

**Faculty and Student Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty**

Emily A. Ford  
B.S., Kansas State University, 2000  
M.L.A., Baker University, 2003

Submitted to the Graduate Department and Faculty of the School of Education of  
Baker University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership

---

Susan K. Rogers, Ph.D.  
Major Advisor

---

Tes Mehring, Ph.D.

---

Marcus Childress, Ph.D.

Date Defended: December 2, 2015

Copyright 2015 by Emily A. Ford

## **Abstract**

During the spring of 2015, faculty and students from the four units of a small, private Midwestern university (the College of Arts and Sciences, the School of Education, the School of Nursing, and the School of Professional and Graduate Studies) participated in this quantitative study. The purpose of the study was to determine whether there were differences between faculty perceptions of students engaging in academically dishonest activities and student perceptions of engaging in academically dishonest activities; faculty and student perceptions of the academic environment; faculty and student perceptions of how students learn about academic dishonesty; faculty and student perceptions about the frequency of instruction about the actions that constitute academic dishonesty; and faculty and student perceptions about the frequency of instruction about the actions that constitute academic dishonesty.

Comparisons between the two groups and within the two groups were made using data collected from two surveys; one was administered to each group. Five hypotheses revealed significant findings related to faculty and student attitudes and perceptions of academic dishonesty. The results of the findings may help to inform academic leaders, faculty, and students on how clear communication, concise policies, and resources for defining academic dishonesty can help to curtail instances of academic dishonesty within a learning community.

## **Dedication**

This dissertation is dedicated to my parents, Les and Cheryl Harrod, for their unwavering support throughout my academic journey. You recognized my potential before I knew what was possible.

## **Acknowledgements**

I would like to express my gratitude to my committee for their guidance during the dissertation process, Dr. Tes Mehring, Dr. Marcus Childress, and Dr. Susan K. Rogers. Thank you for the many hours you spent reviewing my work in support of my educational goal. I would especially like to thank Dr. Rogers, my major advisor, whose relentless pursuit of my best work, sound advice, and constant support has helped me to define my purpose as an educational leader.

To Dr. Gary George, my directed field experience supervisor, your direction during fieldwork taught me how to create and sustain lasting community relationships, thank you. To Mr. Paul Buskirk, thank you for sharing your insights about the purpose of educational leaders and our responsibility to serve our students. To Dr. Katie Hole and Dr. Phillip Messner, I appreciate the time you gave to help me with my research. To Dr. Harold Frye and Dr. Bill Neuenswander, thank you for the support you have given to me over the years before and during my doctoral work. I will always admire your kindness and generosity. To Dr. Tanisha D. Stevens, thank you for allowing me to use your instruments in my study.

To Megan Goff, my sister, thank you for always listening to me during the challenging times. Your perspective and wisdom helped me to stay committed to the process. To my grandmother, Joann Van Hoesen, thank you for the wonderful, encouraging notes you sent; all of which, I carried with me to class. To my husband, Jason Ford, thank you for the many nights and weekends you chose to stay at home with our children, so I could attend class, study, and work on my dissertation. Without you, I could not have accomplished my goal. To Elizabeth and Michael, our children, thank

you for joining me at the dining room table night after night to finish your homework or to just be nearby. I hope you will always appreciate the process of learning.

## Table of Contents

Abstract .....	ii
Dedication .....	iii
Acknowledgements .....	iv
Table of Contents .....	vi
List of Tables .....	ix
Chapter One: Introduction .....	1
Background .....	3
Statement of the Problem .....	5
Purpose of the Study .....	7
Significance of the Study .....	7
Delimitations .....	8
Assumptions .....	9
Research Questions .....	9
Definition of Terms .....	11
Overview of the Methodology .....	13
Organization of the Study .....	14
Chapter Two: Review of the Literature .....	16
External Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty in Higher Education .....	16
Academic Dishonesty Research from Seminal Authors .....	17
Current Research on Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty .....	21
Faculty, Students, and Academic Dishonesty .....	22
Faculty and Academic Dishonesty .....	29

Students and Academic Dishonesty .....	32
Summary .....	42
Chapter Three: Methods .....	43
Research Design.....	43
Population and Sample .....	44
Sampling Procedures .....	45
Instrumentation .....	46
Measurement.....	47
Validity and Reliability.....	48
Data Collection Procedures.....	49
Data Analysis and Hypothesis Testing .....	51
Limitations .....	58
Summary .....	58
Chapter Four: Results .....	59
Reliability Analysis.....	59
Descriptive Statistics.....	60
Faculty Demographics .....	60
Student Demographics .....	61
Hypothesis Testing.....	63
Summary .....	83
Chapter Five: Interpretation and Recommendations .....	84
Study Summary.....	84
Overview of the Problem .....	85

Purpose Statement and Research Questions .....	85
Review of the Methodology.....	85
Major Findings.....	86
Findings Related to the Literature.....	89
Conclusions.....	92
Implications for Action .....	93
Recommendations for Future Research .....	94
Concluding Remarks.....	95
References.....	97
Appendices.....	105
Appendix A. Faculty Survey.....	106
Appendix B. Student Survey.....	117
Appendix C. Permission to Use Instruments.....	132
Appendix D. IRB Application .....	134
Appendix E. IRB Approval .....	139
Appendix F. Provost’s Approval .....	141
Appendix G. Notification to Department of Human Resources .....	143
Appendix H. Request to IT for Assistance .....	145
Appendix I. Faculty Email 1 .....	147
Appendix J. Student Email 1 .....	149
Appendix K. Faculty Emails 2 & 3.....	151
Appendix L. Student Emails 2 & 3.....	153
Appendix M. Results for Student MANOVAs for RQ 11-15 .....	155

## List of Tables

Table 1. Variables by Faculty and Student Survey Items .....	48
Table 2. Faculty Demographics .....	61
Table 3. Student Demographics .....	62
Table 4. Results for One-Sample $t$ tests for Differences between Faculty and Student Attitudes for RQ1-5 .....	65
Table 5. Results for Post Hoc H6.....	67
Table 6. Results for Post Hoc H13.....	71
Table 7. Results for Faculty MANOVAs for RQ6-10.....	73
Table M1. Results for Student MANOVAs for RQ11-15 .....	156

## **Chapter One**

### **Introduction**

With the advent of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the Internet continues to grow into a nebulous array of credible, academic sources and non-academic sources, making it easier for students to access information. The availability of information, the ease with which it can be acquired, and the manner in which it is used to advance learning appears to be changing students' attitudes and perceptions about academic integrity. There exists from faculty in higher education conflicting perspectives regarding what actions constitute academic dishonesty, what students should know about academic dishonesty prior to entering their classrooms, and how to address academic misconduct. Auer and Kruper (2001) and McCabe (2005b) attributed the increase in academic dishonesty to a lack of a basic understanding of what plagiarism is, as well as the skills needed to navigate successfully through an abundance of online sources. Gallant (2008a) and Lang (2013) viewed the current climate of academic integrity as a product of poorly designed curricula, which lack pedagogical methods focused on measuring student learning, but instead foster environments prime for cheating. Both perspectives supported a need for educating students about plagiarism and information literacy as critical components to shaping perceptions of academic dishonesty and creating a culture of appreciation for academic integrity (Auer & Kruper, 2001; Gallant, 2008a; Lang, 2013; McCabe, 2005b).

Other perceptions contained within the literature on academic dishonesty prescribe different ways universities can address academic misconduct. For example, researchers such as Davis, Grover, Becker, and McGregor (1992) and Maramark and Maline (1993) believed administrators and faculty could look for ways to communicate to

students the value of academic integrity through consistent enforcement of concise policies. McCabe (2005a) analyzed perceptions of academic misconduct with over 80,000 undergraduate and graduate students over a period of more than two decades, taking enforcement of policy one-step further. He acknowledged that violations of academic integrity typically result out of the student's misunderstanding of what actions constitute plagiarism when utilizing electronic sources, specifically when "cut and paste plagiarism" occurs (McCabe, 2005a, p. 6). Sutherland-Smith (2010), like Gallant (2008a) and Lang (2013), asserted a more holistic recommendation urging universities to make a move toward a culture of prevention through a "framework of ethical sustainability" (p. 13) using instruction and support to prevent plagiarism and possibly yield greater results, instead of relying on the practice of policy enforcement alone.

While each of the perspectives provides proposed solutions for how to prevent academic dishonesty, there remains a sense of confusion within higher education about the best way to address the violations, warranting further discussion within the academic community at large. Concerns of why students choose to commit academic misconduct are not new to academia; however, the urgency to address academic dishonesty is supported throughout the literature by researchers such as Higgins (2010), McCabe (2005a) and Gallant (2008b). As a call to action for academia, the researchers encouraged higher education to explore the faculty and student attitudes and perceptions of academic dishonesty and instruction about academic dishonesty to determine why the gaps in understanding about academic integrity persist (Gallant, 2008b; Higgins, 2010; McCabe, 2005a).

## **Background**

Administration and faculty in higher education are facing difficult decisions when it comes to addressing academic dishonesty and maintaining a culture of academic integrity. While concerns of the pervasiveness of academic dishonesty are not new to academia, the academic community is under pressure to respond. Ever vigilant in the pursuit to protect the institution, faculty must not only be knowledgeable in their disciplines and the institutional policies surrounding academic dishonesty, but they must also keep up with the numerous sources students have at their disposal for acquiring and using the information to complete coursework.

From hardcopy test files to mass-produced online papers for purchase, attitudes and perceptions about academic dishonesty have changed very little since Bowers (1964) conducted his initial research in the 1960s. There is, however, a greater sense of urgency to address academic dishonesty due to the perceived frequency of occurrence, suggesting a change in how society views academia. While research on academic dishonesty has increased since the 1960s, the self-reported frequency of academic misconduct has remained nearly the same (Bowers, 1964; Lang, 2013; McCabe, 2005a). If in fact academic dishonesty has often been perceived an issue in higher education, then the change in attitudes and perceptions appear to be due to a shift in the academic moral consciousness and fiscal responsibility of society, thereby creating a shift in the community perceptions about the value of post-secondary education (Cronin & Horton, 2009; Meacham, Gray, & Rhodan, 2013). With the influence of media on society, the focus on the quality and cost of a college degree reinforces the need to support a culture of academic integrity through course design, establishing cultural norms, and enforcing

institutional integrity policies (Davis et al., 1992; Gallant, 2008b; Lang, 2013; Sutherland-Smith, 2010).

Higher education is at a juncture in which there is a wealth of data and recommendations from the study of academic dishonesty and pressure from society to be transparent when enforcing sanctions for cases of academic dishonesty. However, unlike the laws that police society, most of academia allows the faculty to determine how to apply policies that allow for sanctions at the classroom level. Therefore, institutional stances on academic dishonesty vary in policy and sanctions making it difficult to assess the effectiveness of higher education's ability to pursue a unified stance on prevention. In response to the decades of research, experts immersed in the study of academic dishonesty have collected a significant amount of data about attitudes and perceptions of academic dishonesty to arrive at the conclusion that there is a connection between honor codes and academic dishonesty, suggesting the potential for academicians to curtail academic dishonesty by making changes to how educational institutions educate students on academic integrity and address violations (Gallant, 2013; Lang, 2013; McCabe, Butterfield, & Trevino, 2012). Gallant's (2013) and Lang's (2013) research indicated the percentages of self-reported academic misconduct by students remains unchanged over time. They recommend further research focused on how to foster a culture of academic integrity through teaching and learning.

In an effort to advance the dialogue about the relationships between faculty and student attitudes and perceptions of academic dishonesty in higher education, the current study was conducted at a private, post-secondary institution in the Midwest accredited by the Higher Learning Commission (HLC). The HLC is a member of the North Central

Association of Colleges and Schools and provides accreditation to “degree granting institutions of higher education in the North Central region of the United States” (North Central Association Higher Learning Commission, 2012, para. 5). At the time of the study, the institution had five locations in rural, suburban, and urban areas distributed between two states with students located online across the United States and internationally (Midwestern University, 2014c).

The institution housed four schools serving populations of traditional and non-traditional students enrolled in face-to-face or online programs offered by the arts and sciences, business, education, and nursing. The faculty teaching at the four schools served in the capacity of adjunct, part-time, or full-time educators. During the academic year the current study was conducted, the university published a total student enrollment of 2,314 and a faculty population of 603, resulting in a student-to-faculty ratio of 12.5 (Midwest University, 2014c).

### **Statement of the Problem**

The consistency with which self-reported academic dishonesty occurs within the literature continues to support it as a valid concern for universities. A glimpse at some of the data collected on self-reported academic dishonesty since the 1990s showed 76 to 94% of students who participated in surveys about academic dishonesty acknowledged committing acts of academic dishonesty, figures that remain largely unchanged since Bowers’ (1964) study (Davis et. al, 1992; Lang, 2013; McCabe, 2005a; McCabe & Trevino, 1996). Several studies during this timeframe concluded that many students lack an understanding of what actions support academic integrity, calling into question their ability to identify with an academic code of conduct.

The concerns of academic dishonesty described by McCabe and Trevino (1996) and McCabe (2005a) have not changed much over time; however, higher education is in a heightened state of awareness because of the ease of access to information provided to students through the Internet (McCabe, 2005a; McCabe & Trevino, 1996). For the academic community to sustain an honest and thoughtful dialogue into the future, it is time to consider opportunities to create a culture based upon academic integrity by addressing the frequency with which a large portion of the students are expected to advance the academic discussion in their disciplines. However, many students appear to lack the tools and knowledge to construct a strong academic moral code. Additionally, some students appear to disregard the value of academic research and how to use the research tools needed to make valid contributions. McCabe and Trevino (1996), McCabe (2005a), Higgins (2010), and others researching academic dishonesty in higher education appeared to be in agreement regarding the confusion created by a lack of a standard definition of academic dishonesty and universal protocols for addressing it. In addition to inconsistencies in defining and addressing academic dishonesty, there is a question of who is responsible for educating students about academic dishonesty and what are the critical components needed to achieve a successful academic career.

For students attending universities with inconsistent academic policies within academic colleges and a variety of protocols at the course level, learning how to avoid academic dishonesty can be difficult. Gallant (2008a) and Howard and Davis (2009) suggested universities could avoid misinterpretation of policies by creating a culture of learning in support of policy through consistent classroom instruction as a proactive approach. Once a student has knowledge of weak or inconsistent faculty enforcement of

policies, the student has the option to take advantage of the system. Staff and faculty within a community can also misinterpret procedures for addressing academic violations, resulting in the sporadic detection of cheating across the university community.

### **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to determine if there were differences between faculty and student attitudes toward academic dishonesty. Additionally, this study was designed to determine whether there were differences between faculty perceptions of students engaging in academically dishonest activities and student perceptions of engaging in academically dishonest activities; faculty and student perceptions of the academic environment; faculty and student perceptions of how students learn about academic dishonesty; faculty and student perceptions about the frequency of instruction about the actions that constitute academic dishonesty; and faculty and student perceptions about the frequency of instruction about the actions that constitute academic dishonesty. The next purpose of this study was to determine if faculty perceptions were affected by the academic appointments and academic colleges of the faculty. Finally, the purpose of this study was to determine if student perceptions were affected by any of the following student variables: gender, academic college, academic standing, age, and residential status.

### **Significance of the Study**

Results from this study could reveal multiple perspectives related to addressing academic dishonesty in higher education, as well as identify gaps that put an institution at risk. Comparison of the faculty and student attitudes and perspectives about academic dishonesty and their academic environment may reveal discrepancies in what actions

constitute academic dishonesty, the relevance of academic integrity, and the effectiveness of sanctions, revealing opportunities to create a more effective institutional approach for addressing academic dishonesty, and strengthening a university community's academic culture. To further the research of academic dishonesty in higher education, the results of this study may provide additional support for how to create a sustainable academic integrity model that is centered on a synthesis of faculty and student attitudes and perspectives unified in support for academic integrity.

### **Delimitations**

To establish the scope of the study, specific delimitations were applied for creating a manageable sample size to research (Creswell, 2009). Application of the delimitations is described within this section, encompassing such parameters as the location of the study, duration of the study, and descriptors highlighting the participants who were surveyed. Research for the study was limited to one institution during the 2014-2015 academic school year during a period of approximately nine weeks. The study involved multiple faculty and student groups representing varied instructional contact times across all disciplines at a Midwest private university that had an academic misconduct code with varying sanctions but did not have an honor code. The instruments used in this study were selected from Stevens' (2012) research focused on data collection in the areas of faculty and student attitudes about academic dishonesty, faculty and student perceptions of academic dishonesty, and faculty and student perceptions of the academic environment. The instruments were not used to collect data on student motivations for committing academic dishonesty or faculty motivations for overlooking it.

## **Assumptions**

For the purpose of pursuing the research within the parameters of the delimitations and limitations, several assumptions or variables intentionally overlooked during the research were defined before commencing the study. During the study, assumptions about the participants' prior knowledge of the university's interpretation of what actions constitute academic dishonesty, and the academic misconduct policy were considered. There also existed a presumption that the instrument selected to measure faculty and student perceptions would yield valid and reliable data. Additionally, an assumption was made that the students and faculty understood the survey items and honestly responded to the questions.

## **Research Questions**

To define the factors contributing to the problem statement for the study, several questions investigating the relationships between variables and the problem statement were posed to provide direction for the study. Responses obtained from the faculty and student populations within the various schools at the university were used to compare differences and similarities between adjunct, part-time, and full-time faculty; students and faculty; and undergraduate and graduate students. Comparisons of the perceptions were designed to demonstrate a relationship between clear and consistent messaging about academic integrity and sufficient instruction in the prevention of academic dishonesty at the undergraduate and graduate levels of study.

Specifically, the following research questions were identified:

**RQ1.** To what extent is there a difference between faculty and student attitudes toward academic dishonesty?

**RQ2.** To what extent is there a difference between faculty perceptions of students engaging in academically dishonest activities and student perceptions of engaging in academically dishonest activities?

**RQ3.** To what extent is there a difference between faculty and student perceptions of the academic environment?

**RQ4.** To what extent is there a difference between faculty and student perceptions about the frequency of instruction about the actions that constitute academic dishonesty?

**RQ5.** To what extent is there a difference between faculty and student perceptions of how students learn about academic dishonesty?

**RQ6.** To what extent is there a difference in faculty attitudes toward academic dishonesty among academic appointments and academic colleges?

**RQ7.** To what extent is there a difference in faculty perceptions of students engaging in academically dishonest activities among academic appointments and academic colleges?

**RQ8.** To what extent is there a difference in faculty perceptions of the academic environment among academic appointments and academic colleges?

**RQ9.** To what extent is there a difference in faculty perceptions of how often they communicate what actions constitute academic dishonesty to students among academic appointments and academic colleges?

**RQ10.** To what extent is there a difference in faculty perceptions of how students learn about academic dishonesty among academic appointments and academic colleges?

**RQ11.** To what extent is there a difference in student attitudes toward academic dishonesty among groups in the following variables: gender, academic college, academic standing, age, and residential status?

**RQ12.** To what extent is there a difference in students' self-report of engaging in academically dishonest activities affected among groups in the following variables: gender, academic college, academic standing, age, and residential status?

**RQ13.** To what extent is there a difference in students' perceptions of the academic environment among groups in the following variables: gender, academic college, academic standing, age, and residential status?

**RQ14.** To what extent is there a difference in students' perceptions of receiving instruction on the actions that constitute academic dishonesty among groups in the following variables: gender, academic college, academic standing, age, and residential status?

**RQ15.** To what extent is there a difference in students' perceptions of how they learn about academic dishonesty among groups in the following variables: gender, academic college, academic standing, age, and residential status?

### **Definition of Terms**

The following definitions are included to aid the reader in developing a common understanding of the terms frequently used throughout the study:

**Academic misconduct.** Academic misconduct (or academic dishonesty) as defined by the Midwestern University (2013a) consists of plagiarizing, cheating on an assignment and/or assessments; turning in counterfeit reports, tests, and papers; stealing of tests and other academic material; forgery or

knowingly falsifying academic records or documents; and turning in the same work to more than one class. (p. 39)

**Adjunct faculty.** Per the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) (2014a), adjunct faculty are university community members who are “non-tenure track instructional staff serving in a temporary or auxiliary capacity to teach specific courses on a course-by-course basis” (para. 16).

**Attitude.** As defined by the Oxford English Dictionary (2015a), attitude is a “settled behavior or manner of acting, as representative of acting or feeling” (para. 3).

**Full-time faculty.** Per the NCES (2014b), full-time faculty are university community members who have assignments...made for the purpose of conducting instruction, research or public service as a principal activity (or activities). They may hold academic rank titles of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor, lecturer or the equivalent of any of those academic ranks. (para. 1)

At the institution where this study took place, most full-time faculty carry a course load equivalent of 24 credit hours during the academic year and contribute their scholarship and service to the institution through the requirements of tenure and promotion (Midwestern University, 2014b).

**Honor codes.** For the purpose of the study, the honor code is believed to support a “dialogue at the institutional, classroom and individual level around fundamental values. Codes and policies call students, faculty and staff to a life of ethical conduct and reflection through the promotion of a campus culture of trust, honesty, fairness, responsibility, respect, courage, and empathy” (Dodd, 2013, p. 1).

**Integrity.** Integrity is the “soundness of moral principle; the character of uncorrupted virtue, esp. in relation to truth and fair dealing; uprightness, honesty, sincerity” (Oxford English Dictionary, 2014b, para. 3).

**Non-traditional student.** Non-traditional students typically have “family and work responsibilities as well as other life circumstances” that require them to pursue post-secondary education “over the age of 24” (NCES, 2014c, para. 1).

**Perception.** Perception is “an interpretation or impression based upon such an understanding; an opinion or belief” (Oxford English Dictionary, 2015c, para. 5).

**Part-time faculty.** Most institutions with part-time faculty are those who have “contracts shorter than full-time faculty” and work “fewer hours within the institution” (NCES, 2002, p. xi).

**Traditional student.** A traditional student is defined for the purpose of this study as a student who

enrolls in college immediately after graduation from high school, pursues college studies on a continuous full-time basis at least during the fall and spring semesters, and completes a bachelor’s degree program in four or five years at the young age of 22 or 23. (Center for Institutional Effectiveness, 2004, p. 2)

## **Overview of the Methodology**

A quantitative survey research model was designed to collect evidence for this study. The instruments selected for the study were created by Stevens (2012) and consisted of two sets of survey questions specific to faculty and students. With permission from Stevens (2012), faculty and student surveys were administered in the

spring of 2015 through a website link in SurveyMonkey that was sent by a trusted third party via the university email system (see Appendix A).

The study took place over a 9-week period beginning in April and culminated during the first week of June. The communication plan to the participants elicited a series of separate emails before and during the data collection phase. An analysis of the data commenced following the data collection period. Statistical analyses conducted for the study included independent sample *t* tests and multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA).

### **Organization of the Study**

This study contains five chapters. In chapter one, the study was introduced by describing the background, statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, the significance of the study, delimitations, assumptions, research questions, the definition of terms, the overview of the methodology, and organization of the study. The literature review on academic dishonesty is outlined in chapter two through the conceptual framework of behavioral and cognitive perspectives and specifically addresses a historical review of the defining academic integrity studies, conceptual theories, and perspectives of academic integrity in higher education. In chapter three the research design and collection of data, as well as the statistical analyses of the data as described in the research design, population and sample, sampling procedures, instrumentation, data collection procedures, data analysis and hypothesis testing, and limitations sections, are outlined. The analyses of the data and research findings appear in chapter four within the results, descriptive statistics, and hypothesis testing. To close the study in chapter five,

interpretations and recommendations, study summary, findings related to the literature, and conclusions are provided.

## **Chapter Two**

### **Review of the Literature**

The purpose of this study was to compare attitudes and perceptions of academic dishonesty between faculty and students at a private university in the Midwest. As support for the study, a literature review was conducted to examine attitudes related to and perceptions of academic dishonesty in the context of higher education and society. Throughout the review of the literature, topics discussed include external perceptions of academic dishonesty in higher education, academic dishonesty research from seminal authors, and current research on attitudes and perceptions of academic dishonesty.

#### **External Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty in Higher Education**

An analysis of research on academic dishonesty began with an exploration of one of the first documented large scale academic dishonesty studies conducted by Bower (1964) and was followed by a review of selected studies from later decades. Throughout the research, a growing body of evidence suggested higher education should respond to concerns about the authenticity of learning in post-secondary academia with punitive sanctions. Evaluation of more recent studies revealed another point of view emerging from higher education that suggested the academy should focus on educating faculty and students through instruction, curriculum development, and the guiding principles of honor codes, rather than relying upon a policy and sanctions alone (Gallant, 2008a; Lang, 2013).

Despite the concerns raised within academia, pressure from external community groups such as the media and affiliated educational organizations have drawn attention to the responsibility of communities of higher learning to instill ethical behaviors in

students, as well as increase sanctions upon offenders. Additionally, advancing technology has helped to propel not only the topic of academic dishonesty into the general public as evidenced by commentary on social media sites and published articles on the Internet, but it is also aiding students in cheating (Schlozam, 2013). As a result, higher education institutions have become a focus of criticism regarding the quality of graduates being produced.

Perceived concerns with faculty not providing students with learning opportunities free from “temptation” (Crawford, 1995, para. 5), that “most schools fail” when enforcing policies and academic standards (Pérez-Peña, 2012, para. 12), and suggestions that students have lost accountability for their academic responsibilities due to the “mashup culture” they live in (Christakis & Christakis, 2012, para. 3) resonate throughout popular culture and to some extent echo the findings within the literature. While most of the articles in popular media touch upon key concerns often noted within the research and occasionally reference known researchers in the field, the information shared portrays a picture of academia that has grown out-of-control in recent years with very little evidence to demonstrate what institutions are doing. Several articles provide suggestions for action, highlighting the most egregious offenses, but not much more (Crawford, 1995; Christakis & Christakis, 2012; Pérez-Peña, 2012).

### **Academic Dishonesty Research from Seminal Authors**

Most studies focusing on academic dishonesty suggest the first instances of concerns about academic dishonesty appear in the literature as early as the 1940s, revealing reports of how the misconduct was addressed within university and community publications. Most reports described instances in which cheating or academic dishonesty

was discovered and what sanctions were applied. Experts on the research of academic dishonesty cite only a few significant studies in their research before the 1990s (Davis, 1993; Davis, Gover, Becker, McGregor, 1992; McCabe and Trevino, 1993).

One of the most commonly referenced studies in the literature prior to the 2000s was conducted by Bowers (1964). Bowers' (1964) study was one of the first attempts to conduct a large-scale research study on academic dishonesty in the United States with the intent to reveal the prevalence and degree of seriousness occurring within the higher education community. Bowers (1964) conducted his research by contacting 600 deans of students, 500 student body presidents, and 5,000 students asking them to rank the prevalence of several types of misconduct. The responses from the deans of students revealed that "academic dishonesty, including cheating on tests and exams and plagiarizing on papers and assignments" to be the second most common form of misconduct (Bowers, 1964, p. 15). The results of his investigation also revealed that academic dishonesty was "primarily handled by faculty members acting individually" (Bowers, 1964, p. 22). He determined that "campus authorities consider it (academic dishonesty) to be one of the more serious disciplinary problems and yet sanctions against it were considerably more lenient than those imposed on other forms of student misconduct" (Bowers, 1964, p. 23).

Upon completion of the study, Bowers (1964) recommended further research on academic misconduct occur in the areas of influence related to social development in childhood, post-secondary recruiting practices, and the effectiveness of honor systems in higher education. Not until much later did the influence of Bowers (1964) resurface within the research, appearing in the work of McCabe and Trevino (1993). As a result,

McCabe's initial research with several colleagues in the 1990s could be what helped to develop a renewed interest in cheating in post-secondary education, and would continue for several decades (International Council for Academic Integrity, 2015). McCabe's body of work by this time yielded data collection from approximately 14,000 students at 58 colleges and universities (McCabe & Trevino, 2002).

Reflecting on his work and his research with colleagues through the mid-2000s, McCabe (2005a) highlighted the value his pursuit of measuring student attitudes toward academic misconduct and the results of his research of over 100,000 college students and 18,000 high school students, stating specifically, his purpose was to "to help colleges and universities think about strategies to improve the climate of academic integrity on their campuses" and show how "campuses can promote integrity among students" (p. 9). McCabe's (2005a) findings revealed students often had concerns about fairness and those who typically did not cheat rationalized the act by saying, "they have no choice when a faculty member makes little or no effort to prevent or respond to cheating" (p. 9). As a result, McCabe (2005a) drew the conclusion that while an honor code or pledge is an important element, it is "the peer culture itself (student perceptions of how faculty and other students feel and behave with regard to academic integrity) that appears to be the most significant factor in influencing the level of academic dishonesty" and that a "community-wide emphasis on the ideal of academic integrity and an acknowledgement of the critical role students can and should play in strategies to reduce cheating" (p. 10).

Davis (1992), another major contributor to the research on academic misconduct, entered the discussion on academic integrity when he published research with Grover, Becker, and McGregor that studied "prevalence, cause, techniques, faculty and

institutional responsibility, determinant measures, and punishment dimensions” (p.16) across several university settings, resulting in data collected from 6,000 students at large and small higher education institutions, both public and private. At the various institutions, Davis et al. (1992) administered an anonymous survey to undergraduate students asking them to respond to questions about their attitudes toward cheating, if the student cheated in high school or college and what happened, their perceptions of faculty concerning cheating scenarios, and appropriate sanctions for academic misconduct. From the data, Davis et al. (1992) determined that “only when students develop a stronger commitment to the educational process and when they possess or activate an internalized code of ethics that opposes cheating will the problem have been dealt with effectively” (p. 19).

Davis (1993) also published additional research from data stemming from two questionnaires about cheating that yielded over “8,000 responses” (p. 4). Like McCabe and Trevino (1993), Davis (1993) referenced several defining studies in the literature prior to the 1990s that demonstrated an increase in self-reported instances of cheating from 1960 to 1980. Davis (1993) also determined through his research a commonality with the literature of students citing pressure to do well as a leading reason for cheating. As the research on academic dishonesty evolved, Davis (1993) determined the percentages of self-reported cheating have increased over the previous decades providing even more support for continued research.

McCabe’s research on attitudes and perceptions of academic dishonesty between 1990 and the mid-2000s, along with work from his colleagues, ultimately contributed to the present day research by challenging other researchers to explore how attitudes and

perceptions can affect communities of learning and how honor codes can form attitudes. Specifically, McCabe and Trevino (1993) and McCabe, Trevino, and Butterfield (2001) highlighted in their review of the research that studies prior to the 1990s were focused upon restricted, individual variables, rather than on “contextual factors” that could reveal a greater understanding of the prevalence in which academic dishonesty occurs throughout higher education, thereby allowing administrators to respond at the institutional level. Additionally, the research suggested that through instruction and curriculum design, incidents of academic integrity can be curtailed and the influence of an honor code could eliminate tolerance for cheating, thereby lowering rates of plagiarism and other forms of academic dishonesty (Lang, 2013; McCabe et al., 2012).

### **Current Research on Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty**

The research following the studies produced during the 1990s appears to have expanded from analyzing attitudes, perceptions, and motivating factors such as pressure to perform well and cheating is easy, to include student perspective on what actions constitute cheating, the effect of technology on perceptions of academic dishonesty, and the ease with which information can be shared and acquired by students in a digital age (Evering & Moorman, 2012; Gibson, Blackwell, Greenwood & Blackwell, 2006; McCabe et al., 2012). Much of the research suggested the ambiguity of a standard definition for academic dishonesty across higher education and varied faculty perspectives on what sanctions are appropriate for enforcing as a major factor in the increase of academic misconduct (Dodd, 2013; McCabe & Trevino, 1993).

Now, early in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, researchers have continued to explore faculty and student perceptions, but also recommended further exploration in the area of honor codes

supported by academic misconduct policies, utilization of teaching strategies, and student engagement to inform students of their academic responsibilities and create a stronger sense of community and shape the academic culture (McCabe, 2005a; McCabe & Trevino, 1993; Whitley & Keith-Spiegel, 2002). While concerns about the prevalence of academic integrity are present during this timeframe, the literature tended to focus on responding to the prevalence of academic misconduct rather than on the frequency. Studies have continued to acknowledge the prevalence of academic misconduct by analyzing perceptions of faculty and students, with most suggesting further research on how knowledge of academic policies and culture of the community affects perceptions. Other areas focus was on how instruction can help shape the academic culture within an institution. Most studies have focused on the exploration of faculty perceptions and attitudes or student perceptions and attitudes, with an additional, smaller segment devoted to a comparison of faculty and student attitudes and perceptions of academic dishonesty.

**Faculty, Students, and Academic Dishonesty.** Evans and Craig (1990) compared teacher and student perceptions of cheating in middle and senior high schools. The study was conducted in four schools from a suburban district in Washington state and assessed “(a) awareness and evaluation of the seriousness of academic cheating in schools; (b) declarative knowledge about cheating; (c) causal attributions for cheating; and (d) benefits about the efficacy of cheating prevention strategies” (Evans & Craig, 1990, p. 45). They determined there was very little research on how teachers’ and students’ understanding of academic dishonesty affects perceptions and sought to find support for how to educate “students about intellectual honesty” by studying the “cognitive aspects of cheating” and “the extent to which student and teacher views of

cheating fit with empirical findings about the causes and conditions of differential cheating rate” (Evans & Craig, 1990, p. 45).

To obtain data from the teachers and students, Evans and Craig (1990) created a survey consisting of 120 questions and administered it to 107 faculty and 1,763 students in April of 1988. Evans and Craig’s (1990) analysis of the individual responses resulted in a different outcome, revealing that students ranked cheating to be more severe than did their teachers. When all scores were analyzed together, Evans and Craig (1990) found “a majority (51%) of both teachers and students in all schools agreed that students usually know when cheating occurs in class” and “typically do not report cheating to their teachers” (p. 46). Additional findings pointed to the perceived affect teacher characteristics have on students, citing students believed “teachers who are unfriendly, boring or dull, and have high expectations for student performance are more likely to encounter classroom cheating” (Evans & Craig, 1990, p. 48).

Evans and Craig (1990) offered the following recommendations for further research: analyze student perceptions of what “is ethical or fair specifically in regard to academic work” and focus research on areas that are “strengthened by examining cheating phenomena specifically in relation to measures of classroom climate”(p. 50). Evans and Craig (1990) also proposed research focused upon teachers’ intuition about cheating behaviors and the causes of those behaviors and subjectivity of those experiences. Additionally, recommendations for teachers to review their classroom practices concerning prevention strategies by maintaining a vigilant stance on protecting exams, conducting open discussions on cheating behaviors, and providing clear

expectations about the penalties for cheating resulted from the data collected (Evans & Craig, 1990).

In 1994, Graham, Monday, O'Brien, and Steffen, conducted a study of attitudes and behaviors about cheating at a private, liberal arts Catholic college and a community college in the Midwest. The study's research questions were designed to investigate such variables as faculty and student attitudes and perceptions about cheating, the severity of cheating, and the faculty's perceived frequency of students cheating (Graham et al., 1994). The population studied by Graham et al. (1994) at the private college consisted of faculty and students; only students were studied at the community college. In total, 482 students were sampled from both institutions, with 70% of the responses coming from students who attended the private college at the time of the study (Graham et al., 1994).

Two surveys were administered, one to faculty and another to students, encompassing tasks such as rating the severity of cheating behavior, students self-reporting their engagement in each of the activities associated with cheating, students reporting the frequency of the occurrence of cheating behaviors in the community at large, and faculty and students ranking the reasons why students do or do not cheat (Graham et al., 1994). The results of their study revealed that "attitudinal variables were better at predicting cheating than background variables" (p. 255) and "there were no statistically significant differences in attitude toward cheating between the two groups or in the amount of cheating that was perceived on each campus" (Graham et al., 1994, p. 256).

However, while the students and faculty agreed on the "top three most serious forms of cheating: "taking a test for someone else, copying someone else's term paper,

and having someone write a term paper for you” (Graham et al., 1994, p.257), they found the faculty rated the severity of cheating behaviors higher than did the student ratings. Another key finding from the self-reporting of students about their behaviors is younger students with low grade point averages cheat more and those “with lenient attitudes toward cheating, who believe cheating is not that severe of an offense, and who think that a large number of other students at their school cheat are more likely to have engaged in various types of cheating” (Graham et al., 1994, p. 258).

Graham et al. (1994) determined the faculty who participated in the study found it difficult to reach “consensus on what is appropriate after a cheater has been caught” (p. 259) and where there is discrepancy in sanctions, cheating among students is prevalent. They recommended institutions address cheating by providing students with a clear definition of what actions constitute cheating, providing students with clear expectations for classroom behavior, and outlining clear and consistent sanctions for cheating offenses (Graham et al., 1994). Most importantly, Graham et al. (1994) highlighted the importance of faculty being “diligent in decreasing situations where cheating can occur” (p. 259). The team also recommended further research in the area of what “behaviors students perceive as unfair and how faculty can avoid being labeled as unfair” (Graham et al., 1994, p. 259).

Roig and Ballew (1994) conducted research on faculty and student attitudes about cheating at a private and a public institution in the urban area of New York. The goal of their research was to ascertain the relationship between student tolerance levels for academic dishonesty and student perceptions of the faculty members’ tolerance levels for students’ academic dishonesty (Roig and Ballew, 1994). Additionally, Roig and Ballew

(1994) sought to determine students' attitudes about what they believed were "typical college professors' attitudes toward cheating" and if the "students' perceptions of the professors' attitudes differ from the actual attitudes held by professors" (Roig and Ballew, 1994, p. 4). Their research was framed within the context of the literature produced by researchers such as Davis et al., (1992) who suggested students who cheat often rationalize their behaviors or place blame on the faculty for their actions as a way to "guard against his/her own disapproval of the deviant behavior, as well as the disapproval of others" (Roig and Ballew, 1994, p. 3).

Using two instruments comprised of the "ATC scale developed by Gardner and Melvin (1988)," Roig and Ballew (1994) collected responses from the faculty and student participants about attitudes and perceptions of students' propensity to cheat (p. 5). Both groups completed the two surveys resulting in data collected from 120 faculty and 404 students. Results of their study revealed that "students, in general, are aware of their professors' highly condemnatory attitudes," that the faculty have "somewhat "harsher" attributions that students are more tolerant than students themselves report to be," and that despite the results, faculty seldom "appear to act in response to incidents of academic dishonesty" (Roig and Ballew, 1994, p. 5). Roig and Ballew (1994), through their research, determined that faculty should "take a more active role in establishing an atmosphere of academic integrity" and "communicate to students their strong positions on academic dishonesty and the negative consequences" (p. 8).

Kennedy, Nowak, Raghuraman, Thomas, and Davis (2000) conducted a study of 69 faculty and 172 students at a medium size, regional, Midwestern university to assess views about academic dishonesty in distance learning. The purpose of the study was to

determine if the growth of distance learning offerings contributed to an increase in academic dishonesty due to the physical separation of faculty and students (Kennedy et al., 2000). In addition to collecting data on demographics, the faculty and students were asked to complete different surveys focused on academic dishonesty based upon “type, rate, and methodology of cheating” (Kennedy et al., 2000, p. 2). The faculty answered four questions specific to cheating and teaching in a virtual classroom and students answered six questions about cheating and learning in a virtual classroom (Kennedy et al., 2000).

The analysis of the survey data revealed, “Both students and faculty believe it is easier to cheat in a distance learning class” (Kennedy et al., 2000, p. 4). Additionally, Kennedy et al. (2000) noted, “cheaters and noncheaters perceive cheating as being easier in distance learning classes” (p. 4). Findings from the faculty survey revealed that they believe cheating can be reduced by engaging the students with authentic assessments and requiring students to interact with the instructor regularly (Kennedy et al., 2000). Kennedy et al. (2000) suggested combating the cheating in the virtual classroom with “technology based virtual measures” (p. 4).

Symaco and Marcelo (2003) conducted a study focused on faculty and student perceptions of academic dishonesty at the University of the Philippines, Diliman that included responses from 48 faculty and 180 undergraduate students. The reason Symaco and Marcelo (2003) cited for pursuing the study resulted from their belief that academic misconduct should be viewed as “a phenomenon most people abhor yet profess to have committed at one time or another under adverse conditions” (p. 327). The perceptions were measured using a survey consisting of questions pertaining to moral scenarios.

Symaco and Marcelo (2003) aligned the survey responses to academic and non-academic scenarios to connect perceptions of peer influence and intent to commit academic misconduct.

Through their research, Symaco and Marcelo (2003) deduced that “faculty and students’ perceptions with regard to the issue are at odds” (p. 328) and “faculty’s perceptions of students’ moral behavior is not exactly positive” (p. 329). Symaco and Marcelo (2003) also reported significant differences in findings pertaining to gender, noting that female students in four instances selected responses that suggested stronger preferences toward acting with morally correct behaviors over their male counterparts. From this research, Symaco and Marcelo (2003) recommended finding solutions to reduce the instances of academic misconduct by encouraging faculty and students to create a common understanding of cheating through discourse.

Howard, Conway, and Moran (2006) studied the behavior of 157 faculty and 421 students by surveying them using two different instruments to determine the prevalence of academic dishonesty and its influence at a medium-sized university in the Northeast. Using social theory as a context for their study, Howard et al. (2006) analyzed how “the descriptive norms of student academic misconduct as predictors of (a) student misconduct and (b) faculty efforts to prevent and challenge misconduct,” affect the accuracy of the perceptions from both groups, and frequency of academic misconduct influenced faculty and student behavior (p. 1062).

The results of the Howard et al. (2006) study revealed that “student academic misconduct peer descriptive norms beliefs overestimated the actual occurrence of misconduct” (p.1070) and “faculty overestimated the actual occurrence of academic

misconduct” (p. 1074). They also determined the “faculty beliefs about the frequency of student academic misconduct were positively related...to prevention efforts and efforts to challenge students suspected of misconduct” (Howard et al., 2006, p. 1075). Further support of the research from Howard et al. (2006) can be found in the work of Lang (2013) and Bluestein (2015), which emphasized the importance of student engagement and communication of expectations for establishing a classroom environment that produces a culture of learning and integrity and encourages faculty to set clear expectations for students to shape their perceptions.

**Faculty and Academic Dishonesty.** Pincus and Schmelkin (2003) surveyed faculty at a private university in the Northeast to “uncover their underlying perceptions and to gain a better understanding of how they conceptualize academic dishonesty” (p. 198). The quantitative study was designed “to allow for multiple dimensions” to emerge “without bias from the researchers” (p. 198). To collect data for their research, Pincus and Schmelkin (2003) utilized two instruments with the second one used to validate the responses from the first. From 1,000 active faculty members, Pincus and Schmelkin (2003) randomly selected 150 full-time faculty and 150 adjunct faculty to participate in the study and mailed surveys to the potential participants. Once the surveys were returned, Pincus and Schmelkin (2003) determined 212 responses could be used in the study.

The results of the study suggested faculty believed there was a range of sanctions based upon severity and there as not “an all or nothing situation” for students who commit academic misconduct (Seirup Pincus & Pedhazur Schmelkin, 2003, p. 206). Specifically, Pincus and Schmelkin (2003) asserted that academic misconduct policies

should differentiate sanctions based on severity to make it easier for faculty to report all types of infractions, not just those that are seen as major offenses. They concluded, “faculty would prefer that sanctions be applied differently depending upon the severity of the behavior” (Seirup Pincus & Pedhazur Schmelkin, 2003, p. 208).

Robinson-Zañata, Pena, Cook-Morales Pena, Afshani, and Nguyen (2005) surveyed 270 faculty members to ascertain readiness to address plagiarism and the sanctions applied. To measure the faculty perceptions, Robinson-Zañata et al. (2005) conducted a quantitative study that included three departments within two universities. Of those contacted to participate in the study, 266 faculty chose to respond. The survey, consisting of two parts, was used to collect data on faculty beliefs about plagiarism by determining if plagiarism had occurred and the severity and sanctions to be applied (Robinson-Zañata et al., 2005).

The results of the study supported recommendations for alignment of academic misconduct policies with faculty expectations; otherwise, faculty were less likely to report offenses for administrative sanctions (Robinson-Zañata et al., 2005). The data analyses confirmed the belief that “faculty members on the whole tend to believe that the punishment should fit the crime,” with support coming from the relationship between “the estimated severity” of the sanction and “the amount of uncited material” within the artifact (Robinson-Zañata et al., 2005, pp. 329-330). Recommendations from Robinson-Zañata et al. (2005) highlighted the need for standard processes “to guide decision-making regardless of consequences” along with instruction about plagiarism (p. 333). Noting that institutions should commit to dialogue about the consistency of the

implementation of the “policy and practice” since policy alone is not sufficient for addressing plagiarism (Robinson-Zañata et al., 2005, p. 334).

Volpe, Davidson, and Bell (2008) studied faculty attitudes and behaviors about academic dishonesty by administering an online survey to 52 faculty at a small private university in Northern California and collected sample syllabi from the participants. Their study attempted to find a relationship between faculty attitudes and beliefs to their syllabi statements about academic misconduct and the potential effect the statements had in preventing cheating. While Volpe et al. (2008) did not find a correlation between faculty attitudes and beliefs to the syllabi statements, they did determine that “the amount of cheating that faculty believed happens does not correspond with written guidelines” and “faculty generally underestimated the levels of cheating in their classrooms” (pp. 2-3). Volpe et al. (2008) also looked at the effect of academic discipline, professional rank, and gender on faculty perceptions of academic misconduct. They identified a “trend toward non-tenure track faculty having a slightly greater tendency to believe less cheating occurs than tenure track faculty” (Volpe et al., 2008, p.5). Additionally, Volpe et al. (2008) found the arts and sciences faculty and the business and engineering faculty correctly predicted increased rates of cheating in their field; however, 34% of the arts and sciences faculty did not have penalties for cheating in their syllabi. They did not find a significant correlation between gender and perceptions.

Based on the results of their study, Volpe et al. (2008) recommended more research in the area of “students’ and faculty’s behaviors and attitudes” of academic dishonesty and to include how the “policies and beliefs of the administration and institution as a whole” (p. 7). They believed that “non-tenure and tenure track faculty

members are grossly underestimating the levels of student cheating” (Volpe et al., 2008, p. 6). Volpe et al. (2008) recommended that if the faculty take a proactive stance about academic dishonesty and are supported by the institution, then the possibility of reducing cheating is likely.

Findings from Pincus and Schmelkin (2003) and Robinson-Zañata et al. (2005) revealed faculty perceptions of academic dishonesty reflect concern for addressing academic misconduct with appropriate sanctions, but also favor the option of being able to select the sanction at the classroom level. Support for academic institutions moving toward honor codes and internal definitions of academic misconduct that are consistently supported across departments within an institution are highlighted by such organizations as the International Center for Academic Integrity (2015) and affiliated researchers such as, Pavela (1997) and Davis et al. (2009). The work of Davis et al. (2009) supports the findings of Pincus and Schmelkin (2003) and Robinson-Zañata et al., (2005) by insisting that “creating a culture of academic integrity...provides the signals that shape values and the structures that support ethical behavior” (Davis et al., 2009, loc. 2866). To be effective, all members of the academic institution should be committed to clear and consistent communication regarding academic integrity for the purpose of preserving its ethos and creating a more unified perception within the community. To sustain a culture supportive of academic integrity, the dialogue should begin with faculty and administrators and expand to students (Davis et al., 2009).

**Students and Academic Dishonesty.** Davis and Ludvigson (1995) surveyed 2,153 juniors and seniors from public and private schools in 11 states, ranging from small to large higher education institutions. The purpose of the study was to determine if the

students “had cheated at least once,” to assess the students’ “fear of being caught cheating,” and “the extent to which this fear influences whether they will cheat” (Davis and Ludvigson, 1995, p. 119).

Davis and Ludvigson (1995) determined students cheat for many reasons, but most often to obtain better grades. They also concluded, “Virtually all students who reported cheating on several occasions in college had also cheated on several occasions in high school” and cheating should be addressed in high school prior to entering college as a preventative measure for curtailing the number academic misconduct cases in higher education (Davis and Ludvigson, 1995, p. 120). Davis and Ludvigson (1995) also concluded that faculty who stipulated sanctions have a greater influence over female students than they did male students when they were faced with the decision to cheat. Davis and Ludvigson (1995) went as far to suggest the faculty “can apparently lay blame on the deterioration of ...standards for student conduct” (p.120) as a catalyst for the vast amount of cheating and suggested that “students must build a personal theory” about the value of their education to reduce the instances of cheating (p. 121).

Jordan (2001) studied results collected from survey responses from 175 students at a private liberal arts college. The survey was completed by the students for each instance of a course they were enrolled in, and the participants were asked to report the frequency of behavior within each survey completed (Jordan, 2001). Areas studied by Jordan (2001) consisted of “cheating rates, motivation, perceived social norms, attitudes, and knowledge” (p. 238). Results of the studied revealed no difference between those classified as cheaters and noncheaters when compared in the context of “program of study, gender, or GPA” (Jordan, 2001, p. 238).

Jordan's (2001) assessment of the responses collected about perceived social norms identified responses related to perceptions from cheaters and noncheaters as falling below the actual self-reported instances of academic misconduct collected during the study. For those participants identified as cheaters, Jordan (2001) reported findings that the students believed the instances of cheating were higher due to observing others committing academic misconduct and believing cheating occurs regular based on their observations. Jordan (2001) determined that "motivation variables, perceived social norms, knowledge of institutional policy, and attitudes about cheating are related to the cheating behavior" (p. 242), with "knowledge of institutional policy" being the "best predictor of cheating rates" (p. 243). Additional predictors of cheating behaviors found to be significant pointed to the "perceptions of behavior of peers and to attitudes about cheating" (Jordan, 2001, p. 243).

Jordan's (2001) research suggested the importance of academic integrity through a persuasive ethical argument centered upon the importance of honesty, through instruction on institutional policies, personal excellence, and the effect of academic misconduct on the institution. Additionally, Jordan (2001) recommended that students be exposed to the data on student perceptions about cheating within their community, as it could help reduce the instances of future academic misconduct since those who cheat believe it is occurring more often than what is reported. The results from the study also revealed that most students did not "believe that cheating is justified" or "an acceptable behavior" (Jordan, 2001, p. 244). Jordan (2001) recommended future research focus on how to tackle the discussion using intervention programs pertaining to academic integrity.

Stearns (2001) conducted a quantitative study focused on how the classroom dynamics and instructor engagement affect students' perceptions of academic dishonesty, including their willingness to admit to committing academic misconduct within particular classes. Through survey data collected from 1,369 students at a large regional college in the West, Stearns (2001) focused on instances of academic misconduct within specific courses. The results of Stearns' (2001) work revealed, "Academically dishonest students' respect evaluations of their instructors were lower than those of students not committing academic dishonesty" (p. 281). Stearns (2001) recognized that the students could be "rationalizing a decision to cheat," but asserted, "Instructors can, to a large extent, shape the college environment via their classroom behavior" (p. 283).

Of those students who completed the survey, Stearns's (2001) analysis of the data revealed that 1 in 5 respondents admitting to "committing at least one act of academic dishonesty" (p. 280) and determined that of those who had committed an offense, "had behaved dishonestly more than once in the course they were enrolled"(p. 281). As a result of the study, Stearns's (2001) recommended dialogues focused upon the importance of academic integrity by highlighting definitions and the effects of academic dishonesty. Stearns' (2001) also suggested the "positively evaluated faculty" should lead the discussions with the students based on the findings of the study related to how student perceptions are shaped by instructor behavior.

Engler, Landau, and Epstein (2008) studied the perceptions of 56 undergraduate students at a small, private liberal arts college about plagiarism and cheating at their institution. The purpose of the study was to assess to what extent a modified honor code could influence the students' perceptions of academic dishonesty. The college was

reported not to have an honor code at the time of the study; therefore, Engler et al., (2008) selected the spring semester to conduct the study with the hope that the students had gained knowledge of the academic misconduct policy and procedures.

Engler et al., (2008) administered to the 56 students a two-part survey that contained scenarios requiring the participants to approximate the frequency of cheating behaviors at their college. Additionally, Engler et al. (2008) asked the students to determine how often they and their friends cheated on written papers and exams. The second part of the survey asked the students to review the same scenarios within the context of an honor code. Engler et al., (2008) determined that overall, “students reported that others are more likely to engage in these behaviors than they are” and when the concept of the honor codes was applied, students believed “an honor code would substantially reduce other students’ propensity to engage in academically dishonest behaviors” (p. 101). From these findings, Engler et al., (2008) recommend regular presentation of information to the students about acting with integrity in academic settings and making such actions the standard for the academic community.

O’Rourke et al., (2010) conducted a two- method study of student attitudes toward academic misconduct at a small liberal arts college with an honor code. O’Rourke et al. (2010) designed a study that consisted of two models, one based on the “effects of observing others engaging in academic dishonesty” and the other focused on “the importance of cheating valence attitudes” (p. 51). The researchers utilized two methods to collect their data, “(a) a survey of students’ attitudes and past cheating behavior, and (b) a vignette experiment” (O’Rourke et al., 2010, p. 51).

The purpose of the two parts was to determine how “the three main variables; neutralizing attitudes, cheating valence attitudes, and direct knowledge of others’ cheating behavior” affected the students’ perceptions of academic dishonesty within their community (p. 52). O’Rourke et al. (2010) collected data from 164 students by administering an anonymous survey and collecting responses from the vignette and questionnaire, which was designed to elicit student responses to a specific scenario in which a student and his peers may cheat.

The results of the O’Rourke et al. (2010) findings revealed that “127 students admitted to cheating in some form during their last semester” and results obtained from questions about high school experiences reflected that “more students in high school cheated than those in college”(p. 55). Additional findings revealed that “88.5% of students did have direct knowledge of cheating behaviors” pointing to the researchers concerns that observing cheating within the community was prevalent and influenced attitudes toward academic misconduct (p. 55). O’Rourke et al. (2010) also determined that “direct knowledge has little effect on the cheating behavior of someone very morally opposed to cheating” and for those students who are more inclined to cheat, “direct knowledge of others cheating has a much bigger impact” (p. 60). Such results suggested to the researchers that the influence of moral standards outweigh the social factors for those students who are strong in their convictions (O’Rourke et al., 2010). O’Rourke et al. (2010), also determined it was possible for students to start and continue cheating if they saw others do it, avoided being caught, and gained from the act. Further, O’Rourke et al. (2010) determined that students perceived those around them were cheating more than they self-reported and were likely to rationalize their decision to cheat after the fact.

O'Rourke et al. (2010) recommended addressing the perceptions of the university community and frequency of cheating by informing students that while they may maintain a strong stance on cheating due to their personal ethics, they still can be influenced by observing others cheating around them. Additional considerations prescribed by O'Rourke et al. (2010) highlighted the importance of academic communities being more open about the consequences of cheating via instructor lead discussion about assignment expectations, reporting general summaries of the instances of cheating and the imposed sanctions for the community, and for students to have clear avenues for reporting cheating without recourse.

Akeley Spear and Neville Miller (2012) studied the effects of fear and moral appeals on students' perceptions of cheating. In a quasi-experimental design, Akeley Spear and Neville Miller (2012) collected data from 157 undergraduate students attending a large public southeastern university. The institution where the study took place did not have a traditional honor code, but instead supported "a creed, and the integrity tenant of the document is much like an honor code" (Akeley Spear & Neville Miller, 2012). Akeley Spear and Neville Miller (2012) divided course sections with the students into control groups and treatment groups with the treatment groups receiving the fear and moral appeals via a statement within the syllabus and a verbal appeal from instructors during the presentation of the syllabus in class. The control group did not receive a written or verbal fear or moral appeal (Akeley Spear and Neville Miller, 2012).

Akeley Spear and Neville Miller (2012) defined a fear appeal based on their analysis of O'Keefe's (2002) research describing the concept as "a persuasive message designed to arouse the emotion of fear in a target audience by depicting the negative

consequences of a relevant threat to motivate people to engage in recommended adaptive behaviors” (p. 198). Akeley Spear and Neville Miller (2012) defined the moral appeal based upon their understanding of Schmitt’s (1964) findings suggesting it is “to persuade people to behave in ways that are consistent with their preexisting moral beliefs” (p. 198). Akeley Spear and Neville Miller (2012) postulated that the fear appeal and moral appeal would increase students’ self-reported cheating and observations of others cheating.

During a post treatment after the course started, all students were provided the option to complete an anonymous survey in class, which provided Akeley Spear and Neville Miller (2012) with the data they needed to assess the effectiveness of fear and moral appeals on the treatment groups and how those responses compared to the responses from the control groups. Specifically, Akeley Spear and Neville Miller (2012) wanted to determine if self-reported cheating could be “predicted by (a) moral attitudes about cheating, (b) neutralizing attitudes, (c) perceived threat, and (d) class social norms of cheating”(p. 199).

Results from the Akeley Spear and Neville Miller (2012) study revealed, “38 students reported they had engaged in at least one type of cheating in the class” (p. 202). Additional findings from Akeley Spear and Neville Miller (2012) indicated that “only neutralizing attitudes and observing others cheat contributed to the model” (p. 203) and that “statistically significant relationships between the variables were found in the moral appeal and fear appeal conditions” (p. 204). Akeley Spear and Neville Miller (2012) also determined that their findings aligned with the existing literature about academic misconduct, specifically stating that “neutralizing attitudes and peer influence were positively related to self-reported cheating” (p. 204). They noted, “observing others

cheat was significantly tied to cheating only when students were receiving regular anticheating messages from their instructors” (Akeley Spear and Neville Miller, p. 205, 2012).

Akeley Spear and Neville Miller (2012) believed their work advanced the research by testing recommendations within the classroom. Based on the results of the research, recommendations from Akeley Spear and Neville Miller (2012) suggested that faculty who utilize fear or moral appeals in class should also provide information to the students about the influence of social norms supported by their peers. They also recommended that faculty spend more time developing strategies for implementing anticheating messages as part of the students’ learning process (Akeley Spear and Neville Miller, 2012).

Research conducted by Bluestein (2015) at a large community college in California demonstrated how student engagement in the classroom and the attitude of the faculty could influence a student’s choice to cheat. The grounded theory case study design was used to explore how “student-faculty interaction in the community college influences academic dishonest behavior” (Bluestein, 2015, p. 179). Bluestein’s (2015) qualitative study consisted of 10 students and 11 faculty who participated in separate, one-hour interviews. Bluestein’s (2015) interviews with the students revealed, “Most students consider academic dishonesty to be the cheating student’s problem” (p. 183). The faculty who participated in the study shared with Bluestein (2015) that “most students who cheat were already disconnected with the classroom” and were “more tempted to cheat if they did not feel connected to the professor” (p. 184).

Bluestein (2015) affirmed through the research that “academic dishonesty is a social norm” (p. 182) at the community college. To change the culture, Bluestein (2015) recommended the faculty should build relationships with the students by “exhibiting passion for the discipline” in and out of the classroom, thereby creating the potential for students to “increase their ability to learn, which could reduce their need to cheat” (p.184). In addition to actively engaging students, Bluestein (2015) suggested “faculty mentoring” for students and believed putting into practice training for all community members who interact with students in the classroom that promotes “positive student-faculty interaction” in a way that is “nontraditional...such as interaction via social media” and “during class time, such as peer-to-peer interaction” (p. 189).

From the research of Stearns (2001) and Bluestein (2015), there is evidence to suggest students who are connected to their faculty through engaging classroom experiences are less likely to commit academic misconduct. Suggesting trust and actively engaging students in the classroom has a positive effect on student learning. Similarly, Lang (2013) supported the concept of mastery-oriented classrooms over performance-based classrooms, because the content and the experience are focused on student learning and not checked tasks off a list. Lang specifically noted that “intrinsic motivation and mastery learning are closely linked” (Lang, 2013, “Learning for Mastery,” para. 17) and if students “lack the confidence in their ability to complete a task successfully, or believe that they have been unfairly given a task beyond their skill or talent level, they are much more likely to resort to cheating” (Lang, 2013, “Case Studies in Cheating,” para 35).

Studies focused upon academic dishonesty revealed the pursuit by those in higher education to address internal and external criticism of the current practices for addressing academic misconduct. However, as mentioned, the evidence suggests the rates at which students are cheating have remained consistent in recent decades (McCabe, Trevino, & Butterfield, 2001). Despite the findings of the research, researchers and academicians continue to emphasize how the effect of honor codes, distinct sanctions for offenses, and creating relationships in the classroom could curtail academic misconduct. The movement to address academic dishonesty universally within higher education is a daunting task and one that has yet to occur (McCabe & Trevino, 1993; Seirup Pincus & Pedhazur Schmelkin, 2003; Robinson-Zañata et al., 2005).

### **Summary**

The review of the literature highlighted in the chapter serves to demonstrate a need to advance the study of academic dishonesty in higher education by focusing on reframing attitudes and perceptions about academic integrity. A discussion about the external perspectives of academic dishonesty in higher education, a brief review of the seminal authors of academic dishonesty, and analysis of the research on current attitudes and perceptions on academic dishonesty attempted to reveal how faculty and student attitudes and perceptions affect the academic environment. The description of the methods used to conduct this research is presented in chapter three.

## **Chapter Three**

### **Methods**

Throughout the academic community, there is a perceived increase in concern regarding the ethical behaviors of students and their understanding of what actions constitute academic dishonesty. Since the end of the 1990s, the data quantifying the perceptions in the academic community have increased; however, gaps remain. In an attempt to bring clarity to the ongoing debate regarding the culture of academic integrity in higher education and to demonstrate how faculty and student attitudes and perceptions shape the culture of academics within a community of learning, the research conducted during this study was focused on the analysis of faculty and student perceptions collected from responses through an online survey. Included in chapter three is research design and the procedures for the determination of the population; selection of the sample included in the study; sampling procedures; instrumentation and measurement; the validity and reliability of those instruments; data collection procedures; data analysis and hypothesis testing; and the limitations of the study.

#### **Research Design**

A quantitative research design was employed utilizing survey instruments designed to measure the attitudes and perceptions of faculty and students. Creswell (2009) recommended measuring perceptions with a survey instrument vetted by an expert panel when employing a quantitative research design. Stevens (2012) conducted a quantitative study utilizing two instruments meeting Creswell's (2009) criteria with the intent to collect and analyze data about student and faculty perceptions of academic

dishonesty. To further the research of Stevens (2012), data were collected using Stevens' (2012) instruments.

Data collected from the faculty sample consisted of the following dependent and independent variables: academic appointment, academic college, demographics, attitudes or perceptions of the academic environment, faculty communication of information about academic dishonesty, student learning about academic dishonesty, and students' engagement in academic dishonesty. Data from the student sample consisted of the following dependent and independent variables: academic standing, academic college, demographics, and attitudes or perceptions of the academic environment, how students learn about academic dishonesty, and of students engaging in academic dishonesty. When possible, the groups of variables were compared during analysis.

### **Population and Sample**

This research occurred within a small, private Midwestern university affiliated with the Methodist faith and accredited by the Higher Learning Commission (HLC). The study occurred during the 2014-2015 academic year at which time degree programs in the arts and sciences, business, education, and nursing were offered. The university reported approximately 2,314 students attending courses online or onsite through four schools administering curricula in the aforementioned disciplines at multiple sites (Midwestern University, 2014). The university also reported during the 2014-2015 academic year, employment of 93 full-time faculty, 19 part-time faculty, and approximately 491 adjunct faculty in online, on ground, or hybrid classrooms (Midwestern University, 2014c).

A convenience sample for the study was created through a self-selection process of full-time, part-time, and adjunct faculty who were currently employed, and students

who were actively enrolled, from the four schools at the time of the study. Participants represented the traditional and non-traditional models of learning and attended or taught classes online or face-to-face during the 2014-2015 academic year. Those who were able to submit a completed survey prior to the end of the data collection phase were included in the sample. Following the suggestion of Lunenburg and Irby (2009), generalizations of the sample were avoided due to the unique nature of the multiple schools housed within the university; however, the schools were not close in physical proximity. Each campus represented a school and while governed by the university, functioned nearly autonomously, thereby creating somewhat different cultures. Before the commencement of the study, the Vice President for Strategic Planning & Academic Resources, Chief Information Officer identified 619 faculty and 2,802 students who were eligible to participate in the study.

### **Sampling Procedures**

The sampling procedures for the study were developed by Stevens (2012) and were based upon previous studies in the field of research on academic misconduct. Davis (1993) and McCabe and Trevino (1993) determined through their research that an anonymous questionnaire is the best method for assuring the desired sample size can be obtained due to the sensitivity of the questions being asked.

Since the institution where the study took place is small, the inclusion of all employed faculty and enrolled students in the study aided in reaching the desired sample size for this research. Additionally, the inclusion of all faculty and students from the university helped to determine what type of academic culture might have been present at the time of the study within the learning community. From the four schools within the

Midwestern university, students were selected based on their enrollment status of active and faculty were selected based on their employment status of hired.

The process for selecting the two groups for the sample was based on the Midwestern University's criteria for active employment and active enrollment. After the population size for each group had been determined, the response rate of at least 30% was calculated for each group, resulting in the desired sample size of approximately 185 faculty and 804 students.

**Faculty population.** Three types of faculty employment are maintained at the institution: adjunct, part-time, and full-time from within the institution. Faculty who were scheduled to teach at least one course during the 2014-2015 academic year were included in the study.

**Student population.** Students included were those who were enrolled in at least one course offered in either model of learning during the 2014–2015 academic year and were classified as “active” by the university's student management information system. The system used was CampusVue, a database for tracking information about students and progress towards degree completion. An “active” status indicated the students were admitted and enrolled in courses at the university (CampusVue, 2014).

### **Instrumentation**

For this study, two instruments developed by Stevens (2012), a researcher in the area of academic dishonesty from the University of Missouri-St. Louis, were used with permission for data collection at the Midwestern University (see Appendices A and B). Stevens (2012) created her instruments with consent from McCabe (2009) and Davis (2009) by combining questions derived from three scales: Davis' Attitudes Toward

Academic Dishonesty Scale, McCabe and Trevino's Academic Integrity Scale, and McCabe's Academic Dishonesty Scale. As a result, Stevens' (2012) new instruments were designed to assess student and faculty attitudes and perceptions of academic dishonesty (see Table 1).

To ensure the research at the Midwestern University yielded data needed to address the research questions, some of the questions within Stevens' (2012) instrument were modified with permission to align terminology related to demographics. Additionally, the demographics section was placed at the end of the surveys to ensure participants provided responses to the more substantive sections of the surveys. Formatting of the surveys was also modified to accommodate SurveyMonkey.

Stevens' (2012) instruments were comprised of two surveys used to collect and measure data from faculty and students. The faculty survey was designed to assess faculty attitudes and perceptions about academic dishonesty, instruction on academic dishonesty, their academic environment, and additional variables including gender, ethnicity, academic appointment, and academic college. Similarly, the survey for students was designed to collect data for the purpose of assessing student attitudes and perceptions about academic dishonesty, instruction on academic dishonesty, their academic environment, and additional variables including gender, academic college, academic standing, age, ethnicity, and residential status.

**Measurement.** In addition to collecting demographic data, Stevens' (2012) surveys included questions from Davis' (1992) Attitudes of Academic Dishonesty Scale, McCabe's and Trevino's (1997) Academic Dishonesty Scale, and McCabe's (2008) Academic Integrity Scale and were organized into groups. Stevens (2012) selected from

the Davis (1992) scale four items with Likert-scale responses designed to collect student perceptions of academic dishonesty. Stevens (2012) described the items from the McCabe and Trevino (1997) scale to include 11 questions also with Likert-scale responses that measured the frequency of engagement in academic dishonesty behaviors by students and the faculty perceptions of those behaviors. Finally, the McCabe (1992) scale contained 21 questions with Likert-scale responses that were designed to measure faculty and student perceptions of the academic environment. See Table 1 for the variables grouped by survey type.

Table 1

*Variable by Faculty and Student Survey Items*

Variable	Faculty Survey Items	Student Survey Items
Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty		1-3
Attitudes toward Dishonesty Scale	1-4	4-7
Academic Dishonesty Scale	5-15	8-18
Academic Environment	16-21	19-24
Demographics	30-33	33-38

**Validity and reliability.** Stevens (2012) concluded the three “instruments to be valid and reliable” due to the persistent use in similar studies (p. 84). Stevens (2012) highlighted the effectiveness of Likert scales and isolated questions from each instrument that would measure the independent and dependent variables in her study because each “possessed specific criteria important to the proposed research study” (p. 84). Stevens (2012) also provided support for her instruments by including how previous research utilizing the items she selected from each scale for her research have various percentages

of internal consistency reliability. Stevens (2012) reported  $\alpha = .83$  for the Attitudes towards Academic Dishonesty Scale. On the Academic Dishonesty Scale, Stevens (2012) reported  $\alpha = .818$  for students and  $\alpha = .922$  for faculty and  $\alpha = .868$  for students and  $\alpha = .773$  for faculty on the Academic Integrity Scale. From these results, Stevens (2012) determined each of the percentages to be sufficient levels for proceeding with the scales for her study. Reliability analyses were conducted on all scales for the student and faculty surveys; results are reported in chapter four.

### **Data Collection Procedures**

To administer the surveys at the Midwestern University, Stevens was contacted for authorization to use questions from the surveys and permission to modify the questions for the online platform, SurveyMonkey, as well as the demographics to ensure alignment between survey terminology and statuses with the Midwestern University (see Appendix C). Before collecting data from participants, the following steps occurred to ensure efficiency and accuracy with the research process. After applying to the Baker University Institutional Review Board (see Appendix D) and securing approval from the Midwestern University Institutional Review Board (IRB) to proceed with the study (see Appendix E), permission to conduct the study was obtained from the Midwestern University's Provost (see Appendix F). A notification of the study was also sent to the Midwestern University's Department of Human Resources (see Appendix G), as well as a request to access university email accounts from the Department of Information and Technology to distribute the survey (see Appendix H).

Once all of the necessary approvals were secured, selected questions from the various instruments were transposed into a legible online format within SurveyMonkey,

producing one survey for faculty and one for students. The surveys were vetted with a small group of participants to ensure the surveys could be viewed and completed. The small group consisted of the dissertation committee members and select university administrators. Two emails to potential participants were drafted and distributed. Appendices I through L contain each of the emails distributed to all actively enrolled students and employed teaching faculty inviting them to complete the survey.

A second meeting took place with the Strategic Planning and Academic Chief Information Officer to map the timeline for sending the emails to the faculty and students. Prior to beginning the study, the emails were sent to the Vice President for Strategic Planning and Academic Resources, Chief information Officer for distribution through an automated process via a listserv. Sending a link to electronic surveys through email was determined to be the best method for the study to ensure the anonymity of the participants, to encourage the participants to provide honest responses, and for ease of data collection. The emails were sent to faculty and students in three rounds over a 9-week period.

All actively-employed teaching faculty and actively-enrolled students during the spring 2015 semester then received three emails alerting them to the opportunity to complete the survey. The first email contained information about the survey, noting when it was to occur and how to access it (see Appendices H and J). The second and third email (see Appendices I and K) reminded the participants of the purpose of the study, and directed the participants to complete the survey anonymously through a link on SurveyMonkey. With the assistance of a research analyst, the data were collected from SurveyMonkey and input into IBM® SPSS® Statistics Faculty Pack 23 for

Windows, commonly referred to as SPSS. Data collected from the surveys were entered into the program, and descriptive statistics were used to interpret the results by using the “mathematical procedures for organizing and summarizing numerical data” (Lunenburg & Irby, 2008, p. 62).

### **Data Analysis and Hypothesis Testing**

During the study, an investigation of the following questions was conducted to determine what attitudes and perceptions of academic dishonesty existed within the university community and to what extent those attitudes perceptions differed within student groups, within faculty groups, and between students and faculty.

**RQ1.** To what extent is there a difference between faculty and student attitudes toward academic dishonesty?

*H1.* There is a difference between faculty and student attitudes toward academic dishonesty.

**RQ2.** To what extent is there a difference between faculty perceptions of students engaging in academically dishonest activities and student perceptions of engaging in academically dishonest activities?

*H2.* There is a difference between faculty and student perceptions of students engaging in academically dishonest activities.

**RQ3.** To what extent is there a difference between faculty and student perceptions of the academic environment?

*H3.* There is a difference between faculty and student perceptions of the academic environment.

**RQ4.** To what extent is there a difference between faculty and student perceptions about the frequency of instruction about the actions that constitute academic dishonesty?

**H4.** There is a difference between faculty and student perceptions about the frequency of instruction about the actions that constitute academic dishonesty.

**RQ5.** To what extent is there a difference between faculty and student perceptions of how students learn about academic dishonesty?

**H5.** There is a difference between faculty and student perceptions of how students learn about academic dishonesty.

Independent samples *t* tests were conducted to test H1-H5. The sample means of the faculty and student attitudes toward academic dishonesty, faculty and student perceptions of students engaging in academically dishonest activities, faculty and student perceptions of the academic environment, faculty and student perceptions about the frequency of instruction about the actions that constitute academic dishonesty, and faculty and student perceptions of how students learn about academic dishonesty were compared. The level of significance was set at .05.

**RQ6.** To what extent is there a difference in faculty attitudes toward academic dishonesty among academic appointments and academic colleges?

**H6.** To what extent is there a difference in the faculty attitudes toward academic dishonesty among academic appointments?

**H7.** There is a difference in faculty attitudes toward academic dishonesty among members' academic colleges.

**RQ7.** To what extent is there a difference in faculty perceptions of students engaging in academically dishonest activities among academic appointments and academic colleges?

**H8.** There is a difference in faculty perceptions of students engaging in academically dishonest activities among members' academic appointments.

**H9.** There is a difference in faculty perceptions toward academic dishonesty among members' academic colleges.

**RQ8.** To what extent is there a difference in faculty perceptions of the academic environment among academic appointments and academic colleges?

**H10.** There is a difference in faculty perceptions of the academic environment among academic appointments.

**H11.** There is a difference in faculty perceptions of the academic environment among academic colleges.

**RQ9.** To what extent is there a difference in faculty perceptions of how often they communicate what actions constitute academic dishonesty to students among academic appointments and academic colleges?

**H12.** There is a difference in faculty perceptions of how often they communicate what actions constitute academic dishonesty to students among members' academic appointments.

**H13.** There is a difference in faculty perceptions of how often they communicate what actions constitute academic dishonesty to students among members' academic colleges.

**RQ10.** To what extent is there a difference in faculty perceptions of how students learn about academic dishonesty among academic appointments and academic colleges?

**H14.** There is a difference in faculty perceptions of how students learn about academic dishonesty among academic appointments.

**H15.** There is a difference in faculty perceptions of how students learn about academic dishonesty among academic colleges.

For research questions 6 through 10, a MANOVA was conducted to determine the extent of any main effects of the independent variables of faculty academic appointments (H6, H8, H10, H12, and H14) and faculty academic colleges (H7, H9, H11, H13, and H15) on the dependent variable(s) of faculty perceptions of student attitudes towards academic dishonesty, engaging in academically dishonesty activities, perceptions of the academic environment, perceptions of receiving instruction, and perceptions of how they learn about academic dishonesty. The Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) procedure was chosen as the follow-up test to be conducted if any statistically significant main effects occurred in the analyses. To control for Type I error, this procedure was used to evaluate any pairwise differences among the means of the independent variables.

**RQ11.** To what extent is there a difference in student attitudes toward academic dishonesty among groups in the following variables: gender, academic college, academic standing, age, and residential status?

**H16.** There is a difference in student attitudes toward academic dishonesty between student genders.

**H17.** There is a difference in student attitudes toward academic dishonesty among students' academic colleges.

**H18.** There is a difference in student attitudes toward academic dishonesty among students' academic standings.

**H19.** There is a difference in student attitudes toward academic dishonesty among students' ages.

**H20.** There is a difference in student attitudes toward academic dishonesty among students' residential statuses.

**RQ12.** To what extent is there a difference in students' self-report of engaging in academically dishonest activities affected among groups in the following variables: gender, academic college, academic standing, age, and residential status?

**H21.** There is a difference in students' self-report of engaging in academically dishonest activities between student genders.

**H22.** There is a difference in students' self-report of engaging in academically dishonest activities among academic colleges.

**H23.** There is a difference in students' self-report of engaging in academically dishonest activities among students' academic standings.

**H24.** There is a difference in self-report of engaging in academically dishonest activities among students' ages.

**H25.** There is a difference in self-report of engaging in academically dishonest activities among students' residential statuses.

**RQ13.** To what extent is there a difference in students' perceptions of the academic environment among groups in the following variables: gender, academic college, academic standing, age, and residential status?

**H26.** There is a difference in students' perceptions of the academic environment between student genders.

**H27.** There is a difference in students' perceptions of the academic environment among students' academic colleges.

**H28.** There is a difference in students' perceptions of the academic environment among students' academic standings.

**H29.** There is a difference in students' perceptions of the academic environment among students' ages.

**H30.** There is a difference in students' perceptions of the academic environment among students' residential statuses.

**RQ14.** To what extent is there a difference in students' perceptions of receiving instruction on the actions that constitute academic dishonesty among groups in the following variables: gender, academic college, academic standing, age, and residential status?

**H31.** There is a difference in students' perceptions of receiving instruction on the actions that constitute academic dishonesty between student genders.

**H32.** There is a difference in students' perceptions of receiving instruction on the actions that constitute academic dishonesty among students' academic colleges.

**H33.** There is a difference in students' perceptions of receiving instruction on the actions that constitute academic dishonesty among students' academic standings.

**H34.** There is a difference in students' perceptions of receiving instruction on the actions that constitute academic dishonesty among students' ages.

**H35.** There is a difference in students' perceptions of receiving instruction on the actions that constitute academic dishonesty among students' residential statuses.

**RQ15.** To what extent is there a difference in students' perceptions of how they learn about academic dishonesty among groups in the following variables: gender, academic college, academic standing, age, and residential status?

**H36.** There is a difference in students' perceptions of how they learn about academic dishonesty between student genders.

**H37.** There is a difference in students' perceptions of how they learn about academic dishonesty among students' academic colleges.

**H38.** There is a difference in students' perceptions of how they learn about academic dishonesty among students' academic standings.

**H39.** There is a difference in students' perceptions of how they learn about dishonesty among students' ages.

**H40.** There is a difference in students' perceptions of how they learn about academic dishonesty among students' residential statuses.

For research questions 11 through 15, a MANOVA was conducted to determine the extent of any main effects of the independent variables of students' gender (H16, H21, H26, H31, and H36), students' academic college (H17, H22, H27, H32, and H37), students' academic standing (H18, H23, H28, H33, and H38), students' age (H19, H24, H29, H34, and H39), and students' residential status (H20, H25, H30, H35, and H40) on the dependent variable(s) of student attitudes toward academic dishonesty, engaging in academically dishonest activities, perceptions of the academic environment, perceptions of receiving instruction, and perceptions of how they learn about academic dishonesty .

The Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) procedure was chosen as the follow-up test to be conducted if any statistically significant main effects occurred in the analyses. To control for Type I error, this procedure was used to evaluate any pairwise differences among the means of the independent variables.

### **Limitations**

Lunenburg and Irby (2009) stated, "limitations are not under the control of the researcher" and further define limitations as "factors that may have an effect on the interpretation of the findings or on the generalizability of the results" (p. 133).

Throughout the study, the following limitations were considered:

1. Participants discontinued involvement in the study because they withdrew from courses at the university during the study, were no longer affiliated with the university, or simply chose not to participate.
2. Participants did not respond honestly due to the perceived threat of the impact their responses had on their academic or professional careers.

### **Summary**

Chapter three included the methodology for the study by introducing the participants, describing and validating the instrument selected, and outlining how the data were collected and analyzed. The results represent to what degree faculty and student attitudes and perceptions of academic dishonesty differ. In chapter four, a detailed analysis of the findings is presented.

## Chapter Four

### Results

The purpose of this study was to determine to what extent faculty and student attitudes and perceptions differ regarding academic dishonesty in the context of the academic environment and faculty instruction of and students learning about academic dishonesty. For faculty, the academic appointment and academic college were considered, as well as gender, academic college, academic standing, age, and residential status of students. In this chapter, the results of the analyses are presented. Descriptive statistics were used to describe the sample. A series of tests including independent samples *t* tests and MANOVAs were used to test the hypotheses in support of the research questions.

#### Reliability Analysis

To ensure the instruments were reliable for this study, the Cronbach's alpha was conducted for each of the scales within the two instruments. Results yielded  $\alpha = .299$  for faculty items and  $\alpha = .125$  for the student items associated with the Attitudes of Academic Dishonesty Scale. When item one was omitted from both instruments associated with the scale, the second analyses revealed  $\alpha = .820$  for faculty and  $\alpha = .768$  for student items.

Additionally, analyses of faculty responses related to items associated with academic dishonesty revealed  $\alpha = .932$  and  $\alpha = .888$  for the student responses. For the analyses of the items related to academic environment,  $\alpha = .859$  was reported for faculty responses and  $\alpha = .888$  was reported for student responses. The analyses conducted for items related to receiving instruction yielded  $\alpha = .839$  for faculty and  $\alpha = .847$  for student

responses. Finally, for the analysis of the items related to how students learn, the responses collected yielded  $\alpha = .777$  for faculty and  $\alpha = .737$  for the student responses.

### **Descriptive Statistics**

In response to the faculty survey, 38.1% of the faculty contacted to participate in the study self-selected to respond. Of those responses, three faculty responses were thrown out due to being incomplete. In response to the student survey, 13% of the students contacted to participate in the study self-selected to respond. Of those responses, nine were thrown out due to being incomplete. Of those responses, one student did respond yes to cheating before exiting the survey.

**Faculty demographics.** Female and male faculty who participated in the survey represented all of the faculty appointment types and ranks within the groups from the schools and college at the institution. The largest percentage of faculty to respond self-identified as adjunct faculty, resulting in 70.5% of the responses. Of the faculty who responded to the survey, 44.5% were from the School of Professional and Graduate Studies. See Table 2 for the summary of the descriptive statistics for the faculty responses.

Table 2

*Faculty Demographics*

Demographic	<i>n</i>	Percent
Gender		
Female	87	55.0
Male	70	45.0
Academic College		
College of Arts and Sciences	40	25.5
School of Education	42	26.9
School of Nursing	5	3.1
School of Professional and Graduate Studies	70	44.5
Academic Appointment		
Adjunct Instructor	110	70.0
Non-Tenure Track, Full-Time Faculty	18	12.0
Non-Tenure Track, Part-Time Faculty	6	4.0
Tenure-Track Faculty	22	14.0

**Student demographics.** More female than male students responded to the study with the highest percentage of students responding to the survey falling into the 18-24 age range. Each of the academic levels from the college and schools at the institution had responses from female and male students. The students from the business administration programs had the highest response rate of 31.6% of the total responses from students. Overall, graduate students produced the highest response rate of 30%. Students who

lived in off-campus housing had the highest response rate of 60%. See Table 3 for a summary of the descriptive statistics for the student responses.

Table 3

*Student Demographics*

Demographic	<i>n</i>	Percent
<b>Gender</b>		
Female	173	68.0
Male	77	32.0
<b>Academic College</b>		
College of Arts and Sciences	64	25.0
School of Education	88	35.0
School of Nursing	21	8.0
School of Professional and Graduate Studies	80	32.0
<b>Academic Standing</b>		
Freshman	19	7.0
Sophomore	28	11.0
Junior	38	15.0
Senior	34	14.0
Graduate	76	30.0
Post Graduate	58	23.0

## Hypothesis Testing

In this section, the results of the hypotheses testing are presented. The research questions were grouped by the differences between faculty and student attitudes and perceptions of academic dishonesty, faculty attitudes and perceptions of students engaging in and learning about academically dishonest activities, and student attitudes and perceptions about engaging in and learning about academically dishonest activities.

**Differences between faculty and students.** Independent samples *t* tests were used for H1-H5.

**RQ1.** To what extent is there a difference between faculty and student attitudes toward academic dishonesty?

**H1.** There is a difference between faculty and student attitudes toward academic dishonesty.

The results of the independent samples *t* test indicated a statistically significant difference between the two values,  $t = -2.615$ ,  $df = 436$ ,  $p < .01$ . The sample mean for faculty ( $M = -0.60$ ,  $SD = .557$ ) was lower than the sample mean for students ( $M = -0.73$ ,  $SD = .446$ ). On average, faculty and student responses were between neutral and disagree; however, the students' responses were closer to disagree with these items. This supports H1.

**RQ2.** To what extent is there a difference between faculty perceptions of students engaging in academically dishonest activities and student perceptions of engaging in academically dishonest activities?

**H2.** There is a difference between faculty and student perceptions of students engaging in academically dishonest activities.

The results of the independent samples  $t$  test indicated a statistically significant difference between the two values,  $t = -22.963$ ,  $df = 436$ ,  $p < .001$ . The sample mean for faculty ( $M = 2.26$ ,  $SD = .983$ ) was higher than the sample mean for students ( $M = 0.44$ ,  $SD = .679$ ). On average, faculty agreed strongly, whereas student responses ranged from strongly disagree to neutral on these items. This supports H2.

**RQ3.** To what extent is there a difference between faculty and student perceptions of the academic environment?

**H3.** There is a difference between faculty and student perceptions of the academic environment.

The results of the independent samples  $t$  test indicated a statistically significant difference between the two values,  $t = 5.875$ ,  $df = 420$ ,  $p < .001$ . The sample mean for faculty ( $M = 2.11$ ,  $SD = .779$ ) was lower than the sample mean for students ( $M = 2.58$ ,  $SD = .829$ ). Faculty responses were closer to agree and strongly agree; however, while the student responses to these items were closer to strongly agree, they were higher than the faculty responses. This supports H3.

**RQ4.** To what extent is there a difference between faculty and student perceptions about the frequency of instruction about the actions that constitute academic dishonesty?

**H4.** There is a difference between faculty and student perceptions about the frequency of instruction about the actions that constitute academic dishonesty.

The results of the independent samples  $t$  test indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two values,  $t = -.616$ ,  $df = 411$ ,  $p = .539$ . The sample mean for faculty ( $M = 2.58$ ,  $SD = .879$ ) was higher than the sample mean for students ( $M = 2.52$ ,  $SD = .894$ ). This does not support H4.

**RQ5.** To what extent is there a difference between faculty and student perceptions of how students learn about academic dishonesty?

**H5.** There is a difference between faculty and student perceptions of how students learn about academic dishonesty.

The results of the independent samples *t* test indicated a statistically significant difference between the two values,  $t = -4.562$ ,  $df = 394$ ,  $p < .001$ . The sample mean for faculty ( $M = 1.09$ ,  $SD = .416$ ) was higher than the sample mean for students ( $M = 0.88$ ,  $SD = .461$ ). This supports H5.

Independent samples *t* tests were conducted to test H2-H5. The sample means of faculty and student perceptions of students engaging in academically dishonest activities were compared. See Table 4 for the summarized results of these analyses.

Table 4

*Results for One-Sample t Tests for Differences between Faculty and Student Attitudes for RQ 1-5*

Variable	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
Attitude Dishonesty	-2.615	436	.009
Academic Dishonesty	-22.963	436	< .001
Academic Environment	5.875	420	< .001
Receive Instruction	-.616	411	.539
Learn	-4.562	394	< .001

**Faculty attitudes and perceptions.** A MANOVA was used for H6-H15.

**RQ6.** To what extent is there a difference in faculty attitudes toward academic dishonesty among academic appointments and academic colleges?

**H6.** To what extent is there a difference in the faculty attitudes toward academic dishonesty among academic appointments?

The results of the analysis indicated there was a statistically significant main effect of academic appointment on faculty attitudes toward academic dishonesty,  $F = 4.905$ ,  $df = 3, 130$ ,  $p < .01$ . The mean for the non-tenure track, full-time faculty ( $M = -.152$ ) attitudes toward academic dishonesty was higher than the mean for the adjunct instructor ( $M = -.675$ ), non-tenure track, part-time faculty ( $M = -.778$ ), and tenure-track faculty ( $M = -.597$ ). This supports H6.

A follow-up post hoc was conducted. The Tukey HSD post hoc was conducted at  $\alpha = .05$ . See Table 5 for the post hoc analysis results. The mean difference between adjunct instructors and non-tenure track, full-time faculty was statistically significant.

Table 5

*Post Hoc Analysis for H6*

Academic Appointment		Mean Difference	
(I)	(J)	(I-J)	<i>p</i>
Adjunct Faculty	Non-Tenure Track, Full-Time Faculty	-.4329	.014
	Non-Tenure Track, Part-Time Faculty	.0132	1.000
	Tenure-Track Faculty	-.1035	.863
Non-Tenure Track, Full-Time Faculty	Non-Tenure Track, Part-Time Faculty	.4461	.309
	Tenure-Track Faculty	.3294	.256
Non-Tenure Track, Part-Time Faculty	Tenure-Track Faculty	-.1167	.967

**H7.** There is a difference in faculty attitudes toward academic dishonesty among members' academic colleges.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant main effect of academic college on faculty attitudes toward academic dishonesty,  $F = 0.938$ ,  $df = 3, 130$ ,  $p = .424$ . The mean for the faculty responses from the School of Nursing was the lowest of the four groups ( $M = -.781$ ). The remaining means were higher for the College of Arts and Sciences ( $M = -.507$ ), the School of Professional and Graduate Studies ( $M = -.480$ ), and School of Education ( $M = -.462$ ). No follow-up post hoc was warranted. This does not support H7.

**RQ7.** To what extent is there a difference in faculty perceptions of students engaging in academically dishonest activities among academic appointments and academic colleges?

**H8.** There is a difference in faculty perceptions of students engaging in academically dishonest activities among members' academic appointments.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant main effect of academic appointment on faculty perceptions of academic dishonesty,  $F = 1.990$ ,  $df = 3, 130$ ,  $p = .119$ . The mean for the faculty responses from the tenure-track faculty was the highest ( $M = 2.850$ ), and the lowest mean was calculated for the adjunct faculty ( $M = 2.098$ ). The means for remaining groups were non-tenure track, part-time faculty ( $M = 2.744$ ) and full-time faculty ( $M = 2.822$ ). No follow-up post hoc was warranted. This does not support H8.

**H9.** There is a difference in faculty perceptions of students engaging in academically dishonest activities among members' academic colleges.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant main effect of academic college on faculty perceptions of academic dishonesty,  $F = 1.095$ ,  $df = 3, 130$ ,  $p = .354$ . The means for the faculty responses by academic college resulted as follows: the School of Nursing had the highest rate ( $M = 3.575$ ), followed by the College of Arts and Sciences ( $M = 2.615$ ), the School of Professional and Graduate Studies ( $M = 2.503$ ), and the lowest mean was from the School of Education ( $M = 2.399$ ). No follow-up post hoc was warranted. This does not support H9.

**RQ8.** To what extent is there a difference in faculty perceptions of the academic environment among academic appointments and academic colleges?

**H10.** There is a difference in faculty perceptions of the academic environment among academic appointments.

The results of the analysis indicated there was a marginally statistically significant main effect of academic appointment on faculty perceptions of the academic environment,  $F = 2.354$ ,  $df = 3, 130$ ,  $p = .075$ . The means for the faculty responses by academic appointment revealed that the tenure track faculty responses were lower than the other appointments ( $M = 1.755$ ). The non-tenure, full-time faculty mean was higher ( $M = 2.154$ ), followed by the adjunct faculty mean ( $M = 2.198$ ), and the non-tenure track, part-time faculty mean ( $M = 2.204$ ). No follow-up post hoc was warranted.

**H11.** There is a difference in faculty perceptions of the academic environment among academic colleges.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant main effect of academic appointment on faculty perceptions of the academic environment,  $F = 1.026$ ,  $df = 3, 130$ ,  $p = .384$ . The means for the faculty responses by academic college revealed that the mean for the School of Education ( $M = 1.867$ ) was lower than the other groups: College of Arts and Sciences ( $M = 2.006$ ), School of Nursing ( $M = 2.479$ ), and School of Professional and Graduate Studies ( $M = 2.097$ ). No follow-up post hoc was warranted. This does not support H11.

**RQ9.** To what extent is there a difference in faculty perceptions of how often they communicate what actions constitute academic dishonesty to students among academic appointments and academic colleges?

**H12.** There is a difference in faculty perceptions of how often they communicate what actions constitute academic dishonesty to students among members' academic appointments.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant main effect of academic appointment on faculty perceptions toward how often they communicate what actions constitute academic dishonesty,  $F = 0.285$ ,  $df = 3, 130$ ,  $p = .836$ . The means for the faculty responses by academic appointment revealed that the means were similar, but the means for non-tenure, full-time faculty ( $M = 2.888$ ) and tenure-track faculty ( $M = 2.748$ ) were higher than the means for the adjunct faculty ( $M = 2.522$ ) and non-tenure track, part-time faculty ( $M = 2.250$ ). No follow-up post hoc was warranted. This does not support H12.

**H13.** There is a difference in faculty perceptions of how often they communicate what actions constitute academic dishonesty to students among members' academic colleges.

The results of the analysis indicated there was a statistically significant main effect of academic college on faculty perceptions toward how often they communicate what actions constitute academic dishonesty to students,  $F = 2.852$ ,  $df = 3, 130$ ,  $p < .05$ . The mean ( $M = 3.437$ ) for the School of Nursing ( $M = 3.437$ ) was higher than the mean for the College of Arts and Sciences ( $M = 2.932$ ), the School of Education ( $M = 2.511$ ), and the School of Professional and Graduate Studies ( $M = 2.054$ ). This does support H13.

A follow up post hoc was conducted. The Tukey HSD post hoc was conducted at  $\alpha = .05$ . See Table 6 for the post hoc analysis results; none of the mean differences were statistically significant.

Table 6

*Post Hoc Analysis for H13*

Academic Colleges		Mean Difference	
(I)	(J)	(I-J)	<i>p</i>
College of Arts and Sciences	School of Education	.0995	.960
	School of Nursing	-.6495	.387
	School of Professional and Graduate Studies	.1265	.890
School of Education	School of Nursing	-.7491	.263
	School of Professional and Graduate Studies	.0269	.999
School of Nursing	School of Professional and Graduate Studies	.7760	.212

**RQ10.** To what extent is there a difference in faculty perceptions of how students learn about academic dishonesty among academic appointments and academic colleges?

**H14.** There is a difference in faculty perceptions of how students learn about academic dishonesty among academic appointments.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant main effect of academic appointment on faculty perceptions toward how often they communicate what actions constitute academic dishonesty,  $F = 2.092$ ,  $df = 3, 130$ ,  $p = .104$ . The means for the responses related to academic appointment revealed that the

mean for non-tenure track, part-time faculty ( $M = 1.438$ ) was the highest, with the means for the groups falling closer together: adjunct faculty ( $M = 1.110$ ), non-tenure track, full-time faculty ( $M = 1.064$ ), and tenure-track faculty ( $M = 1.145$ ). No follow-up post hoc was warranted. This does not support H14.

**H15.** There is a difference in faculty perceptions of how students learn about academic dishonesty among academic colleges.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant main effect of academic college on faculty perceptions toward how often they communicate what actions constitute academic dishonesty,  $F = 1.899$ ,  $df = 3, 130$ ,  $p = .133$ . The means reported for each group show the mean for the School of Nursing to be slightly higher than the mean for the others ( $M = 1.507$ ). The School of Education had the lowest mean ( $M = 1.066$ ), while the College of Arts and Sciences ( $M = 1.163$ ) and the School of Professional and Graduate Studies fell closer together ( $M = 1.137$ ). No follow-up post hoc was warranted. This does not support H15.

MANOVAs were conducted to test H6-H15. The sample means of faculty attitudes and perceptions toward students engaging in academically dishonest activities were analyzed. See Table 7 for the summarized results of these analyses.

Table 7

*Results for MANOVAs for Faculty by Variable for RQ 6-10*

	<u>Academic Appointment</u>			<u>Academic College</u>		
	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	$\eta$	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	$\eta$
Attitude Dishonesty	1.554	.191	.046	.938	.424	.021
Academic Dishonesty	1.534	.196	.046	1.095	.354	.025
Academic Environment	1.967	.103	.058	1.026	.384	.023
Receive Instruction	.357	.839	.011	2.852	.040	.062
Learn	.883	.467	.027	1.899	.133	.042

**Student attitudes and perceptions.** A MANOVA was used for H16-H40.

**RQ11.** To what extent is there a difference in student attitudes toward academic dishonesty among groups in the following variables: gender, academic college, academic standing, age, and residential status?

**H16.** There is a difference in student attitudes toward academic dishonesty between student genders.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant main effect of gender on student attitudes towards academic dishonesty,  $F = 0.579$ ,  $df = 1, 111$ ,  $p = .448$ . The means for the responses were slightly different, with the mean for females ( $M = -.768$ ) lower than the mean for males ( $M = -.646$ ). No follow-up post hoc was warranted. This does not support H16.

**H17.** There is a difference in student attitudes toward academic dishonesty among students' academic colleges.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant main effect of academic college on student attitudes toward academic dishonesty,  $F = 1.794$ ,  $df = 3, 111$ ,  $p = .153$ . The mean responses by academic college were slightly different, but not significant, with the mean for the School of Education ( $M = -.804$ ) being lower than the others. The other groups reported slightly higher means: College of Arts and Sciences ( $M = -.679$ ), School of Professional and Graduate Studies ( $M = -.697$ ), and School of Nursing ( $M = -.719$ ). No follow-up post hoc was warranted. This does not support H17.

**H18.** There is a difference in student attitudes toward academic dishonesty among students' academic standings.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant main effect of academic standing on student attitudes towards academic dishonesty,  $F = 0.308$ ,  $df = 5, 111$ ,  $p = .907$ . The means for academic standing were lowest in the graduate ( $M = -.831$ ) and the post graduate ( $M = -.771$ ) groups, while the other groups reported slightly higher averages: freshman ( $M = -.619$ ), sophomore ( $M = -.679$ ), junior ( $M = -.622$ ), and senior ( $M = -.724$ ). No follow-up post hoc was warranted. This does not support H18.

**H19.** There is a difference in student attitudes toward academic dishonesty among students' ages.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant main effect of student age on student attitudes towards academic dishonesty,  $F = 0.501$ ,  $df = 4, 111$ ,  $p = .735$ . The mean for the 18 to 24 age range ( $M = -.565$ ) was the highest and the mean for 55 + ( $M = -1.000$ ) lowest. The means for the remaining groups were 25 to 34

age range ( $M = -.726$ ), 35 to 44 ( $M = -.831$ ), and 45 to 54 ( $M = -.804$ ). No follow-up post hoc was warranted. This does not support H19.

**H20.** There is a difference in student attitudes toward academic dishonesty among students' residential statuses.

The results of the analysis indicated there was a marginally statistically significant main effect of residential status on student attitudes toward academic dishonesty,  $F = 2.816$ ,  $df = 3, 111$ ,  $p = .064$ . For residential status, the highest mean was associated with the on-campus housing ( $M = -.440$ ). The means for off-campus housing ( $M = -.767$ ) and online ( $M = -.819$ ) were lower. No follow-up post hoc was warranted.

**RQ12.** To what extent is there a difference in students' self-reports of engaging in academically dishonest activities among groups in the following variables: gender, academic college, academic standing, age, and residential status?

**H21.** There is a difference in students' self-report of engaging in academically dishonest activities among student genders.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant main effect of gender on students' self-report of engaging in academically dishonest activities,  $F = 0.000$ ,  $df = 1, 111$ ,  $p = .987$ . The mean for females ( $M = .386$ ) was lower than the mean for males ( $M = .452$ ). No follow-up post hoc was warranted. This does not support H21.

**H22.** There is a difference in students' self-report of engaging in academically dishonest activities among academic colleges.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant main effect of academic college on students' self-report of engaging in academically dishonest

activities,  $F = 0.813$ ,  $df = 3, 111$ ,  $p = .489$ . The analysis of the means revealed that the College of Arts and Sciences had the highest mean ( $M = .599$ ), followed by the School of Nursing ( $M = .417$ ), the School of Professional and Graduate Studies ( $M = .350$ ), and the School of Education mean ( $M = .343$ ). No follow-up post hoc was warranted. This does not support H22.

**H23.** There is a difference in students' self-report of engaging in academically dishonest activities among students' academic standings.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant main effect of academic standing on students' self-report of engaging in academically dishonest activities,  $F = 0.303$ ,  $df = 5, 111$ ,  $p = .910$ . An analysis of the means revealed that graduate students had the lowest mean ( $M = .255$ ), and juniors had the highest mean ( $M = .660$ ). The means for the other groups, post graduate ( $M = .326$ ), freshman ( $M = .353$ ), sophomore ( $M = .505$ ), and senior ( $M = .470$ ), fell between. No follow-up post hoc was warranted. This does not support H23.

**H24.** There is a difference in self-report of engaging in academically dishonest activities among students' ages.

The results of the analysis indicated there was a marginally statistically significant main effect of student age on students' self-report of engaging in academically dishonest activities,  $F = 2.393$ ,  $df = 4, 111$ ,  $p = .055$ . The analysis of the means for each age range revealed that the means for the 18 to 24 age range ( $M = .797$ ) and the 55 + age range ( $M = .600$ ) to be higher than the other groups, 25 to 34 age range ( $M = .215$ ), 35 to 44 age range ( $M = .220$ ), and 45 to 54 age range ( $M = .345$ ). No follow-up post hoc was warranted.

**H25.** There is a difference in self-reports of engaging in academically dishonest activities among students' residential statuses.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant main effect of residential status on students' self-reports of engaging in academically dishonest activities,  $F = 2.104$ ,  $df = 2, 111$ ,  $p = .127$ . An analysis of the means related to residential status revealed that on-campus housing ( $M = .800$ ) was higher than off-campus housing ( $M = .353$ ) and online ( $M = .268$ ). No follow-up post hoc was warranted. This does not support H25.

**RQ13.** To what extent is there a difference in the students' perceptions of the academic environment among groups in the following variables: gender, academic college, academic standing, age, and residential status?

**H26.** There is a difference in the students' perceptions of the academic environment between student genders.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant main effect of gender on the students' perceptions of the academic environment,  $F = 1.878$ ,  $df = 1, 111$ ,  $p = .173$ . An analysis of the means revealed that the mean for female ( $M = 2.754$ ) to be slightly higher than the mean for male ( $M = 2.498$ ). No follow-up post hoc was warranted. This does not support H26.

**H27.** There is a difference in the students' perceptions of the academic environment among students' academic colleges.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant main effect of academic college on the students' perceptions of the academic environment,  $F = 1.189$ ,  $df = 3, 111$ ,  $p = .317$ . An analysis of the means revealed that the mean for the

College of Arts and Sciences ( $M = 2.384$ ) was lower than the means for the School of Education ( $M = 2.729$ ), the School of Professional and Graduate Studies ( $M = 2.710$ ), and the School of Nursing ( $M = 2.916$ ). No follow-up post hoc was warranted. This does not support H27.

**H28.** There is a difference in the students' perceptions of the academic environment among students' academic standings.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant main effect of academic standing on the students' perceptions of the academic environment,  $F = 0.571$ ,  $df = 5, 111$ ,  $p = .722$ . An analysis of the means revealed that the mean for the freshman ( $M = 2.383$ ) was lower than the other groups, post graduate ( $M = 2.545$ ), senior ( $M = 2.619$ ), graduate ( $M = 2.701$ ), sophomore ( $M = 2.738$ ), and junior ( $M = 2.860$ ). No follow-up post hoc was warranted. This does not support H28.

**H29.** There is a difference in the students' perceptions of the academic environment among students' ages.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not statistically significant main effect of student age on the students' perceptions of the academic environment,  $F = 1.125$ ,  $df = 4, 111$ ,  $p = .348$ . An analysis of the means revealed that the mean for 55 + age range ( $M = 3.417$ ) was the highest compared to the other groups, 18 to 24 age range ( $M = 2.554$ ), 25 to 34 age range ( $M = 2.604$ ), 35 to 44 age range ( $M = 2.554$ ), and 45 to 54 age range ( $M = 2.927$ ). No follow-up post hoc was warranted. This does not support H29.

**H30.** There is a difference in the students' perceptions of the academic environment among students' residential statuses.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant main effect of residential status on the students' perceptions of the academic environment,  $F = 0.179$ ,  $df = 2, 111$ ,  $p = .836$ . An analysis of the means revealed that the residential status was only slightly different, off-campus housing ( $M = 2.656$ ), on-campus housing ( $M = 2.638$ ), and online ( $M = 2.628$ ). No follow-up post hoc was warranted. This does not support H30.

**RQ14.** To what extent is there a difference in students' perceptions of receiving instruction on the actions that constitute academic dishonesty among groups in the following variables: gender, academic college, academic standing, age, and residential status?

**H31.** There is a difference in students' perceptions of receiving instruction on the actions that constitute academic dishonesty between student genders.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant main effect of gender on students' perceptions of receiving instruction on the actions that constitute academic dishonesty,  $F = 0.005$ ,  $df = 1, 111$ ,  $p = .943$ . An analysis of the means revealed that the mean for female ( $M = 2.477$ ) was lower than male ( $M = 2.650$ ). No follow-up post hoc was warranted. This does not support H31.

**H32.** There is a difference in students' perceptions of receiving instruction on the actions that constitute academic dishonesty among students' academic colleges.

The results of the analysis indicated there was a marginally statistically significant main effect of academic college on students' perceptions of receiving instruction on the actions that constitute academic dishonesty,  $F = 2.332$ ,  $df = 3, 111$ ,  $p = .078$ . An analysis of the means revealed similarities between the four groups, College of Arts and Sciences

( $M = 2.147$ ), School of Education ( $M = 2.618$ ), School of Nursing ( $M = 2.132$ ), and School of Professional and Graduate Studies ( $M = 2.815$ ). No follow-up post hoc was warranted.

**H33.** There is a difference in students' perceptions of receiving instruction on the actions that constitute academic dishonesty among students' academic standings.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant main effect of academic standing on students' perceptions of receiving instruction on the actions that constitute academic dishonesty,  $F = 1.770$ ,  $df = 5, 111$ ,  $p = .125$ . An analysis of the means revealed that the means for junior ( $M = 2.869$ ) were the highest and post graduate ( $M = 2.358$ ) was the lowest. The other groups, freshman ( $M = 2.413$ ), graduate ( $M = 2.422$ ), senior ( $M = 2.581$ ), and sophomore ( $M = 2.701$ ) fell between. No follow-up post hoc was warranted. This does not support H33.

**H34.** There is a difference in students' perceptions of receiving instruction on the actions that constitute academic dishonesty among students' ages.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not statistically significant main effect of student age on students' perceptions of receiving instruction on the actions that constitute academic dishonesty,  $F = 0.990$ ,  $df = 4, 111$ ,  $p = .416$ . An analysis of the means revealed the means for the 35 to 44 age range ( $M = 2.358$ ) to be the lowest and the 45 to 54 age range ( $M = 2.944$ ) to be the highest. The other groups, 25 to 34 age range ( $M = 2.429$ ), 55 + ( $M = 2.500$ ), and 18 to 24 ( $M = 2.511$ ) fell between. No follow-up post hoc was warranted. This does not support H34.

**H35.** There is a difference in students' perceptions of receiving instruction on the actions that constitute academic dishonesty among students' residential statuses.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant main effect of residential status on students' perceptions of receiving instruction on the actions that constitute academic dishonesty,  $F = 0.784$ ,  $df = 2, 111$ ,  $p = .459$ . An analysis of the means revealed that there was a slight difference between off-campus housing ( $M = 2.430$ ) and the other groups, on-campus housing ( $M = 2.623$ ) and online ( $M = 2.688$ ), which were closer. No follow-up post hoc was warranted. This does not support H35.

**RQ15.** To what extent is there a difference in students' perceptions of how they learn about academic dishonesty among groups in the following variables: gender, academic college, academic standing, age, and residential status?

**H36.** There is a difference in students' perceptions of how they learn about academic dishonesty between genders.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not statistically significant main effect of student gender on students' perceptions of learning about academic dishonesty,  $F = .510$ ,  $df = 1, 111$ ,  $p = .477$ . An analysis of the means revealed that female ( $M = .879$ ) and male ( $M = .872$ ) to be nearly equal. No follow-up post hoc was warranted. This does not support H36.

**H37.** There is a difference in students' perceptions of how they learn about academic dishonesty among students' academic colleges.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not statistically significant main effect of student academic colleges on students' perceptions of receiving instruction on the actions that constitute academic dishonesty,  $F = 1.547$ ,  $df = 3, 111$ ,  $p = .206$ . An analysis of the means revealed that the School of Nursing ( $M = 1.026$ ) was higher than the other groups, College of Arts and Sciences ( $M = .732$ ), School of Education ( $M =$

.871), School of Professional and Graduate Studies ( $M = .931$ ). No follow-up post hoc was warranted. This does not support H37.

**H38.** There is a difference in students' perceptions of how they learn about academic dishonesty among students' academic standings.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not statistically significant main effect of student academic standing on students' perceptions of learning about academic dishonesty,  $F = .484$ ,  $df = 5, 111$ ,  $p = .788$ . An analysis of the means was conducted revealing that junior academic standing ( $M = 1.049$ ) was the highest and post graduate ( $M = .752$ ), was the lowest. The other groups, freshman ( $M = .933$ ), sophomore ( $M = .923$ ), senior ( $M = .908$ ), and graduate ( $M = .784$ ), fell between. No follow-up post hoc was warranted. This does not support H38.

**H39.** There is a difference in students' perceptions of how they learn about dishonesty among students' ages.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not statistically significant main effect of student age on students' perceptions of learning about academic dishonesty,  $F = 1.080$ ,  $df = 4, 111$ ,  $p = .370$ . An analysis of the means revealed that the 55 + age range ( $M = .750$ ) and the 35 to 44 age range ( $M = .760$ ) were lower than the other groups, 18 to 24 age range ( $M = .909$ ), 25 to 24 age range ( $M = .847$ ), and 45 to 54 age range ( $M = .994$ ). No follow-up post hoc was warranted. This does not support H39.

**H40.** There is a difference in students' perceptions of how they learn about academic dishonesty among students' residential statuses.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not statistically significant main effect of student residential status on students' perceptions of learning about academic

dishonesty,  $F = 0.983$ ,  $df = 2, 111$ ,  $p = .378$ . An analysis of the means revealed that on-campus housing ( $M = .962$ ) was higher than off-campus housing ( $M = .872$ ) and online ( $M = .813$ ). No follow-up post hoc was warranted. This does not support H40.

MANOVAs were conducted to test H16-H40. The sample means of students attitudes and perceptions toward engaging in academically dishonest activities were analyzed. The summarized results are found in Table M 1 (see Appendix M).

### **Summary**

Within chapter four the research questions and hypotheses were grouped by a comparison of faculty and student attitudes, faculty perceptions of student attitudes, and student attitudes. The results of the study were presented through the results of the hypothesis testing and data analysis. Chapter five outlines the study summary, an overview of the problem, purpose statement and research questions, review of the major findings, findings related to the literature, and recommendations for future research.

## **Chapter Five**

### **Interpretations and Recommendations**

In chapter one, the problem was introduced and discussed. Chapter two contained a review the literature relevant to the study of academic dishonesty with a focus on faculty and student attitudes and perceptions. In chapter three, the methodology for the study was outlined and in chapter four the findings of the research were presented. In chapter five the study summary is discussed through an overview of the problem, the reiteration of the purpose statement and research questions, and a review of the methodology. Additionally, the major findings from the study are presented, as well as the findings from the literature. The implications for action and recommendations for future research are discussed. Finally, the concluding remarks complete the dissertation.

#### **Study Summary**

Research on academic dishonesty provides the academic community with much to consider with regard to prevalence, instruction, and sanctions. Within the literature are many perspectives on how to curtail academic dishonesty and speculation as to why it occurs. A brief review of this study is detailed, and the differences between faculty and student attitudes and perceptions toward academic dishonesty, students engaging in academically dishonest activities, the academic environment, the frequency of instruction about the actions that constitute academic dishonesty, and how students learn about academic dishonesty are provided. The overview of the problem is reviewed, as well as the purpose statement, research questions, and methodology. Finally, the major findings are presented.

**Overview of the Problem.** A trend of academic dishonesty persisting over several decades is evident throughout the literature focused on academic dishonesty in higher education (Davis et. al, 1992; Lang, 2013; McCabe, 2005a; McCabe & Trevino, 1996). Faculty and student attitudes and perceptions of academic dishonesty have not changed much over time demonstrating a need to respond to academic dishonesty in more deliberate ways. Establishing a consistent definition of academic dishonesty, identifying universal protocols for addressing academic misconduct, and educating learning communities about academic dishonesty are central to curtailing cheating behaviors and reshaping the perceptions of the learning community at large.

**Purpose Statement and Research Questions.** The purpose of this study was to determine the differences between faculty and student attitudes and perceptions of academic dishonesty, specifically in the context of engaging in academically dishonest activities, the academic environment, the frequency of instruction about the actions that constitute academic dishonesty, and learning about academic dishonesty. Additionally, this study also examined how faculty attitudes and perceptions were affected by the academic appointments and academic colleges. Finally, the following student variables: gender, academic college, academic standing, age, and residential status were analyzed to determine the effect of each on student attitudes and perceptions of academic dishonesty.

**Review of the Methodology.** Two instruments created by Stevens (2012), consisting of two sets of survey questions specific to faculty and students were used during a quantitative study of faculty and students attitudes and perceptions of academic dishonesty. The study took place at a small, private Midwestern university during the spring of 2015. Lasting about nine weeks from April to June, participants from the four

units of the university, the College of Arts and Sciences, the School of Education, the School of Nursing, and the School of Professional and Graduate Studies, received a series of separate emails prior to and during the data collection phase inviting them to participate in an anonymous survey.

Data analyses were conducted to test 40 hypotheses, which utilized the independent samples *t* test and MANOVA. The independent samples *t* tests were used to analyze differences between the faculty and student attitudes toward academic dishonesty and perceptions of students engaging in academically dishonest activities, the academic environment, the frequency of instruction about the actions that constitute academic dishonesty, and the way students learn about academic dishonesty. The MANOVA was used to compare responses about attitudes and perceptions within the faculty group and within the student group. The Tukey HSD was conducted for post hoc analyses.

**Major Findings.** An analysis of the differences between faculty and student attitudes and perceptions about academic dishonesty revealed several interesting and significant findings. Of the 40 hypotheses, five were supported by statistically significant results. The areas with significance resulted from the analysis of the difference between faculty and student attitudes toward academic dishonesty and perceptions of students in engaging in academically dishonest activities, the academic environment, and how students learn about academic dishonesty. Additionally, significance was found in the analysis of the faculty attitudes by academic appointment, as well as how faculty communicate what actions constitute academic dishonesty by academic college. There were no statistically significant findings related to the student attitudes and perceptions

when compared to the students' gender, academic college, academic standing, age, and residential status.

Through their responses, the participants demonstrated support for a university community focused on academic integrity. Very few students self-identified as having cheated, the faculty responses conveyed support for the academic dishonesty policies, and the student responses revealed a support for academic integrity within their work. As a result of the research from this study, the following major findings are presented for discussion.

The first major finding pertains to faculty and their perceptions of students' attitudes toward academic dishonesty in the context of specific scenarios that constitute academic misconduct. When asked to assess their level of agreement about the students' perceptions of the scenarios, faculty responses were lower than the student responses. The faculty believed students would respond to statements about cheating with responses that were, for the most part, in support of not committing acts of academic dishonesty. Specifically, the faculty indicated that students would either respond with neutral or disagree to each of the scenarios. The analysis of the students' responses revealed that the students selected disagree more often than the faculty expected, suggesting that the students have stronger attitudes against academic dishonesty than the faculty perceive them to have.

Similarly, the second major finding revealed that when faculty were asked to assess student perceptions of engagement in certain academically dishonest activities, they believed students would strongly agree with the statements about the actions that constitute academic dishonesty. The student responses, while similar, were lower in

agreement with the faculty responses and closer to neutral. The results of data analysis could suggest that the students recognize that engaging in academically dishonest activities is wrong in some instances, but may be uncertain if all instances are considered academically dishonest.

When asked to assess the academic environment at the Midwestern University, faculty believed students would respond with statements that indicated a very high level of support for academic integrity based upon responses to questions about severity of penalties, students' understanding of the academic misconduct policies, faculty's understanding of the policies, student support of the policies, faculty support of the policies, and the effectiveness of the policies. Student responses indicated a level of agreement higher than what the faculty expected from the students. This finding could suggest that students have a strong knowledge of policy, understand the implication of the policies if broken, and have respect for the learning community.

Finally, when comparing faculty and student attitudes and perceptions of how students learn about academic dishonesty, the faculty reported they often discuss academic dishonesty through instruction. When compared to what the students reported, the responses indicated that the students believed the frequency of instruction on academic dishonesty received is less than what the faculty reported providing. The difference could suggest that the students believe they are not getting enough instruction about how to avoid plagiarism through group work, proper citation, and proper referencing of internet sources. Students use other resources to inform them of how to avoid academic dishonesty.

For the major findings about the faculty, the interaction between faculty attitudes and academic appointment revealed differences between the faculty groups and their attitudes about students' perceptions of engaging in academically dishonest activities. The differences revealed that the non-tenure track full-time faculty were less likely to agree to the same extent with the other academic appointments regarding the extent to which students would not support academic dishonesty. There was also a slight distinction between faculty appointment and the faculty attitudes toward students' perceptions of the academic environment. The differences revealed that tenure-track full-time faculty were less likely to agree with the other academic appointments about student perceptions of the academic environment. The findings could suggest that the faculty who have a full-time status have more opportunities to interact with students in these situations resulting in their attitudes and perceptions being different from the faculty representing other academic appointments.

### **Findings Related to the Literature**

In this section, the results of this study are discussed in the context of the findings from the literature presented in chapter two. The similarities and differences between the results of this study and the literature are presented in the sequence of three segments. First, the findings related to faculty and student attitudes and perceptions of academic dishonesty are discussed, followed by a summary of the findings related to faculty attitudes and perceptions of academic dishonesty, and finally, the observations about student attitudes and perceptions of academic dishonesty are presented.

*Faculty and Students.* When reviewing previous research on academic dishonesty and comparing the findings to the results of this study, faculty and student responses were

similar to the literature in a few instances. The responses from faculty and students in this study conveyed support and knowledge for measures that discourage academic dishonesty. While the research questions were different in the studies focused on comparing faculty and student perceptions, the similarity of this study to the literature demonstrates in some ways continuity of attitude and perception within the university community about academic dishonesty and the institution's policies to address it.

Evans and Craig (1990) reported agreement between faculty and students regarding instances of cheating and Graham et al. (1994) determined that faculty and students found agreement within the most frequent forms of cheating at the institution studied. Both results suggest the possibility of a common understanding of what actions constitute academic dishonesty. Researchers from the two studies also recommended faculty and students further engage in discussions about academic dishonesty as an attempt to further reduce instances of misconduct and create clear messaging.

A few focused areas of significance from this study that somewhat align with the findings of Evans and Craig (1990) and Graham et al. (1994) pertain to how faculty perceive that students learn about academic dishonesty and what students reported about how they learn about it. In this study, faculty and students were generally in agreement about the ways in which students learn about academic dishonesty; however, students found the website to provide more information than the other ways they could learn about academic dishonesty. There was also general agreement between the faculty and students about their perceptions of the academic environment and their attitudes toward academic dishonesty, suggesting the academic colleges do have clear messages about academic dishonesty.

**Faculty.** As evidenced by the faculty statements about academic dishonesty in this study, the results of this study supported the findings produced by the research of Robinson- Zañata et al. (2005) and Davis et al. (2009), suggesting faculty may believe they are providing clear expectations. Their responses when compared to the student responses also suggest that they should do more to engage in a discussion with the students to ensure clear and consistent communication about academic dishonesty policies and the actions that constitute academic dishonesty are understood. Faculty who participated in the study believed they were communicating the components of the policies to students; however, students believed most of their information was obtained from the university's website. With the anticipated results that Robinson- Zañata et al. (2005) and Davis et al. (2009) believed can occur through a dialogue between faculty and students, a more succinct understanding of academic dishonesty within the learning community could develop.

Also consistent with the literature, are the responses from the tenure track faculty. The tenure track faculty conveyed a general belief that students were more likely to commit academic misconduct than the other groups of faculty that participated in this study. The research of Volpe et al. (2008) produced similar findings. Conversely, the concern of Volpe et al. (2008) of faculty underestimating academic dishonesty committed by students was not found within the results of this study.

**Students.** The research of Jordan (2001) revealed students did not support academic dishonesty, as is the case in this study. Most of the students who responded in this study were generally against participating in activities that are often classified as being academically dishonest. These results differ from the research of O'Rourke et al.

(2010), in which it was determined that a majority of the students in the study did not have knowledge of what actions constituted academic dishonesty. The research of Bluestein (2015) placed academic dishonesty in the context of social norms. Applying Bluestein's (2015) theory that academic dishonesty is perpetuated through social norms, the analyses of the students' responses from this study suggest they are committed to an environment where community members are committed to academic integrity.

Additionally, the analyses of student demographics revealed that the variables did not have a significant effect on student attitudes and perceptions of the academic environment, how students learn about academic dishonesty, and of students engaging in academic dishonesty. These findings differ from the research produced by Graham et al., (1994) and Symaco and Marcelo (2003). The results of the two studies highlighted the significant findings of the effect of demographics on the student populations studied, as well as perceptions of academic dishonesty.

When comparing the results of the student analyses from this study to the findings from the literature, there appears to be a connection between instruction, communication, and the culture of the academic environment. The responses from the students who participated in this study generally revealed a clear understanding of what actions constitute academic dishonesty. Additionally, their responses suggested they support an academic environment focused on upholding academic dishonesty policies.

## **Conclusions**

In chapter one, the pervasiveness of academic dishonesty in higher education and the effects on faculty and students were discussed. Focus upon consistent policies within institutions, protocols for enforcing the policies, and greater instruction within the

university community about academic dishonesty were also discussed, as well as opportunities for reform. A call to action in the literature suggested the community of higher education can do more to curtail academic misconduct by taking strong actions against cheating and can do more prevent future instances.

**Implications for Action.** The community at the Midwestern University appears to have a solid foundation from which the academic leadership could further strengthen the learning community by following the recommendations from Davis, Drinan, and Bertram Gallant (2009), Lang (2013), McCabe and Trevino (1993), McCabe et al. (2012), and Whitley and Keith-Spiegel (2002). The actions to improve the university community and guard against regression away from the existing culture could include actively engaging students and faculty in regular discussions about academic dishonesty through instructional opportunities (Davis, Drinan, & Bertram Gallant, 2009; Lang, 2013). The academic leadership, faculty, and students could also develop an honor code for the institution (McCabe & Trevino, 1993; McCabe et al., 2012) and they could consider a regular review of the website resources for students to ensure clear and consistent communication about academic dishonesty continues to be accessible to students through the primary way they selected for learning about academic dishonesty at the Midwestern University.

Additionally, following the recommendations from Davis, Drinan, and Bertram Gallant (2009) for providing opportunities for dialogue about academic misconduct, the academic leadership could consider opportunities to engage all faculty groups in discussions about academic dishonesty on a regular basis. Consistent communication may help to ensure a universal message about academic dishonesty is shared with

students across all sources of knowledge within the institution. The regular dialogue could also serve to remind all faculty of what actions constitute academic dishonesty at the institution and what procedures to following addressing academic dishonesty. Additionally, the regular dialogue could help to build confidence in identifying and reporting suspected cases of academic dishonesty within each academic college.

Finally, the open dialogue and clear messaging that the institution is committed to instruction that addresses what actions constitute academic dishonesty and the process for addressing academic dishonesty sends a positive message to the members of the learning community and the external community at large. Demonstrating commitment to academic integrity in ways that are more overt should send a clear message about the value of an education obtained at the institution. Additionally, such a message further demonstrates a commitment to preparing students for life beyond the walls of the institution.

**Recommendations for Future Research.** Based on the findings from this study, there is support for continuing research focusing on the development of a common definition of academic dishonesty within academic institutions. Additional researched focused on the effect of training for faculty and students about academic misconduct should be explored further. Further exploration on the effect of faculty members' academic appointments on the academic environment as related to student perceptions and attitudes of academic dishonesty, the effect of students' residential status on their attitudes towards academic dishonesty, the effect of the age of students and their attitudes and perceptions toward engagement in academically dishonest activities, and the effect of the students' academic college on their perceptions of receiving instruction should also be

considered. Each of these areas returned marginally significant differences during this study. If explored further, these areas could contribute to increasing understanding of what impact the faculty and student attitudes and perceptions toward academic dishonesty have in a university setting.

Due to the limitations of studying one population of faculty and students at a university, replicating the study in differing institutions with and without honor codes should be considered. Including the effect of students' international status on their attitudes towards academic dishonesty in future research could offer further clarity on a larger scale. Additional research using the instruments from this study in a variety of university settings may also contribute to developing a complete understanding of how social norms and the underlying attitudes and perceptions of academic dishonesty could help to advance the discussion of academic dishonesty within higher education (Bluestein, 2015). In doing so, research on the effectiveness of honor codes curtailing academic dishonesty in a university and the effect of the faculty and student attitudes and perceptions in those academic environments could be observed and compared.

**Concluding Remarks.** During this study 15 research questions were identified for the purpose of determining to what extent differences exist between faculty and student attitudes and perceptions of student attitudes and perceptions toward students engaging in academically dishonest activities, the academic environment, the frequency of instruction about the actions that constitute academic dishonesty, and how students learning about academic dishonesty. Faculty academic appointment and academic college assignment were studied, as well as student demographics of gender, academic college enrollment, academic standing, age, and residential status.

Despite the numerous studies on academic dishonesty, the research indicates further study is needed to ascertain how to curtail academic dishonesty in higher education. Current research has suggested institutions should move toward creating academic cultures grounded in the guiding principles of honors codes that contain clear and consistent messaging about academic dishonesty and focus on shaping the academic culture within a university (McCabe, 2005a; McCabe et al., 2012). Additionally, the research pointed to supporting an ongoing dialogue through instruction and community awareness initiatives to ensure communication between administrators, faculty, and students about the importance of preventing academic dishonesty (Davis, Drinan, & Bertram Gallant, 2009; Evans & Craig, 1990; Lang, 2013; McCabe and Trevino, 1993; McCabe et al., 2012).

## References

- Akeley Spear, J., & Neville Miller, A. (2012). The effects of instructor fear appeals and moral appeals on cheating-related attitudes and behaviors of university students. *Ethics and Behavior*, 22(3), 196-207. doi: 10.1080/10508422.2012.659603
- Auer, N. J., & Kruper, E. M. (2001). Mouse click plagiarism: The role of technology in plagiarism and the librarian's role in combating it. *Library Trends*, 49(3), 415-432. Retrieved from <http://www.ideals.illinois.edu>
- Attitude. (n.d.). In Oxford English Dictionary. Retrieved on June 6, 2015, from <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/12876?redirectedFrom=attitude#eid>
- Bowers, W. (1964). *Student dishonesty and its control in college*. New York, NY: Bureau of Applied Social Research.
- Bluestein, S. A. (2015). Connecting student-faculty interaction to academic dishonesty. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 39(2), 179-191. doi:10.1080/10668926.2013.848176
- CampusVue. (2012, July 24). *About us*. CampusManagement. Retrieved from <http://www.campusmanagement.com>
- Center for Academic Integrity. (2012). *Integrity*. Retrieved from <http://www.academicintegrity.org/icai/integrity-1.php>
- Center for Institutional Effectiveness. (2004). *A fresh look at traditional and nontraditional undergraduates at KSU*. Kennesaw State University, Georgia: Retrieved from [http://ir.kennesaw.edu/EIMWebApps/vic/analytic\\_studies/documents/pdf/study\\_trad\\_nontrad\\_ug\\_200308.pdf](http://ir.kennesaw.edu/EIMWebApps/vic/analytic_studies/documents/pdf/study_trad_nontrad_ug_200308.pdf)

- Christakis, E., & Christakis, N. A. (2012, September). Harvard cheating scandal: Is academic dishonesty on the rise. *Time*. Retrieved from <http://ideas.time.com/2012/09/04/harvard-cheating-scandal-is-academic-dishonesty-on-the-rise/print/>
- Crawford, P. (1995, February 14). Is 'academic dishonesty' now a fact of college life? *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/1995/02/14/news/14iht-cheated.html?pagewanted=print>
- Creswell, J. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Cronin, J. M., & Horton, H. E. (2009). Will higher education be the next bubble to burst? *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 55(37), A56-A56. Retrieved from <http://web.ebscohost.com&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#db=aph&AN=40924610>
- Davis, S. F. (1993). Academic dishonesty in the 1990s. *The Public Perspective*. Retrieved from <http://www.ropercenter.org>
- Davis, S. F., Drinan, P. F., & Bertram Gallant, T. (2009). Cheating in school: What we know and what we can do. [Kindle DX version]. Available from [http://www.amazon.com/Cheating-School-What-Know-Can-ebook/dp/B005UNVI7G/ref=sr\\_1\\_1?s=digital-text&ie=UTF8&qid=1433907087&sr=1-1&keywords=cheating+in+schools](http://www.amazon.com/Cheating-School-What-Know-Can-ebook/dp/B005UNVI7G/ref=sr_1_1?s=digital-text&ie=UTF8&qid=1433907087&sr=1-1&keywords=cheating+in+schools)
- Davis, S. F., Grover, C. A., Becker, A. H., & McGregor, L. N. (1992). Academic dishonesty: Prevalence, determinants, techniques, and punishments. *Teaching of Psychology*, 19, 16-20. doi: 10.1207/s15328023top1901\_3

- Davis, S. F., & Ludvigson, H. W. (1995). Additional data on academic dishonesty and a proposal for remediation. *Faculty Forum*, 22(2), 119-121, Retrieved from <http://web.ebscohost.com>
- Dodd, T. (2013). *Honor codes 101*. Retrieved from [http://www.academicintegrity.org/icai/assets/honor\\_codes\\_101.pdf](http://www.academicintegrity.org/icai/assets/honor_codes_101.pdf)
- Engler, J. N., Landau, J. D., & Epstein, M. (2008). Keeping up with the Jones: Students' perceptions of academically dishonest behavior. *Teaching of Psychology*, 35(2), 99-102. doi: 10.1080/00986280801978418
- Evering, L. C., & Moorman, G. (2012). Rethinking plagiarism in the digital age. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*. 56(1), 33-44. Retrieved from <http://web.ebscohost.com>
- Evans, E. D., & Craig, D. (1990). Teacher and student perceptions of academic cheating in middle and senior high schools. *Journal of Education Research*, 84(1). 44-52. Retrieved from <http://web.ebscohost.com>
- Gallant, T. (2008a). A new approach to academic integrity: The teaching and learning strategy. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, 33(5), 87-103. Retrieved from <http://web.ebscohost.com>
- Gallant, T. (2008b). Recommendations for practice and research. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, 33(5), 105-113. Retrieved from <http://web.ebscohost.com>
- Gibson, J. W., Blackwell, C. W., Greenwood, R. A., Mobley, I. & Blackwell, R. W. (2006). Preventing and detecting plagiarism in the written work of college students. *Journal of Diversity Management*, 1(2), 35-41. Retrieved from <http://web.ebscohost.com>

- Graham, M., Monday, J., O'Brien, K., & Steffen, S. (1994). Cheating at small colleges: An examination of student and faculty attitudes and behaviors. *Journal of College Student Development*, 4(35), 255-260. Retrieved from <http://web.ebscohost.com>
- Higgins, V. (2010). *Faculty and students' perceptions of cheating behavior: A journey into moral development* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://etd.ohiolink.edu>
- Howard, R. M., & Davies, L. J. (2009). Plagiarism in the internet age. *Educational Leadership*, 66(6), 64-67. Available from <http://www.ascd.org>
- Integrity. (n.d.). In Oxford English Dictionary. Retrieved on June 6, 2015, from <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/97366?redirectedFrom=integrity#eid><http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/144939?redirectedFrom=plagiarism#eid>
- International Center for Academic Integrity (2012a, July 25). *Who we are: Advisory council*. Dr. Donald L. McCabe. Retrieved from <http://www.academicintegrity.org>
- International Center for Academic Integrity (2012b, July 25). *Mission statement*. Retrieved from <http://www.academicintegrity.org>
- International Center for Academic Integrity (2015, June 9). *Stages of institutional development*. Retrieved from <http://www.academicintegrity.org>
- Jordan, A. E. (2001) College student cheating: The role of motivation, perceived norms, attitudes, and knowledge of institutional policy. *Ethics and Behavior*, 11(3) 233-247. Retrieved from <http://web.ebscohost.com>

- Kennedy, K., Nowak, S., Raghuraman, R., Thomas, J., & Davis, S. F. (2000). Academic dishonesty and distance learning: Student and faculty views. *College Student Journal, 34*(2), 309-315. Retrieved from <http://web.ebscohost.com>
- Lang, J. (2013). *Cheating lessons: Learning from academic dishonesty*. [Kindle DX version]. Available from [http://www.amazon.com/Cheating-Lessons-James-M-Lang-ebook/dp/B00EOL23YC/ref=tmm\\_kin\\_title\\_0/182-3028899-4537152](http://www.amazon.com/Cheating-Lessons-James-M-Lang-ebook/dp/B00EOL23YC/ref=tmm_kin_title_0/182-3028899-4537152)
- Lunenburg, F. C., & Irby, B. J. (2008). *Writing a successful thesis or dissertation: Tips and strategies for students in the social and behavioral sciences*. Thousand Oak, CA: Corwin Press.
- Maramark, S., & Maline, M. B. (1993). Academic dishonesty among college students [Monograph]. (OR-93-3082). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- McCabe, D. L. (2005a). Cheating among college and university students: A North American perspective. *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 1*(1), 1-11. Available from <http://www.ojs.unisa.edu.au/index.php/IJEI/article/viewFile/14/9>
- McCabe, D. L. (2005b). It takes a village: Academic dishonesty and educational opportunity. *Liberal Education, 91*(3), 26-31. Available from <http://web.ebscohost.com>
- McCabe, D. L., Trevino, L., & Butterfield, K. (2001) Cheating in academic institutions: a decade of research. *Ethics and Behavior, 11*(3), 219-232. Lawrence Earlbaum and Associates. Available from <http://web.a.ebscohost.com/bakeru.idm.oclc.org/ehost/detail/detail?vid=19&sid=ff085114-e0aa-4d68-ba34-2d6e57e19668%40sessionmgr4002&hid=4114&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#db=aph&AN=4949872>

- McCabe, D. L., Butterfield, K., & Trevino, L. (2012) *Cheating in college*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. (1993). Academic dishonesty honor codes and other contextual influences. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 6(5), 522-538. Available from <http://library.uvm.edu/~pmardeus/honors/honorcode.pdf>
- McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. (1996). What we know about cheating in college: Longitudinal trends and recent developments. *Change*, 28(1), 28-33. Available from <http://www.ebscohost.com/academic/academic-search-premier>
- McCabe, D. L. & Trevino, L. (2002). Honesty and honor codes. *Academe*, 88(1)  
Retrieved from <http://web.b.ebscohost.com>
- Meacham, J., Gray, E., & Rhodan, M. (2013). The class of 2025. *Time*, 182(15), 40.
- Midwestern University. (2014a). *Catalog and student handbook*. Midwest: Author.
- Midwestern University. (2014b). *Faculty handbook*. Midwest: Author.
- Midwestern University. (2014c). *The fact book*. Midwest: Author.
- National Center for Educational Statistics. (2014a). Adjunct faculty. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/glossary/?charindex=A>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2014b). Faculty. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/glossary/?charindex=F>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2014c). Non-traditional student. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs/web/97578e.asp>
- North Central Association of the Higher Learning Commission. (2015, October 4). How institutions are accredited. Retrieved from <https://hlcommission.org/HLC-Institutions/how-institutions-are-accredited.html>

O'Rourke, J., Barnes, J., Deaton, A., Fulks, K., Ryan, K., & Rettinger, D. (2010).

Imitation is the sincerest form of cheating: The influence of direct knowledge and attitudes on academic dishonesty. *Ethics and Behavior*, 20(1), 47-64.

doi:10.1080/10508420903482616

Pavela, G. (1997). *Applying the power of association on campus: A model code of academic integrity*. Retrieved from <http://www.academicintegrity.org>

Perception, (n.d.). In Oxford English Dictionary. Retrieved on June 6, 2015, from <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/140560?redirectedFrom=perception#eid>

Pérez-Peña, R. (2012, September 7). Studies find more students cheating, with high achievers no exception. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from

[http://www.nytimes.com/2012/09/08/education/studies-show-more-students-cheat-even-high-achievers.html?\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2012/09/08/education/studies-show-more-students-cheat-even-high-achievers.html?_r=0)

Pincus, H. S., & Schmelkin, L. P. (2003). Faculty perceptions of academic dishonesty.

*The Journal of Higher Education*, 74(2), 196-209. Retrieved from

<http://web.b.ebscohost.com>

Robinson-Zañata, C., Pena, E. D., Cook-Morales, V., Pena, A.M., Afshani, R. & Nguyen,

L. (2005). Academic crime and punishment: Faculty members' perceptions of and responses to plagiarism. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 20(3), 318-337. Retrieved from <http://web.b.ebscohost.com.bakeru.idm.oclc.org>

Roig, M., & Ballew, C. (1994). Attitudes toward cheating of self and others by college students and professors. *Psychological Record*, 94(44), 3-10. Retrieved from

<http://web.ebscohost.com>

- Symaco, L., & Marcelo, E. (2003) Faculty perceptions on student academic honesty. *College Student Journal*, 37(3), 327-333. Retrieved from <http://web.ebscohost.com>
- Schlozam, S. (2013). Cheating in the age of Facebook. *Psychology Today*, 46(2), 47–48. Retrieved from <http://web.ebscohost.com>
- Stearns, S. A. (2001). The student-instructor relationship's effect on academic integrity. *Ethics and Behavior*, 11(3), 275-285. Retrieved from <http://web.ebscohost.com>
- Stevens, T. (2012). *Promoting a culture of integrity: A study of faculty and student perceptions of academic dishonesty at a large public Midwestern university*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3546883)
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (2002). *A profile of part-time faculty: Fall 1998*(Working Paper No.2002-08). Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2002/200208.pdf>
- Volpe, R., Davidson, L., & Bell, M.C. (2008). Faculty attitudes and behaviors concerning student cheating. *College Student Journal*, 42(1). Retrieved from <http://web.ebscohost.com>
- Whitley, B. E., & Keith-Spiegel, P. (2002). *Academic dishonesty: An educator's guide*. New York, NY: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.

## Appendices

**Appendix A: Faculty Survey**

## FACULTY SURVEY

### Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty

You were selected for the study, because you currently teach for the University. Participants, who elect to take the anonymous survey, should expect to complete it in approximately 15 to 20 minutes.

The survey is divided into four sections:

- I. Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty
- II. Attitude Towards Academic Dishonesty
- III. Academic Environment
- IV. Demographics

At no time will the responses collected be connected to the participants or their university records. The survey is completely anonymous. Your privacy is important; answers will be combined with other participants and reported in summary format. Information reported will not indicate individual participants or academic colleges within the University. There is no penalty should you choose not to participate or answer all of the questions. Completion of the survey assumes the participant's consent to participate in the study and to use the responses in the study.

**FACULTY SURVEY****Part I: Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty**

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

**1. It is wrong to cheat.**

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

**2. Students should go ahead and cheat if they know they can get away with it.**

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

**3. Students should try to cheat even if their chances of getting away with it are slim.**

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

**4. I would let another student cheat off my test if he/she asked.**

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

**FACULTY SURVEY****Academic Dishonesty Scale**

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

**5. Copy material and turn it in as their own work.**

- Not even one time
- One time
- Two times
- A few times
- Many times

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

- Not even one time
- One time
- Two times
- A few times
- Many times

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

- Not even one time
- One time
- Two times
- A few times
- Many times

**FACULTY SURVEY****Part II: Attitude Towards Dishonesty Scale**

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

**8. Help someone else cheat on a test.**

- Not even one time
- One time
- Two times
- A few times
- Many times

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

- Not even one time
- One time
- Two times
- A few times
- Many times

**10. Copy from another student during a test.**

- Not even one time
- One time
- Two times
- A few times
- Many times

**11. Turn in work done by someone else.**

- Not even one time
- One time
- Two times
- A few times
- Many times

**FACULTY SURVEY**

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

- Not even one time
- One time
- Two times
- A few times
- Many times

**13. Cheat on a test in any way.**

- Not even one time
- One time
- Two times
- A few times
- Many times

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

- Not even one time
- One time
- Two times
- A few times
- Many times

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

- Not even one time
- One time
- Two times
- A few times
- Many times

**FACULTY SURVEY****Part III: Academic Environment**

How would you rate the following:

**16. The severity of penalties for cheating at your institution.**

- Very low
- Low
- Medium
- High
- Very high

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

- Very low
- Low
- Medium
- High
- Very high

**18. The faculty's understanding of these policies.**

- Very low
- Low
- Medium
- High
- Very high

**19. Student support of these policies.**

- Very low
- Low
- Medium
- High
- Very high

## FACULTY SURVEY

### 20. Faculty support of these policies.

- Very low  
 Low  
 Medium  
 High  
 Very high

### 21. The effectiveness of these policies.

- Very low  
 Low  
 Medium  
 High  
 Very high

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

- Yes  
 No

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

	Little or no information provided	Some information provided	A lot of information provided
First year orientation programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Campus website	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Academic Advisor, Residential Advisor, or Faculty Advisor	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Faculty (discussed in class, course syllabi, or course outlines)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Teaching Assistant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Dean or other Administrator	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**FACULTY SURVEY**

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

**24. Plagiarism**

- Never
- Very seldom
- Seldom
- Often
- Very often

**25. Guidelines on group work or collaboration**

- Never
- Very seldom
- Seldom
- Often
- Very often

**26. Proper citation/referencing of written sources**

- Never
- Very seldom
- Seldom
- Often
- Very often

**27. Proper citation/referencing of Internet sources**

- Never
- Very seldom
- Seldom
- Often
- Very often

**FACULTY SURVEY****28. Falsifying/fabricating course lab data**

- Never
- Very seldom
- Seldom
- Often
- Very often

**29. Falsifying/fabricating research data**

- Never
- Very seldom
- Seldom
- Often
- Very often

**FACULTY SURVEY****Part IV: Demographics****30. What is your academic college or school?**

- Arts and Sciences
- Business Administration
- Education
- Nursing

**31. What is your academic appointment?**

- Tenure Track Faculty
- Non-Tenure Track Faculty, Full-Time Faculty
- Non-Tenure Track Faculty, Part-Time Faculty
- Adjunct Instructor

**32. What is your academic rank?**

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

**33. What is your gender?**

- Female
- Male

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING IN THIS SURVEY.

## **Appendix B: Student Survey**

## STUDENT SURVEY

### Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty

You were selected for the study, because you are a current student at the University. Participants, who elect to take the anonymous survey, should expect to complete it in approximately 15 to 20 minutes.

The survey is divided into four sections:

- I. Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty
- II. Attitude Towards Academic Dishonesty
- III. Academic Environment
- IV. Demographics

At no time will the responses collected be connected to the participants or their university records. The survey is completely anonymous. Your privacy is important; answers will be combined with other participants and reported in summary format. Information reported will not indicate individual participants or academic colleges within the University. There is no penalty should you choose not to participate or answer all of the questions. Completion of the survey assumes the participant's consent to participate in the study and to use the responses in the study.

**STUDENT SURVEY****Part I: Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty**

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

- Yes  
 No

**2. If you answered yes to question 1, were you caught?**

- Yes  
 No

**3. If you answered yes to question 2, were you disciplined by the faculty, university, or both?**

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

**4. It is wrong to cheat.**

- Strongly agree  
 Agree  
 Neutral  
 Disagree  
 Strongly disagree

**STUDENT SURVEY****Part II: Attitude Towards Dishonesty Scale**

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

**5. Students should go ahead and cheat if they know they can get away with it.**

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

**6. Students should try to cheat even if their chances of getting away with it are slim.**

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

**7. I would let another student cheat off my test if he/she asked.**

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

**STUDENT SURVEY****Academic Dishonesty Scale**

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

**8. Copied material and turned it in as your own work.**

- Not even one time
- One time
- Two times
- A few times
- Many times

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

- Not even one time
- One time
- Two times
- A few times
- Many times

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

- Not even one time
- One time
- Two times
- A few times
- Many times

**11. Helped someone else cheat on a test.**

- Not even one time
- One time
- Two times
- A few times
- Many times

**STUDENT SURVEY****12. Collaborated on an assignment when the instructor asked for individual work.**

- Not even one time
- One time
- Two times
- A few times
- Many times

**STUDENT SURVEY**

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

**13. Copied from another student during a test.**

- Not even one time
- One time
- Two times
- A few times
- Many times

**14. Turned in work done by someone else.**

- Not even one time
- One time
- Two times
- A few times
- Many times

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

- Not even one time
- One time
- Two times
- A few times
- Many times

**16. Cheated on a test in any way.**

- Not even one time
- One time
- Two times
- A few times
- Many times

**STUDENT SURVEY**

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

- Not even one time
- One time
- Two times
- A few times
- Many times

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

- Not even one time
- One time
- Two times
- A few times
- Many times

**STUDENT SURVEY****Part III: Academic Environment**

How would you rate the following:

**19. The severity of penalties for cheating at the institution.**

- Very low
- Low
- Medium
- High
- Very high

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

- Very low
- Low
- Medium
- High
- Very high

**21. The average faculty member's understanding of these policies.**

- Very low
- Low
- Medium
- High
- Very high

**22. Student support of these policies.**

- Very low
- Low
- Medium
- High
- Very high

**STUDENT SURVEY****23. Faculty support of these policies.**

- Very low
- Low
- Medium
- High
- Very high

**24. The effectiveness of these policies.**

- Very low
- Low
- Medium
- High
- Very high

## STUDENT SURVEY

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

Yes

No

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

	Learned little or nothing	Learned some	Learned a lot
First year orientation programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Campus website	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Academic Advisor, Residential Advisor, or Faculty Advisor	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Faculty (discussed in class, course syllabi, or course outlines)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Teaching Assistant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Dean or other administrator	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**STUDENT SURVEY**

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

**27. Plagiarism**

- Never
- Very seldom
- Seldom/sometimes
- Often
- Very often

**28. Guidelines on group work or collaboration**

- Never
- Very seldom
- Seldom
- Often
- Very often

**29. Proper citation/referencing of written sources**

- Never
- Very seldom
- Seldom
- Often
- Very often

**30. Proper citation/referencing of Internet sources**

- Never
- Very seldom
- Seldom
- Often
- Very often

**STUDENT SURVEY****31. Falsifying/fabricating course lab data**

- Never
- Very seldom
- Seldom
- Often
- Very often

**32. Falsifying/fabricating research data**

- Never
- Very seldom
- Seldom
- Often
- Very often

**STUDENT SURVEY****Part IV: Demographics****33. What is your academic college or school?**

- Arts and Sciences
- Business Administration
- Education
- Nursing

**34. What is your academic standing?**

- Freshman
- Sophomore
- Junior
- Senior
- Graduate
- Post Graduate

**35. What is your gender?**

- Female
- Male

**36. What is your age?****37. Which group best represents your ethnic background/race?**

- American Indian/Alaskan Native
- Asian American/Pacific
- Black/African American (non-Hispanic)
- Hispanic/Spanish/Latin American
- White (non-Hispanic)
- No response

Other (please specify)

**STUDENT SURVEY****38. What is your residential status?**

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

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING IN THIS SURVEY.

## **Appendix C: Permission to Use Instruments**

Stevens, Tanisha N. <smithtn@umsl.edu>

Tue 9/9/2014 8:12 AM

EF

To:

Emily Ford;

...

You forwarded this message on 9/9/2014 8:12 AM.

Ms. Ford,

You have permission to utilize the modifications to the original instruments. Additionally, feel free to modify the questions related to demographics to best fit your study.

Sincerely,

Dr. Tanisha Stevens

Sent from my iPad

On Sep 8, 2014, at 5:01 PM, "Emily Ford" <[Emily.Ford@\[REDACTED\].edu](mailto:Emily.Ford@[REDACTED].edu)> wrote:

Hi Dr. Stevens,

Thank you for taking my phone call last week. As mentioned in our conversation, I would like to use the instruments you developed for your dissertation to aid me in conducting research on student and faculty perceptions of plagiarism and academic integrity. I will provide acknowledgement to you and the other researchers you obtained permission from within my dissertation. I am also willing to discuss my findings with you upon completion of data collection and analysis.

To ensure I follow protocol for obtaining permission, would you please confirm your approval for me to use your surveys? Additionally, may I modify the section of the instrument pertaining to demographics for the purpose of aligning it with the demographics used at the institution where my study will occur?

Thank you, again!

Regards,  
Emily

Emily A. Ford  
[eford@\[REDACTED\].edu](mailto:eford@[REDACTED].edu)  
913.344.6043

**Appendix D: IRB Application**



Date: \_\_\_\_\_

IRB PROTOCOL NUMBER \_\_\_\_\_  
(IRB USE ONLY)

**IRB REQUEST**  
**Proposal for Research**  
**Submitted to the Baker University Institutional Review Board**

**I. Research Investigator(s)**Department(s) School of Education Graduate Department

Name	Signature	
1. Susan Rogers, Ph.D.	<u><i>Susan Rogers</i></u>	Major Advisor
2. Katie Hole	<u><i>KHole</i></u>	Research Analyst
3. Tes Mehring, Ph.D.	_____	University Committee Member
4.	_____	External Committee Member

Principal Investigator: Emily A. Ford, A.B.D.  
 Phone: 913.653.1480  
 Email: eford@bakeru.edu  
 Mailing address: 8024 West.146<sup>th</sup> Street, Overland Park, KS 66223

Faculty sponsor: Susan Rogers, Ph.D.  
 Phone: 785.230.2801(mobile) 913-344-1226 (office)  
 Email: srogers@bakeru.edu

Expected Category of Review: \_\_\_ Exempt  Expedited \_\_\_ Full**II: Protocol: (Type the title of your study)**

Attitudes and Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty

## Summary

**In a sentence or two, please describe the background and purpose of the research.**

The purpose of this study is to determine if there was a difference between faculty and student attitudes toward academic dishonesty. Additionally, this study is designed to determine whether there is a difference between faculty perceptions of students engaging in academically dishonest activities and student perceptions of engaging in academically dishonest activities; a difference between faculty and student perceptions of the academic environment; a difference between faculty and student perceptions of how students learn about academic dishonesty; a difference between faculty and student perceptions about the frequency of instruction about the actions that constitute academic dishonesty; a difference between faculty and student perceptions about the frequency of instruction about the actions that constitute academic dishonesty. The purpose of this study is to also determine if faculty perceptions are affected by the academic appointments and academic colleges of the faculty. Finally, the purpose of this study is to determine if student perceptions are affected by any of the following student variables: gender, academic college, academic standing, age, ethnicity, and residential status.

Baker University is the site for the study.

**Briefly describe each condition or manipulation to be included within the study.**

There are no conditions or manipulations in this study.

**What measures or observations will be taken in the study? If any questionnaire or other instruments are used, provide a brief description and attach a copy. Will the subjects encounter the risk of psychological, social, physical or legal risk? If so, please describe the nature of the risk and any measures designed to mitigate that risk.**

With permission from Dr. Tanisha Stevens, the researcher who created the instruments, I will use the surveys to measure faculty and student attitudes and perceptions of academic dishonesty. The surveys consist of questions grouped into four sections designed to collect data on demographics; perceptions of academic dishonesty; the extent to which academic dishonesty is committed or observed; and knowledge and perceptions of institutional policies. There will be no psychological, social, physical, or legal risks in this study.

Please see attached artifacts A, B, and C.

**Will any stress to subjects be involved? If so, please describe.**

Participants may experience some stress when completing the survey. Any who exhibit stress may cease completion of the survey without penalty.

**Will the subjects be deceived or misled in any way? If so, include an outline or script of the debriefing.**

The participants will not be deceived or misled in any way.

**Will there be a request for information which subjects might consider to be personal or sensitive? If so, please include a description.**

Participants will not be asked to reveal personal or sensitive information.

**Will the subjects be presented with materials which might be considered to be offensive, threatening, or degrading? If so, please describe.**

Offensive, threatening, or degrading materials will not be used in this study.

**Approximately how much time will be demanded of each subject?**

The survey should take approximately 15 to 20 minutes to complete.

**Who will be the subjects in this study? How will they be solicited or contacted? Provide an outline or script of the information which will be provided to subjects prior to their volunteering to participate. Include a copy of any written solicitation as well as an outline of any oral solicitation.**

The sample will consist of faculty and students from █████ University. Email will be the primary form of communication for contacting participants. Participants will receive the primary investigator's contact information with each email.

See attached artifacts D, E, F, and G.

**What steps will be taken to insure that each subject's participation is voluntary? What if any inducements will be offered to the subjects for their participation?**

The following statement was included in the email to ensure voluntary participation:

This email is to inform you of the option to participate in a research study I am conducting to fulfill a requirement of my degree program, a doctorate of education in educational leadership.

The survey is completely anonymous. Your privacy is important; your answers will be combined with other participants and reported in summary form. Information reported will not indicate individual participants or academic colleges within the University. There is no penalty should you choose not to participate or answer all of the questions.

Inducements will not be offered to the subjects.

**How will you insure that the subjects give their consent prior to participating? Will a written consent form be used? If so, include the form. If not, explain why not.**

In the solicitation letter the following statement obtained consent from the participant,

Completion of the survey assumes the participant's consent to participate in the study and to allow the primary investigator to use the responses in the study.

**Will any aspect of the data be made a part of any permanent record that can be identified with the subject? If so, please explain the necessity.**

There will be no data obtained for the study that will be included in the participant's permanent record.

**Will the fact that a subject did or did not participate in a specific experiment or study be made part of any permanent record available to a supervisor, teacher or employer? If so, explain.**

Participation or lack of participation in the study will not become part of the permanent record or be made available to a supervisor, teacher, or employer.

**What steps will be taken to insure the confidentiality of the data? Where will it be stored? How long will it be stored? What will be done with it after the study is completed?**

Names of the participants will not be collected during the study. The faculty survey and the student survey will be distributed via SurveyMonkey using an email distribution list created by the █████ University's staff in the IT department and housed within a distribution list that I cannot access. The email will contain a link from SurveyMonkey that will allow participants to access the survey. Upon completion of the study, I will keep the data for three years and then destroy it per research protocol.

**If there are any risks involved in the study, are there any offsetting benefits that might accrue to either the subjects or society?**

There are no risks involved in this study.

**Will any data from files or archival data be used? If so, please describe.**

No, archival data will not be used in the study.

## **Appendix E: IRB Approval**



April 8, 2015

Dear Emily Ford and Dr. Rogers,

The Baker University IRB has reviewed your research project application and approved this project under Exempt Status Review. As described, the project complies with all the requirements and policies established by the University for protection of human subjects in research. Unless renewed, approval lapses one year after approval date.

Please be aware of the following:

1. Any significant change in the research protocol as described should be reviewed by this Committee prior to altering the project.
2. Notify the IRB about any new investigators not named in original application.
3. When signed consent documents are required, the primary investigator must retain the signed consent documents of the research activity.
4. If this is a funded project, keep a copy of this approval letter with your proposal/grant file.
5. If the results of the research are used to prepare papers for publication or oral presentation at professional conferences, manuscripts or abstracts are requested for IRB as part of the project record.

Please inform this Committee or myself when this project is terminated or completed. As noted above, you must also provide IRB with an annual status report and receive approval for maintaining your status. If you have any questions, please contact me at [CTodden@BakerU.edu](mailto:CTodden@BakerU.edu) or 785.594.8440.

Sincerely,

*Chris Todden EdD*  
Chair, Baker University IRB

Baker University IRB Committee  
Verneda Edwards EdD  
Sara Crump PhD  
Molly Anderson  
Scott Crenshaw

## **Appendix F: Provost's Approval**

**From:** Brian Posler  
**Sent:** Monday, April 06, 2015 4:42 PM  
**To:** Emily Ford  
**Subject:** RE: Permission to Conduct Study, E. Ford

Once you receive final approval from the IRB, you will have my permission to proceed.

I wish you good luck with your interesting project.

Brian

Brian D. Posler, PhD  
Provost

University

[brian.posler@\[REDACTED\].edu](mailto:brian.posler@[REDACTED].edu)

**From:** Emily Ford  
**Sent:** Monday, April 06, 2015 3:24 PM  
**To:** Brian Posler  
**Subject:** Permission to Conduct Study, E. Ford

Hi Dr. Posler,

In partial fulfillment of my doctorate of education in educational leadership, I am required to conduct research and write a dissertation. Last week, the proposal for my research was submitted to the IRB for review. While the results of the committee's review of my proposal have not been made available to me, I am reaching out to university administrators for permission to conduct the study should it be accepted. My research is focused upon faculty and student attitudes and perceptions of academic dishonesty. I plan to survey students and faculty at the university who are currently enrolled or employed at the time of the study. As noted within my proposal, I will not reveal their identities or connect their responses to their official records.

Would you please let me know if I have your approval to proceed? Please let me know if you would like more information.

Regards,  
Emily

**Appendix G: Notification to Department of Human Resources**

**From:** Emily Ford  
**Sent:** Monday, April 6, 2015 3:28 PM  
**To:** Connie Deel (Connie.Deel@[REDACTED].edu)  
**Subject:** Notification of Study, E. Ford

Hi Ms. Deel,

In partial fulfillment of my doctorate of education in educational leadership, I am required to conduct research and write a dissertation. Last week, the proposal for my research was submitted to the IRB for review. While the results of the committee's review of my proposal have not been made available to me, I am reaching out to you to notify you of my intent to conduct the study should it be accepted. My research is focused upon faculty and student attitudes and perceptions of academic dishonesty. I plan to survey students and faculty at the university who are currently enrolled or employed at the time of the study. As noted within my proposal, I will not reveal their identities or connect their responses to their official records. During the study I will comply with all regulations for research defined by the IRB.

Would you please let me know if you have questions or concerns? Please also let me know if you would like more information.

Regards,  
Emily

**Appendix H: Request to IT for Assistance**

**From:** Andy Jett  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 8, 2015 6:33 PM  
**To:** Emily Ford  
**Subject:** RE: E. Ford's Research

Emily I can make that happen

Give me specifics as to who for each group and all the content for subject line, body of text etc.

**Andy Jett**  
*Vice President – Strategic Planning and Academic Resources*  
*Chief Information Officer*  
[REDACTED] **University**  
[ajett@\[REDACTED\].edu](mailto:ajett@[REDACTED].edu)

**From:** Emily Ford  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 07, 2015 5:02 PM  
**To:** Andy Jett  
**Subject:** E. Ford's Research

Hi Andy,

Dr. Rogers expects to hear from the IRB regarding my proposal this week. If it is approved, she would like for me to administer the surveys to the students and faculty this month. Is Josh or another team member on one of your teams available to assist with sending the links out to both groups? There will be two emails for each group, an invite and a reminders.

Regards,  
Emily

Sent using OWA for iPad

**Appendix I: Faculty Email 1**

Dear Faculty Member,

This email is to inform you of the option to participate in a research study I am conducting to fulfill a requirement of my degree program, a doctorate of education in educational leadership. The purpose of the study is to examine the faculty and student attitudes and perceptions of academic dishonesty in higher education. You were selected for the study, because you currently teach for the University.

Participants, who elect to take the anonymous survey, should expect to complete it in approximately 15- to- 20 minutes. The survey is divided into four sections:

- Part I: Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty
- Part II: Attitude Towards Academic Dishonesty
- Part III: Academic Environment
- Part IV: Demographics

Responses received will be collected through SurveyMonkey, a password protected platform and will be used as evidence in my dissertation. At no time will the responses collected be connected to the participants or their university records. The survey is completely anonymous. Your privacy is important; answers will be combined with other participants and reported in summary format. Information reported will not indicate individual participants or academic colleges within the University. There is no penalty should you choose not to participate or answer all of the questions. Completion of the survey assumes the participant's consent to participate in the study and to use the responses in the study.

To participate in the study, please click on this link [INSERT FACULTY LINK].

Thank you for taking the time to complete the survey. If you have questions about the study, please contact me at the email below.

Regards,

Emily A. Ford  
[emilyaford@stu.bakeru.edu](mailto:emilyaford@stu.bakeru.edu)

**Appendix J: Student Email 1**

Dear Student,

This email is to inform you of the option to participate in a research study I am conducting to fulfill a requirement of my degree program, a doctorate of education in educational leadership. The purpose of the study is to examine the faculty and student attitudes and perceptions of academic dishonesty in higher education. You were selected for the study, because you are a current student at the University.

Participants, who elect to take the anonymous survey, should expect to complete it in approximately 15- to- 20 minutes.

The survey is divided into four sections:

- Part I: Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty
- Part II: Attitude Towards Academic Dishonesty
- Part III: Academic Environment
- Part IV: Demographics

Responses received will be collected through SurveyMonkey, a password protected platform and will be used as evidence in my dissertation. At no time will the responses collected be connected to the participants or their university records. The survey is completely anonymous. Your privacy is important; answers will be combined with other participants and reported in summary format. Information reported will not indicate individual participants or academic colleges within the University. There is no penalty should you choose not to participate or answer all of the questions. Completion of the survey assumes the participant's consent to participate in the study and to use the responses in the study.

To participate in the study, please click on this link [INSERT STUDENT LINK].

Thank you for taking the time to complete the survey. If you have questions about the study, please contact me at the email below.

Regards,

Emily A. Ford  
[emilyaford@stu.bakeru.edu](mailto:emilyaford@stu.bakeru.edu)

**Appendix K: Faculty Email Reminders 2 & 3**

Dear Faculty Member,

This email is to remind you of the option to participate in a research study I am conducting to fulfill a requirement of my degree program, a doctorate of education in educational leadership. You were selected for the study, because you currently teach for the University.

If you have already completed the survey, thank you for your time and please disregard this message.

The purpose of the study is to examine the faculty and student attitudes and perceptions of academic dishonesty in higher education. Participants, who elect to take the anonymous survey, should expect to complete it in approximately 15- to- 20 minutes.

The survey is divided into four sections:

- Part I: Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty
- Part II: Attitude Towards Academic Dishonesty
- Part III: Academic Environment
- Part IV: Demographics

Responses received will be collected through SurveyMonkey, a password protected platform and will be used as evidence in my dissertation. At no time will the responses collected be connected to the participants or their university records. The survey is completely anonymous. Your privacy is important; answers will be combined with other participants and reported in summary format. Information reported will not indicate individual participants or academic colleges within the University. There is no penalty should you choose not to participate or answer all of the questions. Completion of the survey assumes the participant's consent to participate in the study and to use the responses in the study.

To participate in the study, please click on this link [INSERT FACULTY LINK].

Thank you for taking the time to complete the survey. If you have questions about the study, please contact me at the email below.

Regards,

Emily A. Ford  
[emilyaford@stu.bakeru.edu](mailto:emilyaford@stu.bakeru.edu)

**Appendix L: Student Email Reminders 2 & 3**

Dear Student,

This email is to remind you of the option to participate in a research study I am conducting to fulfill a requirement of my degree program, a doctorate of education in educational leadership. You were selected for the study, because you are a current student at the University. If you have already completed the survey, thank you for your time and please disregard this message.

The purpose of the study is to examine the faculty and student attitudes and perceptions of academic dishonesty in higher education. Participants, who elect to take the anonymous survey, should expect to complete it in approximately 15- to- 20 minutes.

The survey is divided into four sections:

- Part I: Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty
- Part II: Attitude Towards Academic Dishonesty
- Part III: Academic Environment
- Part IV: Demographics

Responses received will be collected through SurveyMonkey, a password protected platform and will be used as evidence in my dissertation. At no time will the responses collected be connected to the participants or their university records. The survey is completely anonymous. Your privacy is important; answers will be combined with other participants and reported in summary format. Information reported will not indicate individual participants or academic colleges within the University. There is no penalty should you choose not to participate or answer all of the questions. Completion of the survey assumes the participant's consent to participate in the study and to use the responses in the study.

To participate in the study, please click on this link [INSERT STUDENT LINK].

Thank you for taking the time to complete the survey. If you have questions about the study, please contact me at the email below.

Regards,

Emily A. Ford  
[emilyaford@stu.bakeru.edu](mailto:emilyaford@stu.bakeru.edu)

**Appendix M: Results for Student MANOVAs for RQ 11-15**

Table M1

*Results for Student MANOVAs for RQ 11 - 15*

	Attitude			Academic			Academic			Receive			Learn		
	Dishonesty			Dishonesty			Environment			Instruction					
	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	$\eta$	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	$\eta$	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	$\eta$	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	$\eta$	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	$\eta$
Gender	.579	.448	.005	.000	.987	.000	1.878	.173	.017	.024	.877	.000	.510	.477	.005
College/ School	1.794	.153	.046	.813	.489	.022	1.189	.317	.031	2.332	.078	.059	1.547	.206	.040
Academic Standing	.308	.907	.014	.303	.910	.013	.571	.722	.025	.990	.416	.034	.484	.788	.021
Age	.501	.722	.025	2.393	.055	.079	1.125	.348	.039	.956	.434	.031	1.080	.370	.037
Residential Status	1.880	.137	.048	1.410	.244	.037	1.303	.277	.034	.728	.537	.019	1.203	.312	.031