, SD = 2.26) and Other Majors (M = 7.92, SD = 2.09) tended to score about the same on the
student conduct Dimension of the survey. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was -.43 to .51.

**Ho54:** There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 4- Student Consequences on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among students grouped by declared major (Criminal Justice or other).

An independent-samples t test was conducted to evaluate whether the mean scores on Dimension 4 (Student Consequences) of the survey were significantly different among students by major. Dimension 4 was the test variable and the grouping variable was the declared major (Criminal Justice or other). The test was significant, $t(326) = 2.17, p = .031$. Therefore, Ho54 was rejected. The $\eta^2$ index was .01, which indicated a small effect size. Criminal Justice Majors ($M = 18.84, SD = 3.28$) tended to score lower than Other Majors ($M = 19.62, SD = 3.27$) on the student conduct dimension of the survey. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was .07 to 1.50.

**Ho55:** There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 5- Student Conduct on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among students grouped by declared major (Criminal Justice or other).

An independent-samples t test was conducted to evaluate whether the mean scores on Dimension 5 (Student Conduct) of the survey were significantly different among students by major. Dimension 5 was the test variable and the grouping variable was the declared major (Criminal Justice or other). The test was not significant, $t(326) = .40, p = .687$. Therefore, Ho55 was retained. The $\eta^2$ index was .01, which indicated a small effect size. Criminal Justice ($M = 13.96, SD = 2.83$) and Other Majors ($M = 13.83, SD = 2.86$) tended to score about the same on
the student conduct dimension of the survey. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was -0.74 to 0.49.

Research Question 6

Is there a significant difference in the mean scores for each of the dimensions on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey (Dimension 1- Use of Technology, Dimension 2- Perceptions of Policy, Dimension 3- Instructor Consequences, Dimension 4- Student Consequences, and Dimension 5- Student Conduct) between students grouped by self-reported grade point average (GPA: 2.00-3.00, 3.01-4.00)?

**Ho6**: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 1- Use of Technology on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among students grouped by self-reported grade point average (GPA: 2.00-3.00, 3.01-4.00).

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to evaluate whether the mean scores on Dimension 1 (Use of Technology) of the survey were significantly different between the two GPA groups (2.0 to 3.0 or 3.1 to 4.0) of undergraduate students. Dimension 1 was the test variable and the grouping variable was GPA. The test was not significant, \( t(219) = 0.34, p = 0.735 \). Therefore, **Ho6** was retained. The \( \eta^2 \) index was 0.01, which indicated a small effect size. Students in group 1 (M = 18.80, SD = 3.52) and group 2 (M = 18.95, SD = 3.13) tended to score about the same on the use of technology dimension of the survey. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was -1.04 to 0.74.
Ho62: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 2- Perceptions of Policy on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among students grouped by self-reported grade point average (GPA: 2.00-3.00, 3.01-4.00).

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to evaluate whether the mean scores on Dimension 2 (Perceptions of Policy) of the survey were significantly different between the two GPA groups (2.0 to 3.0 or 3.1 to 4.0) of undergraduate students. Dimension 2 was the test variable and the grouping variable was GPA. The test was not significant, $t(219) = .29, p = .774$. Therefore, Ho62 was retained. The $\eta^2$ index was .01, which indicated a small effect size. Students in group 1 ($M = 11.06, SD = 2.26$) and group 2 ($M = 10.97, SD = 2.29$) tended to score about the same on the perceptions of policy dimension of the survey. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was -.52 to .69.

Ho63: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 3- Instructor Consequences on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among students grouped by self-reported grade point average (GPA: 2.00-3.00, 3.01-4.00).

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to evaluate whether the mean scores on Dimension 3 (Instructor Consequences) of the survey were significantly different between the two GPA groups (2.0 to 3.0 or 3.1 to 4.0) of undergraduate students. Dimension 3 was the test variable and the grouping variable was GPA. The test was not significant, $t(219) = 1.64, p = .103$. Therefore, Ho63 was retained. The $\eta^2$ index was .01, which indicated a small effect size. Students in group 1 ($M = 7.55, SD = 2.15$) and group 2 ($M = 8.02, SD = 2.13$) tended to score
about the same on the instructor consequences dimension of the survey. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was -1.04 to 1.0.

Ho6s: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 4- Student Consequences on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among students grouped by self-reported grade point average (GPA: 2.00-3.00, 3.01-4.00).

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to evaluate whether the mean scores on Dimension 4 (Student Consequences) of the survey were significantly different between the two GPA groups (2.0 to 3.0 or 3.1 to 4.0) of undergraduate students. Dimension 4 was the test variable and the grouping variable was GPA. The test was not significant, \( t(219) = .44, p = .662. \) Therefore, Ho5s was retained. The \( \eta^2 \) index was .01, which indicated a small effect size. Students in group 1 (M = 1.18, SD = 3.33) and group 2 (M = 19.37, SD = 3.31) tended to score about the same on the student consequences dimension of the survey. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was -1.08 to .69.

Ho6s: There is no significant difference in the mean scores for Dimension 5- Student Conduct on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey among students grouped by self-reported grade point average (GPA: 2.00-3.00, 3.01-4.00).
An independent-samples t-test was conducted to evaluate whether the mean scores on Dimension 5 (Student Conduct) of the survey were significantly different between the two GPA groups (2.0 to 3.0 or 3.1 to 4.0) of undergraduate students. Dimension 5 was the test variable and the grouping variable was GPA. The test was significant, $t(219) = 2.19$, $p = .030$. Therefore, $H_{o52}$ was rejected. The $\eta^2$ index was .02, which indicated a small effect size. Students in group 1 ($M = 13.50$, $SD = 2.92$) and group 2 ($M = 14.33$, $SD = 2.67$) tended to score lower on the student conduct dimension of the survey. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was -1.58 to -.08.
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter contains a summary of the findings, the conclusion, and recommendations for other individuals who may use the outcome of this research project as a source when reviewing or revising undergraduate student philosophies on academic dishonesty in higher education. The intent of this research was to explore the opinions and attitudes of undergraduate students about academic dishonesty. This research included data gathered through survey packets that were hand delivered to each of the participating classes. Surveys were distributed to the undergraduate student participants, completed, and collected during the visit. Surveys were distributed at a 4-year private university, a 2-year public college, and a 4-year public university.

Summary

The statistical analyses conveyed in the research project were based on six research questions. Each research question was supplemented with five corresponding null hypotheses. Research questions 1, 4, and 6 were examined using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA); research questions 2, 3, and 5 were examined using an independent samples t-test. There were 328 written responses. There were 116 student responses gathered from the private 4-year university, 103 student responses gathered from the public 2-year college, and 109 student responses gathered from the 4-year public university. All of the responses were valid and fit the perquisites for inclusion in the survey. These perquisites were identified as each student was at least 18 years of age and each was registered as an undergraduate student. The level of significance used in the statistical analysis was .05.
Conclusion

As stated in Bushway and Nash (1977), instances of academic dishonesty have been documented in every culture and at all academic levels from elementary to graduate school, with evidence of academic dishonesty 2,000 years ago during Chinese civil service examinations. Studies of academic dishonesty have revealed that 20% of students begin cheating in early elementary school.

By deepening the understanding of the effect that student perceptions on academic dishonesty have on students, instructors, and university administrators, one can better understand the impact their decisions have on the long-term decision making processes of students who may attend institutions of higher learning in Tennessee. By examining this study’s findings, administrators at higher education institutions can gain insight into how undergraduate students feel about academic dishonesty and how often they may take part in it. Using this information, administrators may be able to develop a protocol to address prevention or intervention strategies to help decrease acts of academic dishonesty among undergraduate students. This research has the potential to give substance to the idea under investigation; it will add facts and data to the ideas presented in the research. The investigational process may provide the reader with anecdotes and examples that can be used to evaluate the information.

As stated in the Open Education Database (2010), academic dishonesty has a detrimental effect on institutions of higher learning because it can damage their reputation. Academic dishonesty causes students who may not engage in it to become discouraged when they witness cheating and the individuals who cheat are not caught or punished. There is evidence to support the idea that academic dishonesty is consequential. An act of cheating in a college setting that students see has had a positive outcome may be acted out in other aspects of life.
Newton (2016) found that students articulated the fact that cheating on scholastic examinations should be handled less severely than that of the one set down by the governing body. This research study did not show any differences in opinions. This study did not show that a significant number of the students surveyed had the opinion that cheating in a scholastic environment was an unacceptable activity. This finding is comparable to Jones (2011) who found a significant number of students evaluated in the study articulated the idea that it was alright to participate in cheating activities in university settings.

Tibbetts (2012) revealed that a significant number of surveyed students would take part in academic dishonesty even though each student knew that they would receive punishment from the faculty. The study further showed that students had little concern for the severity of the punishment. The results of this study supported this finding showing that a significant number of the surveyed individuals replied the same way when surveyed.

**Key Findings**

The purpose of this study was to determine the perceptions and opinions of undergraduate students about academic dishonesty gathered from a private 4-year university, a public 2-year college, and a 4-year public university. Further, the purpose of this study was to determine if statistically significant correlations existed between identified student demographic characteristics and students’ attitudes toward academic dishonesty. Specifically, this research project was used to evaluate the views and opinions of 328 undergraduate students from three institutions of higher education. The inferences for each research question were based on the outcomes from data collected during the research project.
Research Question 1

Is there a significant difference in the mean scores for each of the dimensions on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey (Dimension 1- Use of Technology, Dimension 2- Perceptions of Policy, Dimension 3- Instructor Consequences, Dimension 4- Student Consequences, and Dimension 5- Student Conduct) among participating institutions of higher education?

Dimension 1- Use of Technology. The ANOVA was not significant, \( F(2, 325) = .46, p = .632 \). Therefore, Ho1 was retained. The scores on Dimension 1 for the three types of institutions were similar. Effect size was assessed by \( \eta^2 \) was <.01.

Dimension 2- Perceptions of Policy. The ANOVA was not significant, \( F(2, 325) = .58, p = .560 \). Therefore, Ho1 was retained. The mean scores on Dimension 2 for the three types of institutions were similar. Effect size assessed by \( \eta^2 \) was <.01.

Dimension 3- Instructor Consequences. The ANOVA was not significant, \( F(2, 325) = 2.59, p = .076 \). Therefore, Ho1 was retained. The mean scores on Dimension 3 for the three types of institutions were similar. Effect size assessed by \( \eta^2 \) was .02.

Dimension 4- Student Consequences. The ANOVA was significant, \( F(2, 325) = 3.67, p = .027 \). Therefore, Ho1 was rejected. The mean scores on Dimension 4 for the three types of institutions were not similar. Effect size assessed by \( \eta^2 \) was .02. Because the overall \( F \) test was significant, post hoc multiple comparisons were conducted to evaluate pairwise differences among the means of the three groups. A Tukey procedure was selected for the multiple comparisons because equal variances were assumed. There was a significant difference (\( p=.027 \)) in the means between Private 4-year and Public 4-year universities. However, there were no
other statistically significant pairwise differences between the other institutions. The private 4-year university had higher mean scores on the student consequences dimension than the public 4-year university.

Dimension 5- Student Conduct. The ANOVA was not significant, $F(2, 325) = .05, p = .949$. Therefore, Ho15 was retained. The mean scores on Dimension 5 for the three types of institutions were similar. Effect size assessed by $\eta^2$ was <.01.

Research Question 2

Is there a significant difference in the mean scores for each of the dimensions on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey (Dimension 1- Use of Technology, Dimension 2- Perceptions of Policy, Dimension 3- Instructor Consequences, Dimension 4- Student Consequences, and Dimension 5- Student Conduct) between male and female undergraduate students?

Dimension 1- Use of Technology. The independent samples t-test was not significant, $t(326) = 1.52, p = .129$. Therefore, Ho21 was retained. The $\eta^2$ index was .01, which indicated a small effect size. Males ($M =18.59, SD = 3.51$) and Females ($M = 19.16, SD = 3.19$) tended to score about the same on the use of technology dimension of the survey. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was -1.29 to .17.

Dimension 2- Perceptions of Policy. The independent samples t-test was not significant, $t(326) = 1.24, p = .215$. Therefore, Ho22 was retained. The $\eta^2$ index was .01, which indicated a small effect size. Males ($M =11.14, SD =2.39$) and Females ($M =10.84, SD =2.04$) tended to score about the same on the perceptions of policy dimension of the survey. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was -.18 to .79.
Dimension 3- Instructor Consequences. The independent samples t-test was not significant, \( t(326) = .82, p = .410 \). Therefore, \( H_{03} \) was retained. The \( \eta^2 \) index was .01, which indicated a small effect size. Males (\( M = 7.80, SD = 2.28 \)) and Females (\( M = 7.99, SD = 2.06 \)) tended to score about the same on the instructor consequences dimension of the survey. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was -.70 to .27.

Dimension 4- Student Consequences. The independent samples t-test was not significant, \( t(326) = 1.28, p = .203 \). Therefore, \( H_{04} \) was retained. The \( \eta^2 \) index was .01, which indicated a small effect size. Males (\( M = 19.00, SD = 3.34 \)) and Females (\( M = 19.46, SD = 3.25 \)) tended to score about the same on the student consequences dimension of the survey. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was -1.78 to .25.

Dimension 5- Student Conduct. The independent samples t-test was not significant, \( t(326) = 1.63, p = .105 \). Therefore, \( H_{05} \) was retained. The \( \eta^2 \) index was .01, which indicated a small effect size. Males (\( M = 13.64, SD = 3.02 \)) and Females (\( M = 14.14, SD = 2.64 \)) tended to score about the same on the student conduct dimension of the survey. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was -1.12 to .10.

Research Question 3

Is there a significant difference in the mean scores for each of the dimensions on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey (Dimension 1- Use of Technology, Dimension 2- Perceptions of Policy, Dimension 3- Instructor Consequences, Dimension 4- Student Consequences, and Dimension 5- Student Conduct) among traditional age students (18-24) and nontraditional age students (25-52)?
Dimension 1- Use of Technology. The independent samples t-test was not significant, \( t(326) = 1.65, p = .100 \). Therefore, Ho3\(_1\) was retained. The \( \eta^2 \) index was .01, which indicated a small effect size. Traditional (M = 18.76, SD = 3.41) and Nontraditional age students (M = 19.64, SD = 2.96) tended to score about the same on the student conduct dimension of the survey. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was -1.95 to .17.

Dimension 2- Perceptions of Policy. The independent samples t-test was not significant, \( t(326) = 1.12, p = .262 \). Therefore, Ho3\(_2\) was retained. The \( \eta^2 \) index was .01, which indicated a small effect size. Traditional (M = 10.93, SD = 2.19) and Nontraditional age students (M = 11.33, SD = 2.44) tended to score about the same on the student conduct dimension of the survey. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was -1.10 to .30.

Dimension 3- Instructor Consequences. The independent samples t-test was significant, \( t(326) = 2.81, p = .005 \). Therefore, Ho3\(_3\) was rejected. The \( \eta^2 \) index was .01, which indicated a small effect size. Traditional (M = 7.76, SD = 2.12) and Nontraditional age students (M = 8.73, SD = 2.30). Nontraditional aged students tended to score higher than traditional aged students on the instructor consequences dimension. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was -1.65 to -.29.

Dimension 4- Student Consequences. The independent samples t-test was not significant, \( t(326) = 1.83, p = .068 \). Therefore, Ho3\(_4\) was retained. The \( \eta^2 \) index was .01, which indicated a small effect size. Traditional Students (M = 7.76, SD = 2.12) tended to score lower than nontraditional age students (M = 8.73, SD = 2.30). The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was -2.00 to -.07.
Dimension 5- Student Conduct. The independent samples t-test was significant, \( t(326) = 3.68, p < .001 \). Therefore, \( H_{o3} \) was rejected. The \( \eta^2 \) index was .01, which indicated a small effect size. Traditional Students (\( M = 13.67, SD = 2.83 \)) tended to score lower than and Nontraditional age students (\( M = 15.31, SD = 2.47 \)). The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was -2.52 to -.76.

Research Question 4

Is there a significant difference in the mean scores for each of the dimensions on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey (Dimension 1- Use of Technology, Dimension 2- Perceptions of Policy, Dimension 3- Instructor Consequences, Dimension 4- Student Consequences, and Dimension 5- Student Conduct) among academic classification (Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, or Senior)?

Dimension 1- Use of Technology. The ANOVA was not significant, \( F(4, 323) = 1.58, p = .179 \). Therefore, \( H_{o4_1} \) was retained. The scores on dimension 1 for Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, and Senior students were similar. Effect size assessed by \( \eta^2 \) was .01.

Dimension 2- Perceptions of Policy. The ANOVA was not significant, \( F(4, 323) = 1.45, p = .218 \). Therefore, \( H_{o4_2} \) was retained. The scores on dimension 2 for Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, and Senior students were similar. Effect size assessed by \( \eta^2 \) was .02.

Dimension 3- Instructor Consequences. The ANOVA was not significant, \( F(4, 323) = 1.50, p = .201 \). Therefore, \( H_{o4_3} \) was retained. The scores on dimension 3 for Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, and Senior students were similar. Effect size assessed by \( \eta^2 \) was .02.
Dimension 4- Student Consequences. The ANOVA was not significant, $F(4, 323) = .32,\ p = .863$. Therefore, $H_{04}$ was retained. The scores on dimension 4 for Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, and Senior students were similar. Effect size assessed by $\eta^2$ was < .01.

Dimension 5- Student Conduct. The ANOVA was not significant, $F(4, 323) = 1.73,\ p = .143$. Therefore, $H_{05}$ was retained. The scores on dimension 5 for Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, and Senior students were similar. Effect size assessed by $\eta^2$ was < .01.

Research Question 5
Is there a significant difference in the mean scores for each of the dimensions on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey (Dimension 1- Use of Technology, Dimension 2- Perceptions of Policy, Dimension 3- Instructor Consequences, Dimension 4- Student Consequences, and Dimension 5- Student Conduct) among students grouped by declared major (Criminal Justice or other)?

Dimension 1- Use of Technology. The independent-samples t test was not significant, $t(326) = .04,\ p = .971$. Therefore, $H_{01}$ was retained. The $\eta^2$ index was .01, which indicated a small effect size. Criminal Justice ($M = 18.87,\ SD = 3.49$) and Other Majors ($M = 18.88,\ SD = 3.24$) tended to score about the same on the student conduct dimension of the survey. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was -.72 to .75.

Dimension 2- Perceptions of Policy. The independent-samples t test was not significant, $t(326) = .10,\ p = .921$. Therefore, $H_{02}$ was retained. The $\eta^2$ index was .01, which indicated a small effect size. Criminal Justice ($M = 10.98,\ SD = 2.33$) and Other Majors ($M = 11.00,\ SD = 2.05$) tended to score about the same on the student conduct dimension of the survey. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was -.46 to .51.
Dimension 3- Instructor Consequences. The independent samples t-test was not significant, \( t(326) = .16, p = .875 \). Therefore, Ho53 was retained. The \( \eta^2 \) index was .01, which indicated a small effect size. Criminal Justice (\( M = 7.88, SD = 2.26 \)) and Other Majors (\( M = 7.92, SD = 2.09 \)) tended to score about the same on the student conduct dimension of the survey. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was -.434 to .510.

Dimension 4- Student Consequences. The independent samples t-test was significant, \( t(326) = 2.17, p = .031 \). Therefore, Ho54 was rejected. The \( \eta^2 \) index was .01, which indicated a small effect size. Criminal Justice Majors (\( M = 18.84, SD = 3.28 \)) tended to score lower than Other Majors (\( M = 19.62, SD = 3.27 \)) on the student conduct dimension of the survey. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was .07 to 1.50.

Dimension 5- Student Conduct. The independent samples t-test was not significant, \( t(326) = .40, p = .687 \). Therefore, Ho55 was retained. The \( \eta^2 \) index was .01, which indicated a small effect size. Criminal Justice (\( M = 13.96, SD = 2.83 \)) and Other Majors (\( M = 13.83, SD = 2.86 \)) tended to score about the same on the student conduct dimension of the survey. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was -.74 to .49.

Research Question 6

Is there a significant difference in the mean scores for each of the dimensions on the Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty survey (Dimension 1- Use of Technology, Dimension 2- Perceptions of Policy, Dimension 3- Instructor Consequences, Dimension 4- Student Consequences, and Dimension 5- Student Conduct) among students grouped by self-reported grade point average (GPA: 2.00-3.00, 3.01,4.00)?
Dimension 1- Use of Technology. The independent samples t-test was not significant, \( t(219) = .34, p = .735 \). Therefore Ho61 was retained. The scores on dimension 1 were similar across GPAs. Effect size assessed by \( \eta^2 \) was <.01.

Dimension 2- Perceptions of Policy. The independent samples t-test was not significant, \( t(219) = .29, p = .774 \). Therefore, Ho62 was retained. The scores on dimension 2 were similar across GPAs. Effect size assessed by \( \eta^2 \) was <.01.

Dimension 3- Instructor Consequences. The independent samples t-test was not significant, \( t(219) = 1.64, p = .103 \). Therefore, Ho63 was retained. The scores on dimension 3 were similar across GPAs. Effect size assessed by \( \eta^2 \) was .03.

Dimension 4- Student Consequences. The independent samples t-test was not significant, \( t(219) = .44, p = .662 \). Therefore, Ho64 was retained. The scores on dimension 4 were similar across GPAs. Effect size assessed by \( \eta^2 \) was <.01.

Dimension 5- Student Conduct. The independent samples t-test was significant, \( t(219) = 2.19, p = .030 \). Therefore, Ho65 was rejected. Group 2 tended to score higher than group 1 on the student conduct dimension.
**Recommendations for Practice**

A common definition of academic dishonesty involves students claiming that another student’s work is their own (ETS, 1999). According to research findings, there are a number of reasons why students cheat including little probability of detection, consequences are not severe, no stated rules on academic cheating, or if there are such prohibitions in place they are not clearly stated or articulated (ETS, 1999; Novotney, 2011).

It is recommended that colleges and universities concentrate on educating students about the “costs” of participating in academic dishonesty. Based on the mean scores for different groups on the survey, students do not have a high concern for academic dishonesty at the participating institutions. Institutions of higher education can suffer a decrease in reputation as a result of widespread academic dishonesty, especially if it occurs in student research.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

Based on the findings from this research study, there are four recommendations for future research presented here.

1. A longitudinal study of academic dishonesty could help identify changes in students’ perceptions of academic dishonesty over time.

2. A study of institutions of higher education located in regions other than the Southeast U.S. would add to the knowledge base of academic dishonesty.

3. A qualitative study with in-depth interviews could shed more light on students’ perceptions of academic dishonesty.

4. A study that included a more diverse student population in academic majors and in ethnicity would yield more generalizable findings.
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APPENDIX A

Survey Instrument

1. What is your gender?
   □ Male
   □ Female

2. What is your age?
   □ 18-21
   □ 22-25
   □ 26-35
   □ 36-45
   □ over 45

3. According to credit hours earned, what is your current academic class standing?
   □ Freshman
   □ Sophomore
   □ Junior
   □ Senior
   □ Other

4. In which field is your declared major?
   □ ______________________________________
   □ Undecided

5. What is your current overall (cumulative) GPA?
   □ 0.0-1.50
   □ 1.51-2.00
   □ 2.01-2.50
   □ 2.51-2.75
   □ 2.76-3.00
   □ 3.01-3.50
   □ 3.51-4.0
Please respond to the following questions by choosing the answer that best describes your perception or opinion:

6. The penalties for academic dishonesty are severe at my university.
   - [ ] Strongly Agree
   - [ ] Somewhat Agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Somewhat Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree

7. The average student’s understanding of policies concerning academic misconduct is very good at my university.
   - [ ] Strongly Agree
   - [ ] Somewhat Agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Somewhat Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree

8. Policies concerning academic misconduct are an effective deterrent at my university.
   - [ ] Strongly Agree
   - [ ] Somewhat Agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Somewhat Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree

9. Students receive adequate information about what constitutes academic misconduct at my university.
   - [ ] Strongly Agree
   - [ ] Somewhat Agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Somewhat Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree

10. If you do not cheat, or chose not to cheat, what was the reason for your choice?
    (Indicate most important)
    - [ ] Respect for faculty
    - [ ] Fear of consequences
    - [ ] Valuation of learning
    - [ ] Religious teaching/values
    - [ ] Personal ethical code
    - [ ] Parental teaching/values
    - [ ] Other ___________________________________________________________
    Specify
11. Your instructor enforces a zero-tolerance policy for academic dishonesty. If caught, a student will be given an F for the course and will be reported to the university for disciplinary action. Under this scenario, students are less likely to cheat.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Somewhat Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Somewhat Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

12. Your instructor does not enforce the zero-tolerance policy, if caught a student is not likely to face a severe penalty. Under this scenario, students are less likely to cheat.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Somewhat Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Somewhat Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

13. The consequences for cheating are usually not the same from instructor to instructor.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Somewhat Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Somewhat Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

14. An instructor should be fined if found to be tolerating academic misconduct.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Somewhat Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Somewhat Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

15. An instructor that has been caught taking part in acts of academic misconduct should be criminally charged for such offenses.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Somewhat Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Somewhat Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
16. Someone that obtains exam questions or answers from another student who has already taken the exam is guilty of academic dishonesty.
- Strongly Agree
- Somewhat Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

17. A student that turns in homework that was copied from the work of another student is guilty of academic dishonesty.
- Strongly Agree
- Somewhat Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

18. Utilizing an electronic or digital device as an unauthorized aid during a classroom exam is a form of academic dishonesty.
- Strongly Agree
- Somewhat Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

19. Students should report incidences of academic dishonesty committed by other students.
- Strongly Agree
- Somewhat Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

20. Incidences of academic dishonesty are more prevalent because of access to materials on the Internet.
- Strongly Agree
- Somewhat Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
21. In online courses, academic dishonesty is more prevalent than in face-to-face courses.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Somewhat Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Somewhat Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

22. Utilizing a paid online service to complete an assignment should be considered a form of academic dishonesty.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Somewhat Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Somewhat Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
APPENDIX B

Dimension and Survey Information

The survey has twenty-two (22) questions providing demographic information and five (5) dimensions. The following shows the questions that provided data for demographics and each dimension:

- Demographics: Questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5
- Dimension 1- Use of Technology: Questions 18, 20, 21, 22
- Dimension 2- Perceptions of Policy: Questions 11, 12, 13
- Dimension 3- Instructor Consequences: Questions 14, 15
- Dimension 4- Student Consequences: Questions 6, 7, 8, 9
- Dimension 5- Student Conduct: Questions 10, 16, 17, 19
APPENDIX C

Academic Dishonesty in Higher Education Questionnaire – Request for Permission

Dear Sir or Ma’am,

I am a doctoral student at East Tennessee State University in Johnson City, TN, and I am currently working on my doctoral dissertation entitled Academic Dishonesty in Higher Education: Perceptions and Opinions of Undergraduates.

I am writing to request permission to use students at your university for participation in a survey that is estimated to take no longer than 5-10 minutes.

Their participation is completely voluntary and their submission will remain anonymous. Please let me know what additional information is needed. You may contact us with any questions regarding the survey. I can be reached at hodgessk@etsu.edu. You may also contact my faculty advisor for this research study, Dr. James Lampley at lampley@etsu.edu.

Please note, this research project has been reviewed and approved by the ETSU College of Education, the Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis department, as well as the ETSU Institutional Review Board.

If you have any questions or concerns about the research and want to talk to someone independent of the research team, you may call an ETSU IRB Coordinator at 423-439-6002 or at ETSU IRB Coordinator at irb@ETSU.edu.

I greatly appreciate your assistance with furthering my research study.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Stanley Hodges
APPENDIX D

Letter to Prospective Participants

Dear Participant,

My name is Stanley Hodges, and I am a graduate student at East Tennessee State University. I am working on my doctoral degree in Educational Leadership Policy Analysis. In order to finish my studies; I need to complete a research project. The name of my research project is Academic Dishonesty in Higher Education: Perceptions and Opinions of Undergraduates.

With the permission of the College of Education, the Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis Department, I am conducting an in-person survey. The purpose of this study is to possibly inform students, faculty, staff, and other stakeholders how best to meet the needs of undergraduate students.

Please note, this research project has been reviewed and approved by the ETSU Institutional Review Board. You may contact the ETSU IRB with any questions regarding your rights as a research subject.

I would like to give a brief in-person method type such as a survey.

To participate in this study, you must be currently enrolled as an undergraduate student and at least 18 years of age, or older. Participation in this study is entirely voluntary and your submission will remain anonymous. No individual identifiable information will be collected. Only the researchers involved will have access to the aggregated information provided by participants. Your confidentiality will be maintained to the degree permitted by the technology used. Specifically, no guarantees can be made regarding the interception of data sent via the Internet by any third parties, as the case with emails. In other words, we will make every effort to ensure that your name is not connected with your responses. Although your rights and privacy will be maintained, the ETSU IRB (for non-medical research) and personnel particular to this research department have access to the study records.
You are not obligated to participate, and there is no penalty for not participating. You may end your participation at any point. It will take approximately 10 minutes to complete. You will be asked questions concerning your opinions of academic dishonesty and further your opinion and or knowledge of your universities academic dishonesty policy. Since this study deals with academic dishonesty, it might cause some minor stress. However, you may feel better after you have had the opportunity to express yourself about academic dishonesty.

Your participation will add valuable data to this study. Your completion of the survey will be considered your consent for participation.

If you have any research-related questions or problems, you may contact me, Stanley Hodges, at hodgessk@etsu.edu or my research coordinator, Dr. James Lampley at lampley@etsu.edu, telephone number 423-439-7619. Also, the chairperson of the Institutional Review Board at East Tennessee State University is available at 423-439-6054 if you have questions about your rights as a research subject. If you have any questions or concerns about the research and want to talk to someone independent of the research team or you can’t reach the study staff, you may call an IRB Coordinator at 423-439-6055 or 423-439-6002.

I greatly appreciate your assistance with furthering my research study.

Stanley Hodges
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