IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
Digital Repository

Retrospective Theses and Dissertations

Iowa State University Capstones, Theses and Dissertations

1984

A comparison of student attitudes and perceptions regarding academic dishonesty of selected class groups in 1980 and 1983 at Iowa State University

DeLores Rice Brown
Iowa State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd

 Part of the Higher Education Administration Commons, and the Higher Education and Teaching Commons

Recommended Citation
Brown, DeLores Rice, "A comparison of student attitudes and perceptions regarding academic dishonesty of selected class groups in 1980 and 1983 at Iowa State University " (1984). *Retrospective Theses and Dissertations*. 8151.
https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd/8151

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Iowa State University Capstones, Theses and Dissertations at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Retrospective Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact digirep@iastate.edu.

www.manaraa.com

INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of "sectioning" the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.

5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

8505805

Brown, DeLores Rice

A COMPARISON OF STUDENT ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS REGARDING ACADEMIC DISHONESTY OF SELECTED CLASS GROUPS IN 1980 AND 1983 AT IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

Iowa State University PH.D. 1984

University Microfilms International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

A comparison of student attitudes and perceptions regarding academic dishonesty of selected class groups in 1980 and 1983 at Iowa State University

by

DeLores Rice Brown

A Dissertation Submitted to the
Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department: Professional Studies in Education
Major: Education (Higher Education)

Approved:

Signature was redacted for privacy.

In Charge of Major Work

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Major Department

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Graduate College

Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa

1984

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

The Problem

Academic dishonesty among students has been and continues to be a problem for institutions of higher learning. Bushway and Nash (1977) report that cheating behaviors in the classroom can be traced through history and includes many types . . . "using crib notes on an exam, copying answers from another students' paper, letting others copy a homework paper, plagiarizing and ghostwriting."

Some examples of academic dishonesty/cheating that are commonly identified include:

1. Arranging with other students to give or receive answers by signals during an exam.
2. Copying from someone's paper without his or her knowledge.
3. Turning in a paper that one has purchased from a commercial research firm.
4. Giving answers to other students during an exam.
5. Arranging to sit next to someone to copy from his or her paper.
6. Turning in a paper that has been written entirely or in part by another student.

7. Getting questions or answers about an exam from someone who has already taken it.
8. Adding a few items to a bibliography that they did not actually use in writing the paper.
9. Working together with several students on a homework assignment when the instructor does not allow it.
10. Copying a few sentences of material from a source without footnoting it in a paper.

The Iowa State University Information Handbook (1984) defines academic dishonesty as . . .

> an attempt by one or more students to use unauthorized information in the taking of an exam; or, to submit as his or her own work themes, reports, drawings, laboratory notes, or other products prepared by another person; or knowingly to assist another student in such acts. Such behavior is abhorrent to to the university and students found guilty of academic dishonesty face suspension, conduct probation, or disciplinary warning (p. 15).

For the purpose of this study, the terms academic dishonesty, cheating and dishonesty are used interchangeably. The research problem to be investigated in this study is to determine if the attitudes and perceptions of a random sample of freshmen and seniors at Iowa State University toward academic dishonesty has changed during a three year period. This comparison is based on data obtained from this study and a similar one conducted in 1980 by Barnett and Dalton.

This study is a replication of the one done in 1980 by Barnett and Dalton. In replicating the 1980 study, data are available for a cross sectional study of a selected population. In addition, this replication will provide comparative data that can be used for a longitudinal study on students' perceptions and attitudes toward academic dishonesty at Iowa State University. Although a different sample population was used for the 1983 study, respondents in both studies were classified as freshmen and seniors.

The Barnett and Dalton study involved a computer-generated random sample of 1500 freshmen and seniors enrolled at Iowa State University during the spring term of 1980. Students were surveyed regarding their attitudes and perceptions toward academic dishonesty and reasons they attributed to cheating behaviors by themselves and their peers.

There is substantial evidence to support the contention that the frequency of cheating is increasing in America's colleges and universities (Levin, 1981 and Renaud, 1979). Factors cited as causing this increase include: academic pressure, competition for jobs, higher demands for a college degree, a tight job market and a greater acceptance of academic dishonesty by college students as justifiable means for keeping the "competitive edge" (Baird, 1980, Stafford, 1976, Wright and Kelly, 1974, Schab, 1969 and Parr, 1936).

Cheating is an important issue for colleges and universities because scholarship and learning ultimately rest upon the common acceptance of academic integrity. Yet the problems of academic dishonesty are difficult to control for colleges and universities. There are rampart reports of students selling or stealing exams and companies are selling term papers, book reports and other academic supplements for a profit. Nevertheless, college faculty and administrators are expected to control and minimize cheating as well as provide a system of sanction and counseling when violations occur. Similarly, students are expected to observe stated honor codes and report incidents of cheating violations.

Although the courts have provided some guidelines for cases heard regarding classroom cheating, most, if not all institutions have established some written sanctions for academic dishonesty. These sanctions range from a simple reprimand to expulsion from the university.

The review of the literature for this investigation revealed an increasing concern among faculty and administrators regarding academic dishonesty and the impact that cheating behavior has had upon the academic environment. Therefore, the findings of this study may be helpful in stimulating interest and raising an awareness among students, faculty and administrators about students'

perceptions of what actions constitute cheating, their attitudes toward it and appropriate sanctions for violations.

Equally important, these findings may also be of value to judicial boards, university committees and departmental officers in evaluating and implementing policies and procedures for academic dishonesty. Furthermore, these findings may be useful to such individuals in higher education who are attempting to ascertain a broader perspective on why cheating occurs with such rapidity and how institutions can minimize if not eradicate the problem.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to ascertain how selected variables are related to students' perceptions and attitudes toward cheating. Thus, the following questions will be explored in this study:

1. Have changes occurred in attitudes and perceptions of Iowa State student toward academic dishonesty between 1980 and 1983 when variables such as: college affiliation, classification, sex, residence, grade point average, degree aspirations and size of hometown are considered?

2. Have changes occurred in the frequency of student observed cases of academic dishonesty between 1980 and 1983?
3. Have changes occurred in ISU students' attitudes toward sanctions for academic dishonesty between 1980 and 1983?
4. Have changes occurred in ISU students' definitions of cheating behaviors between 1980 and 1983?

Other questions addressed in this study are:

1. Have students' attitudes and perceptions about cheating at ISU changed during the past three years?
2. What behaviors do ISU students believe constitute cheating?
3. Is cheating a serious problem at Iowa State?
4. What actions would a student take if he or she observed someone cheating?
5. What kind of feeling would a student have toward an observed cheater?

The following hypotheses were developed to respond to these questions:

1. There will be no significant difference in attitudes toward academic dishonesty between the 1980 and 1983 class groups.

2. There will be no significant difference between the 1980 and 1983 class groups' attitudes toward sanctions for academic dishonesty.
3. There will be no significant difference in the definition of cheating behaviors given by the 1980 and 1983 class groups.
4. There will be no significant difference in the observation of cheating by the 1980 and 1983 class groups.
5. There will be no significant difference between the attitudes toward cheating of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups in relation to respondents' college affiliation.
6. There will be no significant difference between the attitudes toward cheating of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups in relation to respondents' classification (year in school).
7. There will be no significant difference between the attitudes toward cheating of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups in relation to respondents' sex.
8. There will be no significant difference between the attitudes toward cheating of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups in relation to respondents' place of residence.

9. There will be no significant difference between the attitudes toward cheating of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups in relation to respondents' grade point average.
10. There will be no significant difference between the attitudes toward cheating of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups in relation to respondents' degree aspirations.
11. There will be no significant difference between the attitudes toward cheating of the combined 1980 and 1983 class group in relation to respondents' size of hometown community.

Limitations of the Study

1. This study will be limited to perceptions of Iowa State University students and may not be representative of the perceptions of students at other institutions.
2. The definition of attitude and perception. The term perception is defined "As the act of extracting information from the environment" (Peterson and Walberg, 1979, p. 215). In a like manner, attitude is used synonymously with perception and is defined by Rokeach (1973, p.

18) as "An organization of several beliefs around a specific object or situation".

3. There were two policy changes that occurred during the 1980 to 1983 period which may have affected students' responses. The Barnett and Dalton questionnaire was administered between March and May of 1980 during which time Iowa State utilized an academic quarter system, while the questionnaire for this investigation was administered in March of 1983 to the selected group of students martriculating under an academic semester system.

During this time period, Iowa State University also changed its grading system. In 1980, students were graded on a four point grading scale where they could receive a grade of 'A', 'B', 'C', 'D', or 'F'. In 1983, all undergraduate students were graded on a scale which utilized the plus and minus system in the four point grading scale.

CHAPTER II

Review of Literature

Introduction

Investigators have identified several factors which help to explain why students engage in academic dishonesty. Based on a comprehensive review of the literature, the six most identifiable factors affecting academic dishonesty are: stress, environment, intelligence, personality characteristics and demographics, cheating definitions, and moral judgement and will. The review will be divided according to each of these areas.

Stress

An investigation of the literature revealed that situations or conditions which intensify stress on a student very often will encourage dishonest behaviors. Pressure for good grades created by parents, professional schools, and the general university milieu were cited by students as the foremost reason for cheating (Baird, 1980, Levin, 1981, Budig, 1979, Keller, 1976, and Schab, 1969). Sixty-one percent of the undergraduate students and 40 percent of the faculty at North Carolina State University cited pressure to maintain eligibility for participation in sports, financial

aid, other activities and employment as reasons for cheating (Stafford, 1976).

Parr (1936) found a higher percentage of cheating among students who engaged in extra-curricular activities. Although he found no relationship between the type of activity students engaged in and cheating, he did find a relationship between cheating and the number of activities in which students participated. For example, 36 percent of the students who engaged in only one activity reported cheating behaviors as compared to 57 percent of the students who engaged in more than four activities. However Baird, (1980) found that students who engaged in a high number of extracurricular activities, (three or more disapproved of academic dishonesty) were more likely to report cheating than those not participating in extracurricular activities. When examining the differences between students who were entirely self-supporting, those partially self-supporting and those not self-supporting, the degree of cheating appeared to be related to the means of financing an education. Individuals responsible for financing their total education (53 percent) cheated more than the two other groups (45 percent of partially self-supporters and 34 percent of non-self supporters).

Title and Rowe (1974) reported that the desire for good grades was related to cheating. They found that subjects needing high points on a series of quizzes in order to receive an expected grade were willing to take greater risks to accomplish their goals. In fact, the students in the class who were doing poorly had a discrepancy between their expected grade and the grade actually earned and they were also less responsive to threats of sanctions. The authors noted that this type of behavior is consistent with the "theory that the greater the utility of an act, the greater the potential punishment required to deter it" (p. 48).

In 1978, Budig surveyed 20 college student body presidents at public institutions with 15,000 students or more. Three-fourths of the presidents reported that students were less pressured to cheat because institutional academic standards were too low. Nevertheless, 8 of the 20 admitted to having cheated on at least one exam during college while two admitted to cheating on a regular basis. In an earlier study conducted by Bowers (1964) of 662 deans and 502 student body presidents revealed somewhat different perceptions. Most student body presidents said that students cheated more because of various forms of pressure.

In a study conducted by Zastrow (1970) on cheating at the graduate level students gave similar reasons for

cheating as undergraduate students. Seventeen out of the forty-five graduate respondents listed pressure to obtain good grades as the number one reason for cheating, while seven listed being unprepared for tests, five noted the desires to impress teachers and/or parents and nine cheated because of their desire to impress peers. Only two people listed peer pressure as a reason to cheat. Zastrow also noted that cheating to make good grades was not solely for academic advancement and future job opportunities, but appeared to have psychological meaning as well. For example, cheating reasons such as "fear of self-devaluation in competition and lack of confidence in ones own abilities suggests that students judge, to some extent, their abilities by grades received in competition with other students" (p. 159).

In spite of the widespread recognition that students feel pressure to achieve, Barnett and Dalton (1981) concluded that faculty often do not recognize the actual pressure a student endures. Nor does there appear to be an agreement in the perception of the amount of cheating between students and administrators. When deans and student body presidents were asked to give a rough estimate of the percentage of cheating taking place at their particular institution, the deans estimated that 15 percent of the

student body cheated while the student body presidents estimated 20 percent (Bowers, 1964). Bowers concluded that this difference could be based on the fact that students are more likely to hear about cheating incidents and have actually observed the act of cheating. Another study conducted by Jenson (1972) cited differences between faculty and students regarding ways offenses for plagiarism should be adjudicated. Surprisingly, however there was no significant difference between these two groups in handling offenses for academic dishonesty using crib notes. Steininger, Johnson and Kirts (1964) also presented data which strongly suggests that students feelings and attitudes toward cheating are quite different from that of faculty and administrators.

Stress resulting from Excessively difficult tests was mentioned by Steininger, Johnson and Kirts (1964) as a reason for the increase in cheating behaviors. Although they did not cite correlations between difficult and easy tests, students had greater guilt feelings toward cheating on hard tests. Likewise, Woods (1957) found that specific cheating factors were related to work that was too difficult and work that was too easy.

Test anxiety has also been shown to be associated with cheating. Findings from Heisler's study (1974) revealed a higher degree of cheating among subjects with high test

anxiety as compared to students with lower levels of test anxiety as measured by the Test Anxiety Scale. Similarly, Smith, Regen and Diggins (1972) found that self-reported frequencies of cheating had a positive correlation with test anxiety as measured by the Test Anxiety Questionnaire.

Test anxiety caused by fear of failure or negative evaluation was also found to be associated with cheating (Jacobson, Berger and Milliham, 1970 and Houston, 1978). Houston (1978) conducted an experiment using two conditions--success and failure. In the success condition, subjects were told that they had not done well and if their performace did not improve on the second test, they would not earn extra credits. Findings revealed that more cheating occurred following success than failure. In contrast to these findings, Bronzaft, Stuart and Blum's study (1973) found cheating to be unrelated to test anxiety when subjects were measured by the Alper and Harber's Achievement Anxiety Test.

Nuss (1981) found cheating associated with exams to be more serious than cheating on homework or term papers. Budig (1979) reported that the student body presidents surveyed thought that more students cheated on minor quizzes than on major exams and more were cautious about cheating on term papers because plagiarism was easier to detect and

prove. Even so, Knowlton and Homerlynch (1967) noted that a large number of students considered cheating on examinations as "playing the game with the professor."

Smith, Regen and Diggins (1971) administered three instruments to 44 male and 68 female undergraduates to determine cheating behaviors. They were: the group thematic appreceptive measure of need for achievement, a test anxiety questionnaire and a questionnaire on cheating. The results revealed that cheating pressures were somewhat different between the sexes. The three strongest external sources of pressure for men were:

1. Requirements for graduate school
2. Competition for grades
3. Large work loads

Whereas, external sources for women were:

1. Large work loads
2. Insufficient time to study
3. Competition among students

These researchers also found that men experienced more pressure to cheat because of long term vocational goals.

In the same study, it was reported that students with lower grades expressed more pressure to cheat than students with higher grades. Similar findings were reported by Jacobson, Berger and Milliham (1970). They found that

subjects who initially thought they would succeed and later realized they would not, cheated more than those students who expected to succeed. It is noteworthy that Frymier (1960) also found differences between faculty and students regarding their perception of cheating. Faculty were more severe in labeling an incident of cheating.

According to Wright and Kelly (1974), 14 percent of the faculty members thought that cheating could be justified under certain conditions. Steininger, Johnson and Kirts (1964) reported that subjects found cheating to be more justified in negative situations. The subjects reported a greater urge to cheat in larger proportion if they were under negative pressure to perform.

A further review of the literature revealed a relationship between the style of the teacher and the number of occurrences of cheating behavior. Skirt and Hoffman (1961) stated that authoritarian teachers caused students to cheat more, while Montor (1971) found that negative attitudes of teachers toward inquisitive students were factors in encouraging some of them to cheat.

Students who considered a professor to be a poorly organized teacher reported more anxiety toward obtaining grades (Steininger, Johnson and Kirts, 1964). Furthermore, students cheated less when they were allowed to express

opinions about their work and were not tested by totalitarian procedures (Weldon, 1966). Montor (1971) also found that some students viewed grading on the curve as an inducement to cheating since poor students would have to cheat more under such a system to obtain a satisfactory grade.

Environment

Research conducted to determine the relationship between the environment and academic dishonesty revealed that some correlation does exit. Cheating appeared to flourish when the environment was less structured and supervised. The professor's leaving the room during an examination encouraged more cheating (Steininger, Johnson and Kirts, 1964); students' observing others cheating without being caught increased cheating (Ludeman, 1938); dissatisfying classroom situations were judged by students as producing a greater amount of cheating (Johnson and Klores, 1968); large classrooms and crowded classes contributed to cheating (Stafford, 1976 and Budig, 1979) and a lack of sufficient monitors or proctors increased cheating (Stafford, 1976). Stafford also noted that approximately one-fourth of the students and faculty surveyed reported that regardless of classroom situations or other conditions, a certain percentage of students would still cheat.

Six primary conditions under which cheating flourished were described by Houston (1976):

1. Multiple choice exams in large, crowded conditions with an inadequate number of proctors.
2. Limited secretarial assistance in preparing multiple forms.
3. Pervading emphasis on grades.
4. Use of a limited number of exams.
5. Opinions among students that 'everyone cheats'.
6. Absence of apprehension of cheater.

A review of the literature consistently revealed that students most often do not assume the responsibility for reporting cheating violators due to peer pressure and other factors. Bowers (1964) reported that students considered reporting someone for a cheating violation worse than cheating although most disapproved of cheating. On the other hand, Barnett and Dalton (1981) reported in their study that both faculty and students disagreed with the statement; "Reporting someone for cheating is worse than cheating".

However, Wright and Kelly (1974) reported that of 108 faculty respondents, only 7 percent indicated that students reported other students for cheating directly to them. Barnett and Dalton (1981) found that one student out of 802

said he or she would report someone for cheating. Similarly, Baird (1980) reported that 41 percent of the respondents indicated that they would not be disturbed and would not do anything if they observed someone cheating, whereas, 40 percent would be disturbed, but would do nothing. Baird also reported that only 1 percent of the respondents indicated they would report a cheating incident. On the contrary, Williams (1969) found that 26 out of 37 students responded "yes" to the question "Would you be willing to speak in a Christian way to someone whom you observed cheating concerning this cheating".

Previous studies have indicated that the moral climate of the institution and the severity of sanctions for academic dishonesty influence the amount of cheating. Schools that reported a climate of strong peer disapproval of cheating showed lower levels of cheating than schools that had a weak climate of peer disapproval for cheating (Bowers, 1964). Bowers further noted that schools where students were primarily responsible for handling dishonesty cases showed lower levels of cheating compared to schools where faculty were primary responsible or where both students and faculty were responsible. Contrary to Bowers' findings, Knowlton and Homerlynch (1967) found this type of judicial system to be unpopular in two different student

bodies. However, students would prefer a system where faculty are responsible for doing the "police work" and students serving as "trial judges".

As early as 1936, Atkins and Atkins reported that a good emotional tone in the classroom and appropriate instructions about not cheating before an exam and cheating sanctions led to less cheating. Likewise, Fischer (1970) examined five classroom situations to deter cheating:

1. A "control condition" - Instructions were given for the test.
2. An "informative appeal for honesty condition" - Instructions were given for the test and students were asked to be honest as their test results could help the teacher assess her teaching techniques.
3. A "Public affirmation of value condition" - A previous discussion on cheating was held and students asked to state why they would not cheat.
4. A "Value-relevant threat of punishment condition" - Students were told before the exam that if caught cheating, they would have to write a sentence 50 times about cheating.
5. A "Non-value-relevant threat of punishment Condition" - Students were told the punishment

for cheating would be to write repetitious numbers".

Fischer also reported that conditions which threatened the punishment of subjects if cheating were detected appeared equally as effective as non-punishment conditions. Students who had the greatest fear of action taken by faculty discipline committee or honor court were most likely not to engage in behaviors defined as illegal (Bonjean and McGee, 1965). On the contrary, Title and Rowe (1974) found that the fear of sanctions (punishment) had a greater influence on classroom honesty than did simple trust or moral appeal. Vitro and Schoer (1972) reported that the highest incidence of cheating occurred among students who were unlikely to get caught. Hence, Ludeman (1938) posited that students cheated because they saw others get away with it.

The size of the institution and the composition of the student body were found to be associated with the level of cheating occurring. Bowers (1964) reported that larger schools had higher cheating levels than smaller schools while coed schools reported more cheating than either all women's or all men's schools.

Studies on the use of honor codes as means of reducing cheating behaviors revealed conflicting results. Williams

(1969) indicated that only 9 out of the 37 students surveyed believed that an honor code would reduce cheating on their campus, while 19 thought it would promote cheating. Ackerman (1971) reported a higher incidence of cheating during an honor test than a regular test. At Brigham Young University, Canning (1956) found that cheating was reduced after the implementation of an honor system. He reported that in 1948, one year before the honor system, 81 percent of the subjects cheated, while 41 percent of the subjects cheated during the introduction and revision of the honor system (1949-1953). A further follow up indicated that 30 percent of the subjects cheated after the honor system had been inaugurated for five years. Likewise, Bowers (1964) reported lower rates of dishonesty at schools with an honor system.

A negative correlation between the severity of an institution's academic policy and the amount of cheating was found by Astin (1968). Nonetheless, Uhlig and Howes (1967) found that a permissive environment produced more cheating. This supports Budig's (1979) findings that 16 out of 20 student body presidents, believed that it was easy to cheat at their institution, and penalities were not severe enough to deter this type of behavior.

In a like manner, Sherrill, Salisbury, Horowitz and Friedman (1971) found that 32 percent of their subjects cheated on all three of the exams administered because of cheating opportunities, whereas, findings by Williams (1969) revealed that cheating did not increase regardless of the number of opportunities available to students.

In order to cope with cheating behaviors, Singhal and Johnson (1983) suggested that the environment for testing be designed to make copying and other types of cheating more difficult. They recommended the following steps in alleviating student cheating:

1. Spread out students - Normally this is possible only in sparsely filled classrooms. For crowded classrooms, two different examinations presented on two different colors of paper may be distributed to students. Seat the students to alternate the colors, thus avoiding direct copying.
2. Proctor examination closely - Both instructors and teaching assistants should be present during in-class examinations. They should carefully scan materials placed on the floor and check for possible desk etchings. Proctoring is one of the most effective methods for reducing in-class cheating.

3. Allow no student communication - Talking out loud or even asking questions of the instructor should not be allowed after the examination has started. Questions may inadvertently give hints to answers and distract other students. Certainly there should be no borrowing of calculators among students.
4. Examination pickup - Test papers should be left "insitu" when students leave the room, the instructor should pick up the examination answer sheets in the sequence of rows. This prevents students from switching papers and leaves a record of a student's "neighbors" in case wandering eyes are suspected. The answer sheet should then be graded by selecting one problem at a time. A cheater who has copied the wrong solution from a neighbor is easily detected.
5. Packaging of examinations - Answer sheets should be bound or stapled with all needed scratch paper prior to handling them out to students. No scratch paper should be used by students since paper may contain equations or other pertinent information which could be used to an unfair advantage during exams.

6. Student identifications - Students should be asked to bring identification to examination halls and display it on the desks. Instructors and proctors can check to verify that the students have not "substituted" other students to take their examinations".

Intelligence

The majority of studies relating intelligence and cheating indicated that students with lower intelligence or achievement levels cheated more often. Woods (1957) found that honest students tended to be more intelligent. Drake's (1941) study of 126 university women students revealed that of all students caught cheating, none received As, four percent received Bs, 23 percent received Cs, 75 percent received Ds and 67 percent received Fs. He found that out of the 126 subjects, none of the 30 who cheated scored in the highest quartile on the freshman intelligence test; nine were found in the second quarter; with six in the third quarter; and 15 in the fourth quarter. Interestingly, his study supported other studies which found cheating to be more prevalent among subjects with lower intelligence levels.

Hetherington and Feldman (1964) created three different examination situations where subjects (39 males and 39 females) had the opportunity to cheat. Each subject had

previously taken a battery of tests: Concept Mastery Test (CMT), the California Personality Inventory (CPI), the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS), and the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI). Findings revealed that more cheating occurred among subjects with lower intelligence and lower grades.

Vitro and Shoer (1972) noted that cheating was more prevalent among students with lower grades and Smith, Regen and Diggins (1971) found that students with lower grades felt more pressure to avoid a poor grade than those with higher grades and therefore cheated more frequently. Vitro (1971) found cheating to be more prevalent among subjects with lower grade point averages. Canning (1956) also found that given the opportunity to do so, "poorer" students raised their test scores in order to gain more points compared to "better" students. Baird's (1980) study on cheating and college trends found that students in good academic standing cheated less than students with lower grades. Similarly, Bonjean and McGee (1965) found that students with a grade point average of "C" engaged more in situations described as cheating than students with a higher average. Furthermore, Parr (1936) collected data which showed that subjects who graduated in the upper one-third of their class cheated less than those who ranked in the middle

group. No comparison was made between these two groups and those subjects who ranked in the lower third of their class. In a study, Gross (1946) reported that the mean IQ of those identified as cheaters was slightly higher than that of non-cheaters.

A further review of the literature revealed findings indicating a correlation between intelligence levels and cheating. Hoff (1940) found a .32 correlation between IQ and honesty, thus indicating that slower students tended to cheat more than brighter students. Comparatively, Kanfer and Dverfeldt (1968) indicated that lower achieving students cheated more often than did higher achieving students. A correlation of -.50 was found between cheating and IQ, with IQ increasing to -.60 when age effects were eliminated (Hartshorne and May, 1928). These researchers also found a positive correlation between IQ and honesty. In addition, Hartshorne, May and Shuttleworth (1930) found a strong relationship between honesty and consistency in behavior. They found that honest people tended to be consistent in their behavior while dishonest people tended to be inconsistent in their behavior. Likewise, Burton's model (1963) indicated a positive correlation between honesty and intelligence. In Burton's model, a stronger relationship existed between intelligence and behavioral honesty than

consistency and intelligence. However, he noted that the relationship between consistency and intelligence tended to disappear when honesty was partialed out. Nevertheless, the relationship between IQ and honesty continued to show a relationship when controlling for consistency.

Negative correlations between intelligence and cheating were also cited by Johnson and Gormly (1971). They found that reducing the risk of cheating also reduced the relationship between IQ and non-cheating.

Ellenburg found that approximately one-half of the students who cheated had GPAs of 85 or more and one-half had GPAs below 85. Based on these data, he concluded that cheating was not confined to one particular group. Comparatively, Wilkinson (1973) found that students with higher intellectual levels, as measured by the Scholastic Aptitude Test Verbal Scores, cheated more than students with lower intellectual levels. Similarly, Mulcahy's (1967) study failed to show any difference between cheating and non-cheating behaviors of subjects with high or low scores on a verbal (written) measure of attitude toward cheating. Likewise, Williams (1969) found that cheating did not necessarily occur among the students in the lower half of the grading scale. Johnson and Gormly (1971) also found no significant difference between cheaters and non-cheaters on grade point averages or test scores.

In summary, studies conducted by Baird (1980), Vitro and Shoer (1972), Vitro (1971), Smith, Regen and Diggins (1971), Bonjean and McGee (1965), Hetherington and Feldman (1964), Woods (1957), Canning (1956) and Gross revealed support for the concept that those with lower intelligence levels cheated more often. On the opposite side, however, studies by Ellenburg (1973), Wilkinson (1973), Johnson and Gormly (1971), Williams (1969) and Mulcahy (1967) revealed no significant differences between the amount of cheating and intelligence level.

Personality Characteristics and Demographics

Several investigators reported on personality differences between cheaters and non-cheaters. Milliham's (1974) study examined the relationship of two components, sex and need for approval, to cheating following both success and failure. He found that cheaters had a significantly higher need for approval score than non-cheaters. Only one subject cheated following success and seventeen cheated following failure. An earlier study by Milliham (1972) supported these findings. He found that subjects who cheated following failure had a higher total evlauative dependence score (avoid negative evaluation) than subjects who did not cheat. Similar findings were noted in a related study conducted by Jacobson, Beyer and Milliham (1970). Subjects who scored high in need for approval

cheated more readily because they were more concerned about the negative evaluation associated with poor performance.

McIntire (1968) found that cheaters had a lower need for achievement as measured by the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, and a higher score on the Mood Scale of the Minnesota Counseling Inventory. Shelton (1971) found that failure lead to more cheating by subjects after being told their peers had done well on a raygun shooting gallery game. Moreover, Crowne and Marlowe (1964) reported that subjects who had a high need for approval as measured by a social desirability scale cheated more often. Cheating was found to be high for those subjects who scored poorly on the Brown-Holtzman Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes (Riley, 1967). In a like manner, Vitro's and Schoer's (1972) study investigated cheating on tests using situational conditions: high or low probability of test success, high or low risk of detection, and high or low test importance. Their findings revealed that:

1. Probability of success had a significant influence on cheating when combined with high importance and low risk of detection and with low importance and high risk, but not when combined with high importance and high risk and low importance and low risk.

2. Risk had a significant influence on cheating only when combined significant with any of the other combinations of importance and probability of success.
3. Importance had a significant effect on cheating when combined with high risk and low probability of success and with low risk and low probability of success. The effects of these two combinations were, however, in opposite directions. The effect of importance was not significant when combined with high risk and high probability of success and with low risk and high probability of success (p. 274)".

Furthermore, following a failure on a line puzzle subjects described their feelings as being depressed.

Contradictory studies to these findings were also found. Wilkinson (1973) found that subjects' self-actualization (as defined by the Personality Orientation Inventory) was not related to the student's behavior on the test. Likewise, scores on the Fear of Negative Evaluation Scale revealed less cheating among subjects high in concern for negative evaluation compared to subjects who were less concerned about a negative evaluation (Dickstein, Montoya and Neitlich 1977). Houston (1978) also reported that

subjects who anticipated success cheated more than sujects who anticipated failure. In addition, subjects in the study conducted by Houston and Ziff (1976) were informed that if they performed above average on free recall tasks, they would receive extra credits. After the first trial, half of the subjects were told based on their initial score they would have very few problems in scoring above average. The other half of the subjects were told they had scored well below the average and unless performance improved they would probably fail. Findings revealed that the subjects who were told they could possibly receive extra credits cheated more than subjects who were told they would probably fail.

Investigators have also studied the relationship between sorority and fraternity membership and cheating behaviors. Data collected by Baird (1980) on current trends in college cheating revealed that sorority-fraternity membership affected both the incidence and method of academic dishonesty. Earlier related studies conducted by Bonjean and McGee (1965), Drake (1941) and Parr (1936) also found cheating to be more prevalent among sorority-fraternity members than non-members. Parr found very little difference between dishonesty of fraternity members (47 percent) and non-fraternity members (43 percent). However, noteworthy differences were found between sorority members and non-sorority members who cheated. Forty-four percent of

the sorority members cheated compared to 33 percent of non-sorority members.

Harp and Taietz (1966) found that after controlling for intellectual orientation, cheating was higher among fraternity members when compared to non-members. However, Stannard's and Bowers' (1970) study on college fraternities revealed another perspective on fraternity membership. These investigators found that in spite of a higher degree of cheating among fraternity members than non-members, "the fraternity is serving as a legitimate opportunity structure for meeting academic demands by providing acceptable 'short cuts' to improved academic performance" (p. 371).

The relationship between the sex of the student and the incidence of cheating was of primary concern to other investigators as well. In their pioneering research, Hartshorne and May (1928) reported no significant differences in cheating between the sexes. Later research findings by Houston (1983), Wilkinson (1973), Jacobson, Berger and Milliham (1970), David (1967), Garfield, Cohen and Roth (1967) and Black (1962) supported these findings.

Garfield, Cohen and Roth (1967) found no significant correlations between cheating and sex, and Steininger (1968) reported no difference between male and felmale attitude toward justification for cheating. Similarly, David's

(1967) study utilizing the Barron's ES Scale found no differences in cheating between males and females.

Baird's data (1980) revealed the following results: males respondents cheated on more types of tests, employed a variety of methods for cheating and cheated in more of their courses than female respondents. Burch (1968) allowed students to grade their own test papers after they had been photocopied and found that females cheated less than males. In their study, Kelly and Worell (1978) gave their subjects and opportunity to falsify self-reported scores on a task consisting of tweleve problems. Findings revealed that 24 percent of the male subjects cheated compared to 16.3 percent of the female subjects.

But overall the review of literature indicated that the degree of cheating among females is somewhat less than that of males. Research in support of this overall view included studies conducted by Baird (1980), Renaud (1979), Kelly and Worell (1978), Jenson (1972), Smith, Regen and Diggins (1972), Schab (1969), Burch (1968), Feldman and Feldman (1967), Walsh (1967) and Anderson (1957). However, one study conducted by Canning in 1956 revealed that women lied more than men.

In surveying students about how they would handle selected disciplinary situations, Jenson found a significant

difference between the sexes. Females requested more severity in handling plagiarism offenses than males. Likewise, Uhlig and Howes (1967) asked subjects to respond to 28 situations on a five point Likert scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. They also found females to have more strict attitudes toward cheating than males. Anderson (1957) also noted women had more strict feelings toward cheating than men. Similarly, Roskens and Dizney (1966) reported that males expressed fewer concerns about cheating than females. Moreover, Schab (1969) in a study of 794 girls and 835 boys revealed that males admitted cheating more often than females.

In relation to sex difference and need for approval, females cheaters scored higher on both the attribution and denial components of need for approval compared to non-cheating females. They also had a higher score on attribution component than male cheaters. Nonetheless, male cheaters scores were significantly higher for the denial component of need for approval than non-cheating males. Overall, no significant difference was found between the sexes in the number of subjects that cheated following failure. Johnson and Gormly (1971) reported that the tendency for cheating was lower among females motivated toward high achievement, while males with a similar tendency exhibited a greater tendency to cheat.

There appeared to be some conflicting findings between the relationship of age and the amount of cheating reported by researchers. According to Black (1962) and Wilkinson (1973), the age of the student did not appear to have any effect on the tendency of the student to cheat. Earlier studies conducted by Hartshorne and May (1928) and Parr (1936) revealed that older students considered cheating to be more serious and cheated less than younger students.

A relationship was found between cheating and the students' classification (year in school), college affiliation, place of residence and hometown (Baird, 1980). His investigation of the frequency of college cheating revealed a significant difference between year in school and cheating behaviors. Of the groups surveyed, 18 percent of the juniors; 11.3 percent of the seniors; 2 percent sophomores and 5.7 percent freshmen had never cheated in high school or college. Baird also found that year in school was related to certain cheating styles. Sophomores were more likely to cheat on unit tests, whereas, seniors were more likely to cheat on final exams. Unlike other classifications, freshmen were less likely to involve others in their dishonesty.

In examining the incidence of term paper cheating, Harp and Taietz (1966) found significant differences based on the

students' college affiliation. Forty-two percent of the students enrolled in Agriculture, 50 percent of the students enrolled in Engineering and 26 percent of the students enrolled in Arts and Sciences engaged in this type of cheating. However, term paper cheating was high for juniors and seniors in all colleges. On the contrary, Jenson (1972) found no significant difference in handling dishonest offenses based on the students' academic college.

Jension (1972) reported that seniors and students living in the residence halls were more severe in how they would adjudicate plagiarism offenses than juniors, sophomore, freshmen and off-campus students. In addition, Bonjean and McGee (1965) reported that students from urban areas were most likely to engage in situations classified as cheating compared to students from rural areas. Contrary to this, Parr (1936) found that students from smaller towns (71 percent) were more dishonest when compared to those from larger towns (43 percent).

An investigation of the literature revealed that cheaters were often good but over ambitious students (Boodish, 1962), generally had parents who punished them severely or not at all (Vitro, 1971) and were more neurotic than non-cheaters (Campell, 1933 and Hetherington and Feldman, 1964). Johnson and Gormly (1971) conducted a study

on a Navy ROTC class and found that cheaters held more leadership positions, planned to be career officers and belonged to more clubs than non-cheaters.

Zastrow's (1970) research appeared to be the only study reviewed which found no personality difference between cheaters and non-cheaters. This may be related to the fact that Zastrow studied only graduate students.

For the most part, differences in personality characteristics and demographics of cheaters and non-cheaters were revealed through the research reviewed.

Cheating Behavior Definitions

A review of the literature regarding definitions of cheating revealed that faculty and students were not in agreement regarding all factors that were identified as cheating behaviors. According to Barnett and Dalton, "Cheating is a term typically used to refer to a wide variety of behaviors considered to be unethical" (1980, p. 548). Cheating is a term which appears to mean many different things to different individuals and has caused confusion in what behaviors actually constitute cheating.

In a study conducted regarding the student and faculty definition of cheating by Wright and Kelly (1974), 81 percent of the faculty and 51 percent of the students disagreed that using the same materials from outside sources

without citing reference was cheating. In a similar study conducted by Frymier (1960), it was reported that more students than faculty agreed with the statements that "Writing down formula when first enter room so will not forget" and "using the same term paper for two courses" (p. 119) to be cheating.

Findings of research studies support the conflicting views regarding the definition of cheating. Uhlig and Howes (1967) suggested that students were confused about what is considered to be dishonest behavior. According to Montor (1971), students cheated because they did not know why it was wrong. Barnett and Dalton (1981) found that a negative relationship existed between those acts of cheating that students said occurred frequently, and those acts defined as cheating by a large percentage of students. They concurred that "the more students feel a particular cheating behavior occurs, the less likely it is that they will view it as academic dishonesty" (p. 549).

Evidence was presented in the literature which strongly supported a lack of agreement on the definition of cheating.

Moral Judgement and Will

"Recent work by Kohlberg studying the development of the structure of moral thought has offered new perspectives for understanding the nature of moral behavior and hence of

cheating" (Leming, 1978, p. 214). A review of the literature revealed that several investigators have used Kohlberg's moral development stages, Pre-Convention Level (level 1), Convention Level (level 2), and Post-Conventional, Autonomous, or Principled Level (level 3), in investigating cheating and moral development. Leming (1978) utilized the Hartshorne and May Circle Test to detect cheating behavior among subjects under two situations: (a) high threat--high supervision and low threat--low supervision. In order to assess the level of moral development and cheating, Rest's Defining Issues Test was used. Leming's (1978) findings revealed that subjects in low threat--low supervision and subjects in high moral development were just as likely to cheat as subjects low in moral development.

Schwartz, Feldman, Braum and Heitgartner (1969) used Kohlberg's stages of moral dilemmas to rate subjects, then gave them an opportunity to cheat. Results indicated that 53 percent of the freshmen males rated at levels of two and four cheated, while only 17 percent of those rated at levels five or above cheated. Hersche, Paolitto and Reimer (1979) cited a study of college students which found that 40 percent of those at levels three and four cheated, but only 11 percent cheated at levels five and six. These findings

somewhat paralleled with Schwartz, Feldman, Braum and Heitgartner's results.

Nuss (1981) administered Rest's Defining Issues Test and her own Survey of Academic Dishonesty to 146 undergraduate students at the University of Maryland to assess their attitudes about moral development and academic dishonesty. She found a slight relationship between the students' stage of moral development and their views of academic dishonesty and an inverse relationship between their participation in academic dishonesty and no relationship between their stage of moral development and participation.

Research indicated that cheating is more prevalent when students do not understand the relationship between cheating and morality. Boodish (1962) found that some cheaters could not see a relationship between cheating and morality and a study by Uhlig and Howes (1967) revealed that students cheated because they were confused about what is considered dishonest behavior.

In general, studies in this area revealed significant relationships between cheating and morality.

CHAPTER III

Methodology

This chapter presents information on the development of the survey instrument, selection of the sample size, preparation of the data, and statistical procedures used for data analysis and recommendations. This is a replication of the study conducted in 1980 by Barnett and Dalton on freshmen and seniors' perceptions of academic dishonesty at Iowa State University.

Survey Instrument

The 1983 study utilized the identical questionnaire, "Iowa State University Student Survey on Academic Dishonesty", developed and administered in 1980 by Barnett and Dalton. The research design for this study utilized the same questionnaire to provide institutional data that may serve as a benchmark for future longitudinal research on academic dishonesty at Iowa State University.

In addition, the utilization of the 1980 questionnaire, without modifications, for the 1983 study provided comparative questions for data regarding student's perceptions of academic dishonesty at Iowa State University during the three year period. These data will help to ascertain if changes in student's perceptions had occurred

and if so, in what areas. Both studies were conducted during the spring term.

The 1980 study conducted by Barnett and Dalton was prompted by the increasing numbers of academic dishonesty cases reported to the Dean of Student Life Office, and the perceived differences noted between faculty and students regarding sanctions for academic dishonesty.

Barnett and Dalton designed their instrument to assess perceptions of academic dishonesty at Iowa State University. Specifically, they focused on how these perceptions were related to attitudes about sanctions used for academic dishonesty, attitudes toward observing someone cheat, definitions of cheating behaviors and selected demographic characteristics. Literature on academic dishonesty served as the guideline in developing questions for this instrument.

After gathering questions for the instrument, Barnett and Dalton grouped questions into perceived categories of: attitudes toward academic dishonesty, attitudes about sanctions for academic dishonesty, observations of academic dishonesty, and definitions of cheating behaviors. After completion and subsequent revision, a formal "Iowa State University Student Survey on Academic Dishonesty" was printed.

The questionnaire consisted of 75 Likert-type response items and multiple choice items designed to obtain students perceptions regarding cheating definitions, disciplinary sanctions, observations of cheating, cheating frequencies, and environmental factors affecting cheating. In addition, demographic information was obtained regarding college affiliation, classification (year in school), sex, greek affiliation, place of residence, grade point average (G.P.A.), degree aspirations, size of hometown and educational level of parent. A copy of the survey may be found in Appendix A.

Survey research using the questionnaire method discussed by Borg and Gall (1983) was employed. According to Borg and Gall (1983), "the first step in carrying out a satisfactory questionnaire study is to list specific objective to be achieved by the questionnaire . . . a questionnaire dealing with attitudes must generally be constructed as an attitude scale and must use a number of items in order to obtain a reasonable picture of attitude concerned (p. 423).

This investigator for the 1983 study met with the investigators for the 1980 study:

1. To assess the purpose of the study.

2. To assess how the questions were derived for the instrument.
3. To assess how the sample size was determined and selected.
4. To assess the importance of replicating the study.

The present investigator conducted statistical tests on both data sets utilizing:

1. Chi-square procedures.
2. Frequency counts.
3. Factor analysis.
4. Reliability test.

Selection of the Sample Size

In order to compare the perceptions about academic dishonesty on the part of students entering ISU and those who are completing their undergraduate program, freshmen and seniors were selected as the population for this study. Also freshmen and seniors groups were used because cross sectional and longitudinal studies conducted on the differences between freshmen and senior attitudes about: career preparation, educational goals, interpersonal adjustments, area of study, orientation to post-college life, social orientation and values have revealed significant variations between these two groups (Huntley

1965, Miller 1959, Lehmann 1963, McClintock and Turner 1962, Corey 1936).

Freshmen and senior respondents also provided a better isolation of differences in class ranks, and provided a comparison of changes in attitudes over a longer period of time. The cost estimate for sampling all classifications proved to be prohibitive and therefore the investigator decided not to pursue additional class ranks.

The selection of the sample size employed the simple random sampling methods discussed by Borg and Gall (1983, p.244). Where . . ."all individuals in the defined population have equal and independent chances of being selected as a member of the sample." The random sample for both data sets were drawn by the ISU Registrar's office. The samples for the 1980 data were selected from a population of 4523 freshmen and 4985 seniors enrolled in the spring of 1980. A program was written instructing the computer to randomly select every fourth name in each class group to derive at a sampling size of 1500 freshmen and seniors. The sample size for the 1983 data was selected from a population of 4938 freshmen and 5714 seniors enrolled in the spring of 1983. Again, a program was written instructing the computer to random select 750 individuals from each class group for a total sample of 1500 individuals.

Since both samples were drawn from a heterogenous population, large sampling sizes were needed to minimize error and to have the value of the sample mean be near the population mean. In addition, a study of this nature had not been conducted at ISU, and therefore, it was considered to be an exploratory study and thus required a larger population sample.

Copies of the survey instrument and the cover letter were submitted to the ISU Human Research Committee for approval of the study. This committee concluded that the project protected the rights and welfare of the human subjects being surveyed. Therefore, approval to conduct the research was granted on February 6, 1983.

The first mailing of the 1983 questionnaire was completed late March of 1983. This mailing included a preaddressed postage paid envelope along with a cover letter explaining the purpose of the study and requesting their participation (Appendix B). By early April, 859 surveys were received (60 percent response rate). A second mailing to non-respondents was done which included another copy of the same questionnaire, preaddressed, postage paid envelope with a different cover letter (Appendix C). A total of 1059 surveys (71 percent) were obtained of which thirty-nine were eliminated due to a high number of unanswered questions and

defaced surveys. This resulted in a 69 percent response rate for the survey. Data for the 1980 study were based on 820 surveys which represented 55 percent of the population.

Treatment of the Data

Returned questionnaires for both data sets were coded and key punched by the ISU Student Affairs Research office. Limited frequency runs were made on the 1980 data on questions regarding the definition of cheating behaviors and attitudes toward cheating. Additional statistical runs were made on the 1983 data which consisted of frequency counts, percentages, a chi-square test, a reliability test and factor analysis.

Several minor errors were detected and corrected and the 1983 data were put on a tape along with the data collected in 1980.

Since the primary purpose of the study was to ascertain the perceptions of academic dishonesty of freshmen and seniors at ISU, responses received from all other classifications were eliminated. Thus, the number of useable responses for both surveys decreased. In 1980, 381 freshmen and 411 seniors returned the survey questionnaire which resulted in a total of 792 respondents for a 53 percent return rate. Comparatively, in 1983, 468 freshmen and 543 seniors returned surveys resulting in a total response of 1011 respondents for a 67 percent return rate.

Statistical Procedures of the Survey

The variables used in both studies were nominal (qualitative) therefore, the non-parametric chi-square test was used to compare the class groups surveyed and to test the stated hypotheses.

This statistical test was used to determine if certain selected variables: college affiliation; classification (year in school); sex; residence; grade point average; degree aspiration and size of hometown were significantly related to attitudes and perceptions about cheating by the population studied. This test was further used to ascertain if changes had occurred in relation to 1980 and 1983 class groups' attitudes toward academic dishonesty, attitudes toward sanctions for cheating, observations of cheating and definition of cheating behaviors.

Factor analysis, with varimax rotation was used to determine if the selected variables: attitudes, sanctions, observations and definitions were consistently grouped into four categories (Refer to Table 82). A reliability test, using Cronbach's alpha method, was used on both data sets to determine if the questionnaire was a reliable instrument and yield consistent results.

For those hypotheses needing chi-square treatment, if the computed value exceeded the critical value found in the

statistical tables (Ott, 1977, p. 660), the null hypotheses was rejected. If the computed value was less than the table value, the null hypotheses was accepted. A single asterisk (*) was used to denote significant differences at the .05 level and double asterisks (**) were used to denote significant differences at the .01 level.

Statistical results were used to present findings and to make recommendations about academic dishonesty and its effect on an institution of higher learning.

CHAPTER IV

Results and Discussion

This study was undertaken to determine if any changes had occurred in the attitudes and perceptions of Iowa State University's freshmen and seniors regarding academic dishonesty during a three year period. This study was a replication of a study conducted in 1980 by Barnett and Dalton. An identical survey instrument was utilized for data collection.

Data were collected and analyzed by comparing the responses of two groups: freshmen and seniors enrolled during the academic year, 1980, and freshmen and seniors enrolled during the academic year, 1983. This procedure resulted in a total sample size of 1803 (792 respondents in 1980 and 1011 respondents in 1983) ISU students.

Data were tested and analyzed by using chi-square analyses, frequencies, percentages, factor analyses and reliability procedures. The results of these procedures are presented in this chapter under the following categories: demographics, testing of the hypotheses, factor analysis and reliability of the instrument.

Demographic Characteristics

The demographic characteristics selected to compare the respondents' perceptions and attitudes regarding academic dishonesty were: college affiliation, classification (year in school), sex, place of residence, grade point average, degree aspirations, and size of hometown. The largest percentage of the 1803 respondents were from the College of Engineering (21 percent in 1980 and 26 percent in 1983), whereas, the College of Agriculture had the second largest percentage of respondents (16 percent in 1980 and 1983). Total respondents from the College of Science and Humanities, with majors in Natural/Mathematical Sciences and Humanities, were 28 percent in 1980 and 1983. The smallest percentage of respondents were from the College of Veterinary Medicine (0.1 percent in 1980 and 2 percent in 1983).

Percentage wise, there were slightly more seniors than freshmen in both class groups (52 percent as compared to 48 percent in 1980 and 54 percent as compared to 46 percent in 1983). Females comprised the majority of the population, (55 percent in 1980 and 60 percent in 1983). The largest percentage of respondents resided in university housing (58 percent in 1980 and 57 percent in 1983), while the smallest percentage resided in Greek housing (12 percent in 1980 and

10 percent in 1983). Approximately one-third of the respondents resided in off-campus housing (30 percent in 1980 and 33 percent in 1983). The highest percentage of the respondents had a cumulative grade point average between 2.00 and 2.99 (55 percent in 1980 and 1983), whereas, the second highest percentage of respondents had a cumulative grade point average between 3.00 and 4.00 (40 percent in 1980 and 36 percent in 1983). The lowest percentage of respondents had a cumulative grade point average ranging from 1.99 to 1.74 or below (5.6 percent in 1980 and 9.8 percent in 1983). Most of the respondents intended to complete the bachelor's degree only (62 percent in 1980 and 64 percent in 1983), and approximately one-fourth planned to complete the master's degree (25 percent in 1980 and 22 percent in 1983).

Respondents were mainly from a rural farm, open country, or a village community (29 percent in 1980 and 25 percent in 1983). A detailed summary of these data are presented in Table 1.

Testing the Hypotheses

Eleven hypotheses utilizing implied subhypotheses (questions and statements) were proposed in this study for examination. Students were asked to respond to several questions and statements in order to test each hypothesis.

TABLE 1. Selected characteristics of the 1980 and 1983 class groups

Characteristic	1980 (n=792)	Percent	1983 (n=1011)	Percent
College Affiliation:				
Agriculture	126	16.0	160	16.1
Design	65	8.3	72	7.2
Education	49	6.2	58	5.8
Engineering	165	21.0	256	25.8
Home Economics	69	8.8	67	6.7
Sciences & Humanities				
Major				
Humanities	103	13.1	138	13.9
Social Sciences	94	11.9	88	8.9
Nat'l/Math. Sciences	115	14.6	135	13.6
Veterinary Medicine	1	.1	20	2.0
Classification:				
Freshmen	381	48.1	468	46.3
Seniors	411	51.9	543	53.7
Sex:				
Female	437	55.2	607	60.1
Male	354	44.8	403	39.9
Residence Status:				
University housing	458	58.3	576	57.1
Greek housing	95	12.1	105	10.4
Off-campus housing	235	29.6	328	32.5
Cumulative grade point average:				
3.75 to 4.00	53	6.8	51	5.2
3.50 to 3.74	69	8.8	70	7.1
3.25 to 3.49	83	10.6	85	8.7
3.00 to 3.24	106	13.6	141	14.4
2.75 to 2.99	156	20.0	159	16.2
2.50 to 2.74	118	15.1	138	14.1
2.25 to 2.49	76	9.7	127	13.0
2.00 to 2.24	76	9.7	113	11.5
1.75 to 1.99	25	3.2	49	5.0
1.74 or below	19	2.4	47	4.8

TABLE 1. Continued

Characteristic	1980 (n=792)	Percent	1983 (n=1011)	Percent
Degree aspirations:				
Will not complete baccalaureate degree	14	1.8	11	1.1
Baccalaureate degree only	489	62.2	629	63.5
Master's degree	197	25.1	220	22.2
Ph.D. or professional degree	86	10.9	130	13.1
Size of hometown:				
Rural farm, country or village	226	28.8	250	25.0
Under 2,000	59	7.5	86	8.6
2,000 to 10,000	118	15.0	144	14.4
10,000 to 30,000	76	9.7	139	13.9
30,000 to 100,000	123	15.6	168	16.8
100,000 to 500,000	110	14.0	117	11.7
500,000 and over	21	2.7	28	2.8
Suburb of a large city of 500,000 or more	53	6.7	68	6.8

Criteria used for rejecting or accepting the eleven general hypotheses are:

1. If 10 percent or less of the questions and statements (implied subhypothese) are significant, then the general hypothesis will not be rejected.
2. If 11 - 50 percent of the questions and statements (implied subhypotheses) are significant, then it will be inferred that the general hypothesis received mild evidence for rejection.
3. If 50 - 90 percent of the questions and statements (implied subhypotheses) are significant, then it will be inferred that the general hypothesis received strong evidence for rejection.
4. If 90 - 100 percent of the questions and statements (implied subhypotheses) are significant, then it will be inferred that the general hypothesis will be rejected.

Significant differences were found between the responses for many of these statements and questions (implied subhypotheses). Overall results for the eleven hypotheses tested revealed that: seven hypotheses had strong

evidence for rejecton, three hypotheses had mild evidence for rejection and one hypothesis was rejected.

Some responses were collapsed because they elicited stronger responses than others. For example, "strongly agree" was collapsed with "agree" and "strongly disagree" was collapsed with "disagree". On the other hand, some responses were eliminated because they evoked weaker responses than others. For example, one of the responses for questions 13 and 24-26, "admiration feelings toward cheating", and "no disciplinary action at all for cheating violations" respectively were eliminated. Collapsing and eliminating these responses allowed the most significant responses to be emphasized.

In order to test the respondent's attitudes toward cheating related to the selected characteristics in Table 1, the 1980 and 1983 data were combined.

Hypothesis One

> There will be no significant difference in attitudes toward academic dishonesty between the 1980 and 1983 class groups.

Ten questions and statements (implied subhypotheses) were used to test this hypothesis:

Question 1A: "What would you do if you saw a student cheating? In 1980 and 1983, 81 percent of the respondents

in both class groups said they would either mention the incident to other students but not report the student or ignore the incident. The smallest percentage in both class groups reported that they would either report the student to the appropriate authority or express disapproval to the student but not report him/her (19 percent in 1980 and 1983). No significant differences in responses were identified. The results are presented in Table 2.

Question 1B: "Regardless of the action you would take, what kind of feeling would you most likely have toward a student you observed cheating?" Fifty-five percent of the respondents in both class groups said they would have feelings of disgust toward a student they observed cheating, 28 percent in both groups would have feelings of indifference, while 18 percent in 1980 and 17 percent in 1983 reported they would have feelings of sorrow. Again, no significant differences were identified. These data are reported in Table 3.

Students were asked to express their feelings toward various statements related to academic dishonesty. The results of these statements are reported below:

Statement 1C: "Under no circumstances is cheating justified." In 1980, 84 percent of the respondents agreed with this statement and in 1983, 85 percent of the

TABLE 2. Differences in response between the 1980 and 1983 class groups to the question: What would you do if you saw a student cheating

Response	1980 N	1980 percent	1983 N	1983 percent
Report him/her to instructor, proctor or appropriate authority	32	4.1	51	5.2
Express disapproval to the student but not report him/her	115	14.7	133	13.6
Mention the incident to other students but not report him/her	262	33.4	343	35.0
Ignore the incident	375	47.8	454	46.3

$X^2 = 2.07$ df = 3 significance = .56

TABLE 3. Differences in response between the 1980 and 1983 class groups to the question: Regardless of the action you would take, what kind of feeling would you most likely have toward a student you observe cheating

Response	1980 N	1980 percent	1980 N	1980 percent
Indifference	215	27.5	278	28.0
Sorrow	140	17.9	172	17.3
Disgust	427	54.6	543	54.7
X^2 = .12 df = 2 Significance= .94				

Note: Due to less than 20 percent in a cell, the response "admiration" was eliminated.

respondents agreed with the statement. No significant differences were identified in the responses.

Statement 1D: "Cheating is justified when a person needs to pass a course to stay in school." Eighty-seven percent of the respondents in 1980 and 88 percent in 1983 disagree with this statement. No significant differences were found in the groups responses.

Statement 1E: "Reporting someone for cheating is worse than cheating." Seventy-eight percent of the 1980 class and 81 percent of the 1983 class disagree with this statement. No significant differences were noted in the responses given.

Statement 1F: "Among faculty members, there is little uiformity in handling instances of cheating." In 1980, 68 percent of the respondents agreed with this statement and 67 percent of the respondents in 1983 agreed with the statement. No difference in responses were identified.

Statement 1G: "In general, faculty members do not try hard to catch cheaters." This statement evoked disagreement between the two class groups which resulted in a significant difference at the .01 level. Fifty-eight percent of the respondents in the 1980 class group agreed with this statement whereas, 54 percent of the respondents in 1983 disagreed with this statement.

Statement 1H: "Some faculty members ignore obvious instances of cheating." While both class groups agreed with this statement, a significant difference was found at the .01 level. In 1980, 62 percent of the respondents agreed with this statement and 70 percent of the respondents in 1983 were in agreement with this statement.

Statement 1I: "Students look the other way when they see someone cheating on an exam." Respondents in both class groups were in agreement with this statement (87 percent in 1980 and 1983). Thus, no significant difference was noted.

Statement 1J: "Cheating is a serious problem at Iowa State." Disagreement with this statement was reported by

respondents in both class groups (80 percent in 1980 and 81 percent in 1983). No significant differences in responses were found in the last two statements discussed. Data presented on all of these statements can be ascertained from Table 4.

A significant difference was found in two of the statements under this hypothesis. Fifty-eight percent of the respondents in the 1980 class group believed that faculty members do not try hard to catch cheaters, while 54 percent of the respondents in the 1983 class group believed they did. Respondents in both class groups disagreed that some faculty members ignore obvious instances of cheating (62 percent in 1980 and 81 percent in 1983). Because 20 percent of the questions and statements (implied subhypotheses) were significant, the general hypothesis showed mild evidence for rejection.

Hypothesis Two

> There will be no significant difference between the 1980 class groups' attitudes toward sanctions for academic honesty.

Three statements were asked regarding what disciplinary measures should be taken at Iowa State when a student is caught cheating.

TABLE 4. Differences in response between the 1980 and 1983 class groups to the following statements

	Statement	1980 Agree	1980 Disagree
1C.	Under no circumstances is cheating justified.	657 (83.7)	128 (16.3)
1D.	Cheating is justified when a person needs to pass a course to stay in school.	99 (12.6)	684 (87.4)
1E.	Reporting someone for cheating is worse than cheating.	174 (22.5)	599 (77.5)
1F.	Among faculty members, there is little uniformity in handling instances of cheating.	478 (68.3)	222 (31.7)
1G.	In general, faculty members do not try very hard to catch cheaters.	447 (58.2)	321 (41.8)
1H.	Some faculty members ignore clean-cut instances of cheating.	278 (37.7)	460 (62.3)
1I.	Students look the other way when they see someone cheating on an exam.	667 (87.1)	99 (12.9)
1J.	Cheating is a serious problem at Iowa State.	151 (20.1)	601 (79.9)

**Significance at .01 level.

1983 Agree	Disagree	X^2	df	Significance
845 (84.8)	152 (15.2)	.30	1	.59
118 (11.9)	876 (88.1)	.18	1	.67
187 (19.0)	795 (81.0)	.08	1	.08
610 (67.0)	301 (33.0)	.26	1	.61
454 (46.3)	526 (53.7)	23.84	1	.00**
287 (30.2)	664 (69.8)	10.14	1	.00**
855 (86.5)	134 (13.5)	.10	1	.76
183 (19.1)	774 (80.9)	.19	1	.66

Statements: (2A) "Cheating on a final exam";(2B) "Cheating on a midterm of hourly exam" and (2C) "Plagiarizing a term paper."

Approximately fifty percent of the respondents believed "failure of the examination or failure of the course" should be the disciplinary measure taken for cheating of a final exam, for cheating on a midterm or hourly examination or for plagiarizing a term paper. Between 19 percent and 39 percent of the respondents thought that "a choice of taking the examination over or taking a make-up or re-writing the paper or doing a new paper" should be the disciplinary measure taken for cheating on a final examination, cheating on a midterm or hourly examination, or for plagiarizing a term paper. Less than one percent of the respondents believed that "permanent expulsion from the university" should be the disciplinary measure taken for cheating on a final examination, cheating on a midterm of hourly examination, or for plagiarizing a term paper. Data in Table 5 reveal that all (100 percent) of the statements (implied subhypotheses) showed significant difference in the responses between the two groups. Therefore, the general hypothesis was rejected.

TABLE 5. Differences in response to what disciplinary measures should be taken for cheating between 1980 and 1983 class groups

Disciplinary measure	1980 N	1980 percent	1983 N	1983 percent
Cheating on a final exam				
Reprimand and warning	54	6.9	68	6.8
Choice of taking exam over or taking a make-up	223	28.6	247	24.7
Failure of the examination	413	53.0	522	52.1
Failure of the course	76	9.8	131	13.1
Suspension	9	1.2	26	2.6
Permanent expulsion	4	.5	7	.7
$X^2 = 11.72$ df = 5 significance = .04*				
Cheating on midterm or hourly exam				
Reprimand and warning	89	11.4	126	12.6
Choice of taking exam over or taking a make-up	191	24.4	191	19.1
Failure of the examination	469	59.8	604	60.3
Failure of the course	30	3.8	58	5.8
Suspension	3	.4	18	1.8
Permanent expulsion	2	.3	4	.4
$X^2 = 17.52$ df = 5 significance = .00**				
Plagiarizing a term paper				
Reprimand and warning	41	5.3	68	6.9
Choice of taking exam over or taking a make-up	303	38.9	333	33.8
Failure of the examination	372	47.8	479	48.6
Failure of the course	53	6.8	79	8.0
Suspension	5	.6	21	2.1
Permanent expulsion	4	.5	5	.5
$X^2 = 12.50$ df = 5 significance = .03*				

Note: Due to less than 20 percent in a cell, the statement,"No disciplinary action at all" was collasped.

**Significance at .01 level.
*Significance at .05 level.

Hypothesis Three

> There will be no significant difference in the definition of cheating behaviors given by the 1980 and 1983 class groups.

Respondents were asked to indicate which of twelve statements they considered to be cheating behaviors.

Statements: (3A) "Arranging with other students to give or receive answers by signals during an exam." (3B) "Copying from someone's exam paper without his/her knowledge." (3C) "Taking an exam for another student." (3D) Using unauthorized notes during and exam." (3E) "Turning in a paper that one has purchased from a commercial research firm." (3F) "Giving answers to other students during an exam." (3G) "Arranging to sit next to someone in order to copy from his/her paper." (3H) "Turning in a paper that has been written entirely or in part by another student." (3I) "Getting questions or answers about an exam from someone who has already taken it." (3J) "Adding a few items to a bibliography that they did not use in writing the paper." (3K) "Working together with several students on a homework assignment when the instructor does not allow it." (3L) "Copying a few sentences of material from a source without footnoting it in a paper."

Almost all respondents in both class groups agreed that they considered all of the statements with the exception of

two to be cheating behaviors. Approximately half of the respondents in both groups were not in agreement that working together on a homework assignment when the instructor does not allow it constituted cheating. In 1980, 52 percent of the respondents said this behavior was not dishonest, while 50 percent of the 1983 respondents believed it was. Comparatively, approximately half of the respondents in both class groups were not in agreement that copying a few sentences of material from a source without footnoting it in a paper was cheating. Fifty-five percent of the respondents in 1980 thought this act was not dishonest compared to 52 percent of those responding in 1983 who thought it was. In responding to the statement that arranging to sit next to someone in order to copy, more students in 1980 (97 percent) than in 1983 (95 percent) considered this behavior to be cheating. A significant difference was found in the responses given for statements 3G and 3L as reported in Table 6.

Significant differences in responses were computed for at least two of the individual statements (16 percent). Therefore, hypothesis three received mild evidence for rejection.

TABLE 6. Differences in response between the 1980 and 1983 class groups to the following question: Do you consider the following to be cheating

	Behaviors	1980 Yes	1980 No
3A.	Arranging to give or receive answers during an exam	781 (99.5)	4 (0.5)
3B.	Copying someone's exam without his/her knowledge	781 (99.5)	4 (0.5)
3C.	Taking an exam for another student	775 (98.7)	10 (1.3)
3D.	Using unathorized notes during an exam	764 (97.4)	20 (2.6)
3E.	Turning in a paper purchased from a firm	723 (93.1)	54 (6.9)
3F.	Giving answers to other students during an exam	754 (96.2)	30 (3.8)
3G.	Arranging to sit next to someone in order to copy	760 (96.8)	25 (3.2)
3H.	Turning in a paper written by another student	727 (93.1)	54 (6.9)
3I.	Getting questions or answers from someone taken the exam	447 (57.3)	333 (42.7)
3J.	Adding items to bibliography not used in writing paper	490 (63.2)	285 (36.8)
3K.	Working together on homework assignment when not allowed	373 (47.9)	405 (52.1)
3L.	Copying a few sentences of material without footnoting	352 (45.2)	426 (54.8)

**Significance at .01 level.
*Significance at .05 level.

1983 Yes	1983 No	X^2	df	Significance
993 (98.9)	11 (1.1)	1.18	1	.28
996 (99.3)	7 (0.7)	.04	1	.84
987 (98.3)	17 (1.7)	.28	1	.60
979 (97.7)	23 (2.3)	.04	1	.85
947 (94.9)	51 (5.1)	2.34	1	.13
955 (95.3)	47 (4.7)	.60	1	.44
948 (94.7)	53 (5.3)	4.20	1	.04*
935 (93.4)	66 (6.6)	.03	1	.86
578 (57.9)	421 (42.1)	.03	1	.85
613 (61.9)	377 (38.1)	.26	1	.61
501 (50.3)	495 (49.7)	.88	1	.35
514 (51.9)	477 (48.1)	7.39	1	.01**

Hypothesis Four

> There will be no significant difference in the observation of cheating by the 1980 and 1983 class groups.

Twenty-nine questions and statements (implied subhypotheses) were used to test this hypothesis.

Question 4A: "Since you have been in college, how often has another student asked you for help which you knew it was not legitimate during an exam?" Sixty three percent of the respondents in 1980 and 64 percent in 1983 reported that they had never been asked for help during an exam. However, 23 percent of those responding in 1980 and 1983 had been asked for help a few times. Results of these data are listed in Table 7. No significant differences were noted in the responses.

Question 4B: "Since you have been at Iowa State, how often have you seen another student cheating during an exam?" Data in Table 8 indicate that approximately one-half of the respondents in both groups (53 percent in 1980 and 1983) had observed a student cheating a few times, while approximately one-fourth of the respondents (26 percent in 1980 and 28 percent in 1983) had never seen another student cheating. No significant differences in responses were found in the statements.

TABLE 7. Differences in response between the 1980 and 1983 class groups to the question: Since you have been in college, how often has another student asked you for help which you knew was not legitimate during an exam

Response	N	1980 percent	N	1983 percent
Never	494	62.8	638	63.7
Once	96	12.2	130	13.0
A few times	182	23.2	222	22.5
Many times	14	1.8	9	.9
$X^2 = 3.01$ df = 3	Significance = .39			

TABLE 8. Differences in response between the 1980 and 1983 class groups to the question: Since you have been at Iowa State, how often have you seen another student cheating during an exam

Response	1980 N	1980 percent	1983 N	1983 percent
Never	201	25.5	276	27.6
Once	76	9.5	116	11.6
A few times	414	52.6	514	51.5
Many times	96	12.2	93	9.3
$X^2 = 5.87$ df = 3	Significance = .11			

Respondents were asked to indicate the extent Iowa State students engaged in the following:

Statement 4C: "Getting questions or answers about an exam from someone who had already taken it the same day." Sixty-five percent of the respondents in both class groups believed ISU students engaged in this practice either a great deal or a fair amount. Nonetheless, 29 percent of those responding in 1980 and 28 percent in 1983 thought ISU students either did not engage in this practice much or not at all, whereas, 7 percent of the respondents in 1980 and 1983 did not know the extent ISU students engaged in this practice. Again, no significant differences in responses were identified.

Statement 4D: "Copying a few sentences of materials from a source without footnoting it in a paper." A large percentage of respondents thought ISU students engaged in this practice either a great deal or a fair amount (69 percent in 1980 and 62 percent in 1983). ISU students either did not engage in the practice of copying very much or not at all (15 percent in 1980 and 22 percent in 1983) while a small percentage of respondents (15 percent in 1980 and 17 percent in 1983) did not know the extent to which students at Iowa State engaged in this practice. A significant difference was found however, between class groups at the .01 percent level.

Statement 4E: "Working together with several students on a homework assignment when the instructor does not allow it." Over half of the respondents in both class groups agreed that ISU students engaged in this practice either a great deal or a fair amount (61 percent in 1980 and 60 percent in 1983) while one-fourth of those responding believed ISU students either did not engage in this practice much or not at all (25 percent in 1980 and 1983). This compares to 14 percent of the respondents in both class groups who did not know the extent to which ISU students engaged in this practice. No significant difference in class group responses were noted.

Statement 4F: "Adding a few items to a bibliography that they did not use in writing the paper." In 1980, 50 percent of those surveyed believed that this practice either took place a great deal or a fair amount, whereas, 44 percent of those surveyed in 1983 believed this. Those surveyed also believed ISU students either did not engage much in this practice or not at all (29 percent in 1980 and 30 percent in 1983) compared 21 percent of those surveyed in 1980 and 26 percent of those in 1983, who did not know the extent to which ISU students engaged in this practice. Responses to this statement did not elicit any significant differences.

Statement 4G: "Copying from someone's exam paper withour his/her knowledge." A significant difference was found at the .01 percent level. Forty-eight percent of those responding in 1980 and 40 percent of those in 1983 said that ISU students either engaged a great deal or a fair amount in this practice. A similar percentage of those responding in 1980 (40 percent) and those in 1983 (43 percent) said that ISU students either did not engage in this practice much or not at all. A small percentage in both class groups (12 percent in 1980 and 17 percent in 1983) did not know the extent to which ISU students engaged in this practice.

Statement 4H: Arranging to sit next to someone in order to copy from his/her exam paper." Less than half of those surveyed perceived that ISU students either engage in this practice a great deal or a fair amount (49 percent in 1980 and 39 percent in 1983) and less than half of those surveyed perceived that ISU students either did not engaged in this practice much or not at all (40 percent in 1980 and 45 percent in 1983). However, a small percentage of those survey reported that they did not know the extent to which ISU students engaged in this practice (12 percent in 1980 and 17 percent in 1983). Again, a significant difference in responses was computed at the .01 percent level.

Statement 4I: "Giving answers to other students during as exam." the largest percentage of the respondents believed that ISU students either did not engage in this practice much or not at all (61 percent in 1980 and 64 percent in 1983), whereas approximately one-third or less of those responding believed that ISU students engaged in this practice The smallest percentage of respondents reported that they did not know the extent to which ISU students engaged in this practice (11 percent in 1980 and 14 percent in 1983). A significant difference was found at the .01 percent level.

Statement 4J: "Turning in a paper that has been written entirely or in part by another student." A significant difference was noted between the two groups at the .01 percent level. The highest percentage of respondents perceived that ISU students either engaged in this practice a great deal or a fair amount (33 percent in 1980 and 25 percent in 1983) whereas, the lowest percentage of respondents did not know to what extent that ISU students engaged in this practice (19 percent in 1980 and 21 percent in 1983).

Statement 4K: "Using unauthorized notes during an examination." The chi-square test indicate that no significant differences in responses existed. The majority of those responding to the questionnaire said that ISU students either did not engage in this practice much or not at all (56 percent in 1980 and 57 percent in 1983), while only 29 percent percent of those responding 1980 and 25 percent of those responding in 1983, said that ISU students engaged in this practice either a great deal of a fair amount. Fifteen percent of the 1980 respondents and 18 percent of the 1983 respondents said they did not know the extent to which ISU students engaged in this practice.

Statement 4L: "Arranging with other students to give or receive answers by signals during an exam." The biggest

percentage of the respondents perceived that ISU students either did not engage much in this practice or not at all (66 percent in 1980 and 64 percent in 1983). Approximately One-third of the respondents reported they did not know the extent to which ISU students engaged in this practice, while the smallest percentage of the respondents said that ISU students either engaged in this practice a great deal or a fair amount (8 percent in 1980 and 6 percent in 1983). A significant difference was reported at the .05 percent level.

Statement 4M: "Turning in a paper that one has purchased from a commercial research firm." Forty-nine percent of the respondents in 1980 and 1983 said that ISU students either did not engage in this practice much or not at all. Forty-five percent of the respondents in 1980 and 47 percent in 1983 said they did not know to what extent ISU students engaged in this practice. This compares to 6 percent of the 1980 respondents and 4 percent of the 1983 respondents who believed that ISU students engaged in this practice either a great deal or a fair amount. No significant differences in responses were found.

Statement 4N: "Taking an examination for another student." The major portion of those surveyed reported that ISU students either did not engage in this practice or very

little at all (62 percent in 1980 and 65 percent in 1983), while 26 percent of the respondents in 1980 and 28 percent in 1983 did not know to what extent this practice took place. A smaller percentage of respondents perceived that ISU students either engaged a great deal or a fair amount in this practice (12 percent in 1980 and 8 percent in 1983). A significant difference was found at the .05 level. Table 9 presents detailed results of Statements 4C through 4N.

Respondents were asked to what extent the following statements were descriptive of the conditions they had taken tests and exams at Iowa State:

Statement 4O: "The instructor proctors the exam." Over half of those surveyed said this condition was always or almost always descriptive (58 percent in both class groups), compared to almost one-third of those surveyed who believed this statement was frequently descriptive (28 percent in 1980 and 30 percent in 1983) of the test conditions.

Statement 4P: "Graduate assistants proctor exams." The largest percentage of the respondents said this statement was frequently descriptive of the condition under which they had taken test or exams at ISU (47 percent in 1980 and 43 percent in 1983). The next largest percentage of respondents said the statement was sometimes descriptive

TABLE 9. Differences in response between the 1980 and 1983 class groups to the question: From your own knowledge and experience, to what extent do Iowa State students engage in the following practices in their academic work

Practice	1980 Responses: A great deal	A fair amount	Not much	Not at all	Don't know
4C. Getting questions or answers about an exam from someone who had already taken it	148 (18.9)	363 (46.2)	194 (24.7)	24 (3.1)	56 (7.1)
4D. Copying a few sentences of materials from a source without footnoting it in the paper	209 (26.7)	334 (42.6)	102 (13.0)	19 (2.4)	120 (15.3)
4E. Working together with several students on a homework assignment when not allowed	139 (17.7)	337 (42.9)	175 (22.3)	23 (2.9)	111 (14.1)
4F. Adding a few items to a bibliography that they did not use in writing the paper	116 (14.8)	276 (35.2)	190 (24.3)	39 (5.0)	162 (20.7)
4G. Copying from someone's exam paper without his/her knowledge	86 (11.0)	291 (37.1)	276 (35.2)	38 (4.8)	93 (11.9)
4H. Arranging to sit next to someone in order to copy from his/her exam paper	97 (12.4)	285 (36.3)	275 (35.0)	35 (4.5)	93 (11.8)

**Significance at .01 level.
*Significance at .05 level.

1983 Responses							
A great deal	A fair amount	not much	Not at all	Don't know	X^2	df	Signif-icance
217 (21.5)	436 (43.2)	248 (24.6)	36 (3.6)	73 (7.2)	2.79	4	.59
248 (24.6)	377 (37.4)	200 (19.8)	17 (1.7)	167 (16.6)	17.58	4	.00**
178 (17.7)	428 (42.6)	214 (21.3)	40 (4.0)	145 (14.4)	1.62	4	.80
133 (13.2)	313 (31.1)	248 (24.7)	50 (5.0)	262 (26.0)	8.44	4	.07
86 ((8.6)	318 (31.6)	382 (38.0)	48 (4.8)	171 (17.0)	15.42	4	.00**
103 (10.3)	290 (28.9)	377 (37.6)	70 (7.0)	162 (16.2)	20.47	4	.00*

TABLE 9. Continued

Practice	1980 Responses: A great deal	A fair amount	Not much	Not at all	Don't know
4I. Giving answers to other students during an exam.	28 (3.6)	189 (24.2)	422 (54.0)	58 (7.4)	85 (10.9)
4J. Turning in a paper that has been written entirely or in part by another student.	49 (6.3)	208 (26.6)	308 (39.4)	69 (8.8)	148 (18.9)
4K. Using unauthorized notes during an examination.	30 (3.9)	197 (25.4)	356 (45.8)	74 (9.5)	120 (15.4)
4L. Arranging with other students to give or receive answers by signals during an exam.	6 (0.8)	55 (7.0)	280 (35.8)	230 (29.4)	211 (27.0)
4M. Turning in a paper that one has purchased from a commercial. research firm.	8 (1.0)	39 (5.0)	181 (23.2)	203 (26.0)	349 (44.7)
4N. Taking an examination for another student.	14 (1.8)	77 (9.8)	280 (35.8)	208 (26.6)	203 (26.0)

1983 Responses							
A great deal	A fair amount	Not much	Not at all	Don't know	X^2	df	Signif-icance
31 (3.1)	192 (19.1)	544 (54.2)	97 (9.7)	139 (13.9)	11.22	4	.02*
34 (3.4)	213 (21.3)	438 (43.8)	104 (10.4)	211 (21.1)	17.15	4	.00**
38 (3.8)	214 (21.3)	474 (47.3)	97 (9.7)	180 (17.9)	4.90	4	.30
9 (0.9)	48 (4.8)	314 (31.4)	324 (32.4)	304 (30.4)	9.47	4	.05*
8 (0.8)	34 (3.4)	225 (22.5)	268 (26.7)	467 (46.6)	3.54	4	.47
14 (1.4)	61 (6.1)	341 (34.2)	307 (30.8)	275 (27.6)	11.68	4	.02*

of the condition (29 percent in 1980 and 31 percent in 1983).

Statement 4Q: "There is no proctor in the room during the exam." Most of the respondents in both class groups said this statement was rarely or never descriptive of the condition under which they had taken exam at ISU (83 percent in 1980 and 85 percent in 1983). No significant differences in responses were found for the last three statements discusses.

Statement 4R: "Proctors remain alert throughout the exam in order to spot cases of cheating." Forty-one percent of the respondents in 1980 and 40 percent in 1983 reported this statement was frequently descriptive of the conditions under which test and exams were taken at ISU, compared to the respondents who believed this statement was always or almost always descriptive of tests conditions (21 percent in 1980 and 27 percent in 1983). A significant difference was reported at the .05 level.

Statement 4S: "Students may leave their seats without permission from the proctor." Less than half of those responding said this statement was rarely or never descriptive of the conditions under which they had taken tests or exams at ISU (37 percent in 1980 and 45 percent in 1983). Less than one-third said this statement was

sometimes descriptive of the test conditions (27 percent in 1980 and 28 percent in 1983). A significant difference was calculated at the .01 level.

Statement 4T: "Students may leave the room without permission from the proctor." Most of those responding thought this statement was rarely or never descriptive of the conditions which they had taken tests or exams at ISU (73 percent in 1980 and 77 percent in 1983). The difference between the two groups was significant at the .05 level.

Statement 4U: "Seating is staggered." The highest percentage of respondents said this statement was frequently descriptive of the conditions under which tests and exams were taken (43 percent in 1980 and 45 percent in 1983). The second highest percentage of respondents said this statement was always or almost always descriptive of the tests conditions (30 percent in 1980 and 27 percent in 1983), while the third highest percentage said this statement was sometimes descriptive of the test conditions (23 percent in 1980 and 24 percent in 1983). No significant differences in responses were found.

Statement 4V: "Instructors use the same exams they gave in previous years." Less than half of the respondents thought this statement was sometimes descriptive of the conditions under which they had taken tests and exams at ISU

(42 percent in 1980 and 45 percent in 1983). However, a smaller percentage of the respondents (27 percent in 1980 and 20 percent in 1983) perceived this statement was frequently descriptive of test and exam conditions at ISU, compared to about one-third of the respondents (28 percent in 1980 and 33 percent in 1983) who believed this statement to be rarely or never descriptive of the conditions under which they had taken tests or exams at ISU. The responses to this statement elicited a significant difference at the .01 level.

Statement 4W: "Copies of past exams are routinely available from the instructor in studying for exams." Approximately one-third of those responding in both class groups said that this statement was frequently and sometimes descriptive of the conditions under which they had taken tests or exams at ISU. However, only 9 percent and 15 percent of the respondents respectively in both class groups thought this statement was always or almost always and rarely or never descriptive of the test and exam conditions at ISU.

Statement 4X: "Instructors give the same exam to more than one section of the same class." Forty-eight percent of the respondents in 1980 and 43 percent in 1983 felt this statement was frequently descriptive of the conditions under

which test and exams at ISU were taken. This is compared to approximately 30 percent in both class groups who believed this statement was sometimes descriptive of the test and exam conditions at ISU. A significant difference was found at the .05 level for both of these statements. Data about Statements 40 to 4X can be observed in Table 10.

Respondents were asked to respond to statements which exemplified the extent they had come in contact with the following types of exam questions at Iowa State.

Statement 4Y: "open book exams." Approximately 70 percent of the respondents in both class groups said they had either rarely or never come in contact with this type of exam question at Iowa State. Approximately 20 percent of those in both class groups reported they had either frequently or sometimes come in contact with this type of exam question at Iowa State.

Statement 4Z: "Take home exams." A larger percentage of the respondents in both class groups said they had either rarely or never come in contact with this type of exam question at Iowa State (85 percent in 1980 and 89 percent in 1983), while a smaller percentage of respondents reported that they had either frequently or sometimes came into contact with this type of exam question at Iowa State (15 percent in 1980 and 11 percent in 1983). A significant

TABLE 10. Differences in response between the 1980 and 1983 class groups in describing the conditions under which exams are taken at Iowa State

		1980			
	Condition	Always or almost always	Fre-quently	Some-times	Rarely or never
4O.	The instructor proctors the exam	456 (58.3)	220 (28.1)	88 (11.3)	18 (2.3)
4P.	Graduate assistants proctor the exam	142 (18.2)	363 (46.5)	223 (28.6)	52 (6.7)
4Q.	No proctor in room during the exam	9 (1.2)	13 (1.7)	118 (15.1)	641 (82.7)
4R.	Proctors remain alert to spot cheating	162 (20.8)	319 (41.0)	246 (31.6)	51 (6.6)
4S.	Students leave their seats without permission	107 (13.8)	167 (21.6)	211 (27.3)	289 (37.3)
4T.	Students leave room without permission	34 (4.4)	49 (6.3)	129 (16.6)	564 (72.7)
4U.	Seating is staggered	232 (29.7)	333 (42.7)	177 (22.7)	38 (4.9)
4V.	Instructors use the same exams they gave in previous years	30 (3.9)	205 (26.6)	322 (41.8)	214 (27.8)
4W.	Copies of past exams available in studying for exams	93 (12.0)	304 (39.1)	290 (37.3)	91 (11.7)
4X.	Instructors give the same exam to more than one class	106 (13.7)	374 (48.4)	229 (29.7)	63 (8.2)

**Significance at .01 level.
*Significance at .05 level.

1983						
Always or almost always	Fre-quently	Some-times	Rarely or never	X^2	df	Signif-icance
581 (58.1)	300 (30.0)	98 ((9.8)	21 (2.1)	1.50	3	.68
196 (19.6)	425 (42.5)	313 (31.3)	66 (6.6)	3.14	3	.37
8 (0.8)	26 (2.6)	118 (11.8)	845 (84.8)	6.25	3	.10
268 (27.0)	395 (39.9)	273 (27.5)	55 (5.5)	10.28	3	.02**
105 (10.6)	160 (16.2)	281 (28.4)	444 (44.8)	16.71	3	.00**
53 (5.4)	48 (4.8)	128 (12.9)	761 (76.9)	7.63	3	.05*
263 (26.5)	447 (45.0)	237 (23.9)	46 (4.6)	2.51	3	.47
24 (2.4)	196 (19.8)	443 (44.7)	327 (33.0)	16.63	3	.00**
93 (9.3)	358 (35.8)	393 (39.3)	155 (15.5)	9.24	3	.03*
128 (12.9)	429 (43.3)	318 (32.1)	115 (11.6)	8.67	3	.03*

difference in responses at the .05 level was identified in the last two statements.

Statement 4-Z1: "Objective questions (true-false, multiple choice or mathching)". The majority of the respondents in both class groups said they had frequently come in contact with this type of exam question at Iowa State (80 percent in 1980 and 82 percent in 1983). Therefore, no significant difference was found in the responses between the two groups.

Statement 4Z2: "Short answer or problem solving questions." Almost all of the respondents in both groups said that they either had frequently or sometimes come in contact with this type of exam question at Iowa State, whereas between four and seven percent of the respondents said that they either had rarely or never come in contact with this type of exam question at Iowa State. A significant difference in responses was found at the .01 level.

Statement 4Z3: "Essay questions." Approximately 70 percent of the respondents in both class groups reported that they had either frequently or sometimes came into contact with this type of exam question at Iowa State. Approximately 20 percent reported that they had either rarely or never come in contact with this type of exam

question at Iowa State. No significant differences in responses were found. Data for these statements can be reviewed in Table 11.

Significant differences were revealed for 16 (55 percent) of the 29 questions and statements (implied subhypotheses) used to test this hypothesis. Therefore, the general hypothesis received strong evidence of rejection.

Hypothesis Five

> There will be no significant differences between the attitudes toward cheating of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups in relation to respondent's college affiliation.

Ten questions and statements (implied subhypotheses) were used to test this hypothesis.

Question 5A: "What would you do if you saw a student cheating?" Approximately 80 percent of the respondents in all the colleges said they would either mention the incident to other students but not report the student or ignore the incident altogether. Likewise, a little over a half (57 percent) of the individuals from the College of Veterinary Medicine said they would take this action. On the other hand, 24 percent of the respondents from the College of Veterinary Medicine said they would report the student to the appropriate authority. This compares to between one and seven percent of the individuals from the other colleges.

TABLE 11. Differences in response between the 1980 and 1983 class groups to the question: To what extent have you come in contact with the following types of examinations and examination questions at Iowa State

	Exam/Question Type	1980 Fre-quently	Some-times	Rarely	Never
4Y.	Open book exam	52 (6.6)	138 (17.6)	316 (40.2)	280 (35.6)
4Z.	Take home exams	9 (1.1)	109 (13.9)	324 (41.2)	344 (43.8)
4Z1.	Objective questions true/false, multiple choice or matching	630 (80.3)	117 (14.9)	34 (4.3)	4 (0.5)
4Z2.	problem solving questions	447 (56.9)	281 (35.8)	45 (5.7)	12 (1.5)
4Z3.	Essay questions	225 (28.7)	338 (43.1)	161 (20.5)	60 (7.7)

**Significance at .01 level.

1980						
Fre-quently	Some-times	Rarely	Never	X^2	df	Signif-icance
73 (7.3)	155 (15.5)	313 (31.2)	462 (46.1)	23.19	3	.00**
16 (1.6)	94 (9.4)	365 (36.5)	526 (52.5)	17.97	3	.00**
822 (81.8)	138 (13.7)	40 (4.0)	5 (0.5)	.69	3	.88
669 (66.6)	295 (29.4)	35 (3.5)	6 (0.6)	21.03	3	.00**
324 (32.2)	395 (39.3)	209 (20.8)	78 (7.8)	3.38	3	.34

Responses from these two class groups generated a significant difference in responses at the .01 level. The actual data may be observed in Table 12.

Question 5B: "Regardless of the action you would take, what kind of feeling would you most likely have toward a student you observed cheating?" The largest percentage of respondents from all the colleges reported that they would have feelings of disgust if they observed a student cheating (approximately 59 percent). The next largest percentage of respondents from all the colleges except the College of Veterinary Medicine, said they would have feelings of indifference for observed cheaters (approximately 28 percent), while the smallest percentage of respondents from all the colleges, except the College of Veterinary Medicine, said they would have feelings of sorrow for this behavior (approximately 18 percent). Twenty-nine percent of the respondents from the College of Veterinary Medicine said they would have feelings of sorrow for this act, and four percent said they would feel indifferent. Again, a significant difference was found at the .01 level. Results on all the colleges are reported in Table 13.

Respondents were asked to indicate their feelings about several statements involving academic dishonesty.

TABLE 12. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on college affiliation to the question What would you do if you saw a student cheating

Response	Agric.	Design	Educ.	Engr.
Report him/her to the instructor, proctor or appropriate authority.	10 (3.5)	4 (3.1)	2 (1.9)	22 (5.4)
Express disapproval to the student but not report him/her.	45 (16.0)	20 (15.3)	17 (16.0)	59 (14.5)
Mention the incident to other students but not report him/her.	105 (37.2)	43 (32.8)	28 (26.4)	133 (32.6)
Ignore the incident.	122 (43.3)	64 (48.9)	59 (55.7)	194 (47.5)

$X^2 = 54.56$ df = 24 Significance = .00**

**Significance at .01 level.

Sciences and Humanities				
Home Econ.	Human.	Soc. Sci.	Phy.&Nat./ Math. Sci.	Vet. Med.
3 (2.3)	16 (6.7)	6 (3.4)	13 (5.2)	5 (23.8)
24 (18.0)	23 (9.7)	12 (6.7)	41 (16.5)	4 (19.0)
54 (40.6)	87 (36.6)	59 (33.1)	86 (34.7)	6 (28.6)
52 (39.1)	122 (47.1)	101 (56.7)	108 (43.5)	6 (28.6)

TABLE 13. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on college affiliation to the question: Regardless of the action you would take, what feeling would you most likely have toward a cheater

Response	Agric.	Design	Educ.	Engr.
Indifference	82 (29.3)	47 (35.3)	29 (27.4)	113 (27.3)
Sorrow	59 (21.1)	23 (17.3)	25 (23.6)	75 (18.1)
Disgust	139 (49.6)	63 (47.4)	52 (49.1)	226 (54.6)

$X^2 = 30.17$ df = 16 Significance = .01**

Note: Due to less than 20 percent in a cell, the response "admiration" was eliminated.

**Significance at .01 level.

Sciences and Humanities				
Home Econ.	Human.	Soc. Sci.	Phy.&Nat./ Math. Sci.	Vet. Med.
28 (21.2)	62 (25.9)	61 (33.9)	61 (24.6)	1 (4.8)
22 (16.7)	35 (14.6)	24 (13.3)	37 (14.9)	6 (28.6)
82 (62.1)	142 (59.4)	95 (52.8)	150 (60.5)	14 (66.7)

Statement 5C: "Under no circumstances is cheating justified." Approximately 80 percent of the respondents from all the colleges agreed with this statement, and between 13 and 20 percent disagreed with this statement. No differences in responses for all the colleges were found. Data can be reviewed in Table 14.

Statement 5D: "Cheating is justified when a person needs to pass a course to stay in school." Almost all of the respondents from all the colleges agreed (approximately 88 percent) with this statement compared to a smaller percent who disagreed (approximately 13 percent). Differences in responses were identified at the .05 level. Results are reported in Table 15.

Statement 5E: "Reporting someone for cheating is worse than cheating." All the respondents in the College of Veterinary Medicine disagreed with this statement. Likewise, the majority of the respondents (approximately 79 percent) in the remaining colleges also disagreed with this statement. Again, differences in responses were found at the .05 level. These data can be observed in Table 16.

Statement 5F: "Among faculty members, there is little uniformity in handling instances of cheating." No significant differences were found in the responses. The greatest percentage of the respondents from all the colleges

TABLE 14. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on college affiliation to the statement: Under no circumstances is cheating justified

Response	Agric.	Design	Educ.	Engr.
Agree	244 (86.5)	113 (83.7)	90 (85.7)	355 (85.1)
Disagree	38 (13.5)	22 (16.3)	15 (14.3)	62 (14.9)

$X^2 = 7.89$ df = 8 Significance = .45

Note: Due to less than 20 percent in a cell, the response "strongly agree" and "strongly disagree" were collapsed.

Sciences and Humanities				
Home Econ.	Human.	Soc. Sci.	Phy.&Nat./ Math. Sci.	Vet. Med.
116 (86.6)	197 (82.8)	140 (78.2)	213 (85.2)	16 (80.0)
18 (13.4)	41 (17.2)	39 (21.8)	37 (14.8)	4 (20.0)

TABLE 15. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on college affiliation to the following statement: Cheating is justified when a person needs to pass a course to stay in school

Response	Agric.	Design	Educ.	Engr.
Agree	49 (17.5)	17 (13.0)	12 (11.4)	40 (9.6)
Disagree	231 (82.5)	114 (87.0)	93 (88.6)	378 (90.4)

$X^2 = 17.53$ df = 8 Significance = .03*

Note: Due to less than 20 percent in a cell, the response "strongly agree" and "strongly disagree" were collapsed.

Sciences and Humanities				
Home Econ.	Human.	Soc. Sci.	Phy.&Nat./ Math. Sci.	Vet. Med.
9 (6.8)	28 (11.8)	30 (16.7)	28 (11.2)	2 (9.5)
124 (93.2)	209 (88.2)	150 (83.2)	222 (88.8)	19 (90.5)

TABLE 16. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on college affiliation to the following statement: Reporting someone for cheating is worse than cheating

Response	Agric.	Design	Educ.	Engr.
Agree	54 (19.3)	34 (25.8)	26 (25.0)	95 (23.4)
Disagree	226 (80.7)	98 (74.2)	78 (75.0)	311 (76.6)

$X^2 = 17.21$ df = 8 Significance = .03*

Note: Due to less than 20 percent in a cell, the response "strongly agree" and "strongly disagree" were collapsed.

*Significance at .05 level.

Sciences and Humanities				
Home Econ.	Human.	Soc. Sci.	Phy.&Nat./ Math. Sci.	Vet. Med.
16 (12.3)	44 (18.7)	38 (21.2)	49 (19.8)	0 (0.0)
114 (87.7)	191 (81.3)	141 (78.8)	198 (80.2)	21 (100.0)

agreed with this statement (approximately 67 percent). Data regarding the results on all the colleges are presented in Table 17.

Statement 5G: "In general, faculty members do not try very hard to catch cheaters." Respondents from the College of Agriculture and the College of Engineering were not in agreement witn this statement. Fifty-five percent from Engineering believed this statement was true compared to 57 percent from Agriculture who believed it was not true. Highly significant differences were found between the responses. These differences are illustrated in Table 18.

Statement 5H: "Some faculty members ignore clear-cut instances of cheating." Approximately 65 percent of the respondents from all of the colleges disagreed with this statement. A significant difference in responses was identified at the .05 level. Results can be found in Table 19.

Statement 5I: "Students look the other way when they see someone cheating on an exam." No significant differences in responses for all the colleges were identified regarding this statement. The majority of the respondents from all the colleges (approximately 85 percent) agreed that students look the other way when they observe someone cheating. These data can be found in Table 20.

TABLE 17. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on college affiliation to the following statement: 'Among faculty members there is little uniformity in handling instances of cheating

Response	Agric.	Design	Educ.	Engr.
Agree	169 (66.3)	90 (72.6)	73 (70.9)	259 (70.4)
Disagree	86 (33.7)	34 (27.4)	30 (29.1)	109 (29.6)

$X^2 = 14.42$ df = 8 Significance = .07

Note: Due to less than 20 percent in a cell, the response "strongly agree" and "strongly disagree" were collapsed.

Sciences and Humanities				
Home Econ.	Human.	Soc. Sci.	Phy.&Nat./ Math. Sci.	Vet. Med.
76 (64.4)	133 (60.2)	120 (74.5)	145 (64.2)	12 (63.2)
42 (35.6)	88 (39.8)	41 (25.5)	81 (35.8)	7 (36.8)

TABLE 18. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on college affiliation to the statement: In general, faculty members do not try hard to catch cheaters

Response	Agric.	Design	Educ.	Engr.
Agree	119 (42.8)	71 (53.4)	57 (54.3)	223 (54.5)
Disagree	159 (57.2)	62 (46.6)	48 (45.7)	186 (45.5)

$X^2 = 23.00$ df = 8 Significance = .00**

Note: Due to less than 20 percent in a cell, the response "strongly agree" and "strongly disagree" were collapsed.

**Significance at .01 level.

Sciences and Humanities				
Home Econ.	Human.	Soc. Sci.	Phy.&Nat./ Math. Sci.	Vet. Med.
72 (56.7)	115 (49.6)	111 (62.4)	114 (46.7)	12 (57.1)
55 (43.3)	117 (50.4)	67 (37.6)	130 (53.3)	9 (42.9)

TABLE 19. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on college affiliation to the following statement: Some faculty members ignore clear-cut instances of cheating

Response	Agric.	Design	Educ.	Engr.
Agree	98 (36.7)	50 (37.9)	37 (37.0)	115 (29.0)
Disagree	169 (63.3)	82 (62.1)	63 (63.0)	282 (71.0)

$X^2 = 17.20$ df = 8 Significance = .02*

Note: Due to less than 20 percent in a cell, the response "strongly agree" and "strongly disagree" were collapsed.

*Significance at .05 level.

Sciences and Humanities				
Home Econ.	Human.	Soc. Sci.	Phy.&Nat./ Math. Sci.	Vet. Med.
50 (41.7)	67 (29.4)	68 (40.5)	70 (29.5)	7 (35.0)
70 (58.3)	161 (70.6)	100 (59.5)	167 (70.5)	13 (65.0)

TABLE 20. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on college affiliation to the following statement: Students look the other way when they see someone cheating on an exam

Response	Agric.	Design	Educ.	Engr.
Agree	242 (87.1)	116 (86.6)	85 (81.7)	354 (86.1)
Disagree	36 (12.9)	18 (13.4)	19 (18.3)	57 (13.9)

$X^2 = 11.36$ df = 8 Significance = .18

Note: Due to less than 20 percent in a cell, the response "strongly agree" and "strongly disagree" were collapsed.

Sciences and Humanities				
Home Econ.	Human.	Soc. Sci.	Phy.&Nat./ Math. Sci.	Vet. Med.
110 (85.3)	205 (86.9)	164 (92.1)	212 (86.9)	15 (71.4)
19 (14.7)	31 (13.1)	14 (7.9)	32 (13.1)	6 (28.6)

Statement 5J: "Cheating is a serious problem at Iowa State." Data presented in Table 21 indicate that the largest percentage (approximately 79 percent) of the respondents from all the colleges disagreed with this statement. This difference in responses was found to be significant at the .05 level.

Strong evidence for rejection was received for hypothesis five. Seventy percent of the questions and statements (implied subhypotheses) revealed significant differences.

Hypothesis Six

> There will be no significant difference between the attitudes toward cheating of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups in relation to respondents' classification (year in school).

This hypothesis was tested through 10 statements and questions.

Question 6A: "What would you do if you saw a student cheating." Approximately 80 percent of the freshmen and seniors said they would either mention the incident to other students, but not report the student or ignore the incident. Fourteen percent of both groups reported that they would express disapproval to the student but not report him/her, compared to three percent of the freshmen and six percent of

TABLE 21. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on college affiliation to the following statement: Cheating is a serious problem at Iowa State

Response	Agric.	Design	Educ.	Engr.
Agree	56 (20.3)	24 (18.0)	21 (21.0)	56 (13.9)
Disagree	220 (79.7)	109 (82.0)	79 (79.0)	347 (86.1)

$X^2 = 18.37$ df = 8 Significance = .02*

Note: Due to less than 20 percent in a cell, the response "strongly agree" and "strongly disagree" were collapsed.

*Significance at .05 level.

Sciences and Humanities				
Home Econ.	Human.	Soc. Sci.	Phy.&Nat./ Math. Sci.	Vet. Med.
35	48	42	44	5
(28.5)	(21.4)	(24.0)	(18.6)	(27.8)
88	176	133	192	13
(71.5)	(78.6)	(76.0)	(81.4)	(72.2)

the seniors who said they would report the student to the appropriate authority. These data can be found in Table 22.

Question 6B: "Regardless of the action you would take, what kind of feeling would you most likely have toward a student you observed cheating?"

As indicated in Table 23, approximately half of the respondents in both classifications would have feelings of disgust towards an observed cheater. On the other hand, 32 percent of the freshmen compared to 24 percent of the seniors would have feelings of indifference. Only 18 percent of the freshmen and 17 percent of the seniors would have feelings of sorrow for this act. Highly significant difference in responses were identified in the last two questions discussed.

Several statements were proposed to elicit the respondents' feelings about academic dishonesty. Statement 6C: "Under no circumstances is cheating justified." At least 80 percent of the respondents agreed with this statement, and no significant differences were found in the responses as noted in Table 24.

Statement 6D: "Cheating is justified when a person needs to pass a course to stay in school." Again, no significant differences were found in the responses. The largest percentage of the respondents in both class groups

TABLE 22. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on classification (year in school) to the question: What would you do if you saw a student cheating

Response	Freshman	Senior
Report him/her to the instructor, proctor or appropriate authority	28 (3.4)	55 (5.9)
Express disapproval to the student but not report him/her	120 (14.4)	128 (13.7)
Mention the incident to other students but not report him/her	269 (32.3)	336 (36.1)
Ignore the incident	417 (50.0)	412 (44.3)

$X^2 = 11.19$ df = 3 Significance = .01**

**Significance at .01 level.

TABLE 23. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on classification to the question: Regardless of the action, what kind of feeling would you most likely have toward a cheater

Response	Freshman	Senior
Indifference	266 (31.8)	227 (24.2)
Sorrow	152 (18.2)	160 (17.0)
Disgust	418 (50.0)	552 (58.8)

$X^2 = 15.88$ df = 2 Significance = .00**

Note: Due to less than 20 percent in a cell, the response "admiration" was eliminated.

**Significance at .01 level.

TABLE 24. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on classification (year in school) to the statement: Under no circumstances is cheating justified

Response	Freshman	Senior
Agree	711 (84.5)	791 (84.1)
Disagree	130 (15.5)	150 (15.9)

$X^2 = .05$ df = 1 Significance = .83

disagreed with this statement (87 percent of the freshmen and 89 percent of the seniors). Findings concerning this statement are found in Table 25.

Statement 6E: "Reporting someone for cheating is worse than cheating." The majority of the respondents in both class groups disagreed with this statement (75 percent of the freshmen and 84 percent of the seniors). These data can be ascertained from Table 26.

Statement 6F: "Among faculty members, there is little uniformity in handling instances of cheating." Sixty-one percent of the freshmen and 73 percent of the seniors agreed with this statement. Results are reported in Table 27.

Statement 6G: "In general, faculty members do not try very hard to catch cheaters." Responses to this statement received disagreement between the two class groups. Forty-nine percent of the seniors believed faculty members do not try very hard to catch cheaters, in comparison to 57 percent of the freshmen who believed they do. Table 28 provides detailed information on these findings. Statements 6C through 6F revealed highly significant differences in responses.

Statement 6H: "Some faculty members ignore clear cut instances of cheating." Approximately 74 percent of the freshmen and 60 percent of the seniors disagreed with this

TABLE 25. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on classification (year in school) to the statement: Cheating is justified when a person needs to pass a course to stay in school

Response	Freshman	Senior
Agree	113 (13.5)	104 (11.1)
Disagree	725 (86.5)	835 (88.9)

$X^2 = 2.18$ df = 1 Significance = .14

TABLE 26. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on classification (year in school) to the statement: Reporting someone for cheating is worse than cheating

Response	Freshman	Senior
Agree	208 (25.1)	153 (16.5)
Disagree	622 (74.9)	772 (83.5)

$X^2 = 18.92$ df = 1 Significance = .00**

**Significance at .01 level.

TABLE 27. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on classification (year in school) to the statement: among faculty members, there is little uniformity in handling instances of cheating

Response	Freshman	Senior
Agree	466 (61.4)	622 (73.0)
Disagree	293 (38.6)	230 (27.0)

$X^2 = 24.14$ df = 1 Significance = .00**

**Significance at .01 level.

TABLE 28. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on classification (year in school) to the statement: In general, faculty members do not try very hard to catch cheaters

Response	Freshman	Senior
Agree	354 (43.0)	547 (59.2)
Disagree	470 (57.0)	377 (40.8)

$X^2 = 45.33$ df = 1 Significance = .00**

**Significance at .01 level.

statement, whereas 26 percent of the freshmen and nearly 40 percent of the seniors agreed with the statement. Highly significant differences in responses were found at the .01 level. These data may be observed in Table 29.

Statement 6I: "Students look the other way when they see someone cheating on an exam." Both freshmen and seniors believed this statement was true. Approximately 80 percent agreed that students look the other way when they observe someone cheating. No significant differences were found in the responses as illustrated in Table 30.

Statement 6J: "Cheating is a serious problem at Iowa State." A significant difference was found at the .01 level. Both freshmen and seniors agreed with this statement, as eighty-one percent of the freshmen and 75 percent of the seniors indicated agreement.

These data can be observed in Table 31. Based on the criteria used for interpreting the hypotheses, hypothesis six received showed evidence for rejection. Seventy percent of the questions and statements (implied subhypotheses) showed significant differences.

Hypothesis Seven

> There will be no significant difference between the attitudes toward cheating of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups in relation to respondents' sex.

TABLE 29. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on classification (year in school) to the statement: Some faculty members ignore clear-cut instances of cheating

Response	Freshman	Senior
Agree	209 (26.4)	356 (60.3)
Disagree	583 (73.6)	541 (60.3)

$X^2 = 32.82$ df = 1 Significance = .00**

**Significance at .01 level.

TABLE 30. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on classification (year in school) to the statement: Students look the other way when they see someone cheating on an exam.

Response	Freshman	Senior
Agree	703 (85.1)	814 (88.2)
Disagree	123 (14.9)	110 (11.8)

$X^2 = 3.27$ df = 1 Significance = .07

TABLE 31. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on classification (year in school) to the statement: Cheating is a serious problem at Iowa State

Response	Freshman	Senior
Agree	108 (13.5)	226 (24.9)
Disagree	694 (86.5)	681 (75.1)
$X^2 = 34.77$ df = 1 Significance = .00**		

**Significance at .01 level.

Ten questions and statements were utilized to test this hypothesis.

Question 7A: "What would you do if you saw a student cheating?" At least 80 percent of both the males and females surveyed said they would either mention the incident to other students but not report the student or ignore the incident. Fifteen percent of the females and 13 percent of the male respondents reported they would express disapproval to the student but not report him/her, while only four percent of the female respondents and five percent of the male respondents said they would report the student to the proper authority. Results of these findings are reported in Table 32. Highly significant differences were found in the responses.

Question 7B: "Regardless of the action you would take, what kind of feeling would you most likely have toward a student you observed cheating?" Fifty percent of the females compared to 61 percent of the male respondents said they would have feelings of disgust toward an observed cheater. Thirty-one percent of the females compared to 23 percent of the male respondents said they would feel indifferent, whereas 19 percent of the females and 16 percent of the male respondents reported they would feel sorrow towards an observed cheater. These data are

TABLE 32. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups on the basis of sex to the question: What would you do if you saw a student cheating

Response	Female	Male
Report him/her to the instructor, proctor or appropriate authority.	44 (4.3)	39 (5.3)
Express disapproval to the student but not report him/her	150 (14.6)	98 (13.3)
Mention the incident to other students but not report him/her	322 (31.4)	282 (38.2)
Ignore the incident	508 (49.6)	320 (43.3)

$X^2 = 10.75$ df = 3 Significance = .01**

**Significance at .01 level.

presented in Table 33. Highly significant differences in responses were found.

Eight statements were presented to obtain respondents' feelings toward academic dishonesty.

Statement 7C: "Under no circumstances is cheating justified." No significant differences were found between males and females as approximately 80 percent of the female and male respondents agreed with this statement. These data can be found in Table 34.

Statement 7D: "Cheating is justified when a person needs to pass a course to stay in school." A significant difference was found at the .05 level. The majority of respondents in both groups thought this statement was true (86 percent of the females and 90 percent of the male respondents). Table 35 reports these results.

Statement 7E: "Reporting someone for cheating is worse than cheating." Seventy-six of the female respondents compared to 85 percent of the male respondents disagreed with this statement. As indicated in Table 36, highly significant differences in responses were found.

Statement 7F: "Among faculty members, there is little uniformity in handling instances of cheating." Approximately two-thirds of the respondents in both groups agreed with this statement, and the remaining one-third

TABLE 33. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups on the basis of sex to the question: Regardless of the action you would take, what kind of feeling would you most likely have toward a cheater

Responses	Female	Male
Indifference	324 (31.4)	169 (22.8)
Sorrow	192 (18.6)	120 (16.2)
Disgust	516 (50.0)	452 (61.0)

$X^2 = 22.42$ df = 2 Significance = .00**

Note: Due to less than 20 percent in a cell, the response "admiration" was eliminated.

**Significance at .01 level.

TABLE 34. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on sex to the following statement: Under no circumstances is cheating justified

Response	Female	Male
Agree	867 (83.9)	633 (84.7)
Disagree	166 (16.1)	114 (15.3)

X^2 = .16 df = 1 Significance = .69

TABLE 35. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on sex to the following statement: Cheating is justified when a person needs to pass a course to stay in school

Response	Female	Male
Agree	140 (13.0)	77 (10.4)
Disagree	892 (86.4)	666 (89.6)

$X^2 = 3.84$ df = 1 Significance = .05*

*Significance at .05 level.

TABLE 36. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on sex to the following statement: Reporting someone for cheating is worse than cheating

Response	Female	Male
Agree	247 (24.3)	113 (15.4)
Disagree	770 (75.7)	623 (84.6)

$X^2 = 20.34$ df = 1 Significance = .00**

**Significance at .01 level.

disagreed with this statement. No significant differences in responses were found. These data are presented in Table 37.

Statement 7G: "In general, faculty members do not try very hard to catch cheaters." Approximately half of the female and male respondents agreed with this statement. No significant differences in responses were found between the groups. A summary of these results are presented in Table 38.

Statement 7H: "Some faculty members ignore clear-cut instances of cheating." The difference in responses proved to be highly significant. Seventy-two percent of the female respondents compared to 59 percent of the male respondents thought this statement was true. Twenty-eight percent of the female respondents compared to 41 percent of the male respondents disagreed with this statement. These data can be ascertained from Table 39.

Statement 7I: "Students look the other way when they see someone cheating on an exam." Approximately 80 percent of both the female and male respondents agreed with this statement. No significant differences were found in the responses as noted in Table 40.

Statement 7J: "Cheating is a serious problem at Iowa State." Response differences were highly significant for

TABLE 37. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on sex to the following statement: among faculty members, there is little uniformity in handling instances of cheating

Response	Female	Male
Agree	630 (67.7)	457 (67.3)
Disagree	300 (32.3)	222 (32.7)

X^2 = .02 df = 1 Significance = .90

TABLE 38. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on sex to the following statement: In general, faculty members do not try very hard to catch cheaters

Response	Female	Male
Agree	509 (50.0)	392 (53.8)
Disagree	508 (50.0)	337 (46.2))

$X^2 = 2.21$ df = 1 Significance = .14

TABLE 39. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on sex to the following statement: Some faculty members ignore clear-cut instances of cheating

Response	Female	Male
Agree	276 (28.1)	288 (40.8)
Disagree	705 (71.9)	418 (59.2)

$X^2 = 29.99$ df = 1 Significance = .00**

**Significance at .01 level.

TABLE 40. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on sex to the following statement: Students look the other way when they see someone cheating on an exam

Response	Female	Male
Agree	875 (86.2)	645 (87.4)
Disagree	140 (13.8)	93 (12.6)

X^2 = .43 df = 1 Significance = .51

this statement as depicted in Table 41. Eighty-four percent of the female respondents compared to 76 percent of the male respondents disagreed that cheating was a serious problem at Iowa State.

Hypothesis seven received strong evidence for rejection because 60 percent of the questions and statements (implied subhypotheses) revealed significant differences.

Hypothesis Eight

> There will be no significant difference between the attitudes toward cheating of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups in relation to respondents' place of residence.

Ten questions and statements were used to test this hypothesis.

Question 8A: "What would you do if you saw a student cheating?" Eight-three percent of the individuals residing in university housing and Greek housing said they would either mention the incident to other students but not report the student or ignore the incident. Seventy-eight percent of those individuals residing in off campus housing reported that they would take this approach.

The smallest percentage of respondents in all groups said they would either report the student to the appropriate authority or express disapproval to the student but not report him/her (between 17 to 22 percent). A significant

TABLE 41. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on sex to the following statement: Cheating is a serious problem at Iowa State

Response	Female	Male
Agree	160 (16.0)	173 (24.4)
Disagree	839 (84.0)	535 (75.6)

$X^2 = 18.77$ df = 1 Significance = .00**

**Significance at .01 level.

difference was found between groups at the .01 level. These data are presented in Table 42.

Question 8B: "Regardless of the action you would take, what kind of feeling would you most likely have toward a student you observed cheating?" Again, a significant difference was found in responses. Approximately, half of the individuals in all the groups reported that they would have feeling of disgust for this type of behavior, while the smallest percentage of individuals in all areas said they would feel sorrow for an observed cheater. Table 43 presents these findings.

The respondents were asked to state their feelings about academic dishonesty based on various statements. Statements 8C: "Under no circumstances is cheating justified." At least 80 percent of the respondents in all the groups agreed with this statement. No significant differences were found in responses as presented in Table 44.

Statement 8D: "Cheating is justified when a person needs to pass a course to stay in school." Again, approximately 80 percent of all respondents thought cheating was not justifiable. Therefore, no significant differences were found between the responses. Findings are presented in Table 45.

TABLE 42. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on place of residence to the question: What would you do if you saw a student cheating

Response	University housing	Greek housing	Off campus housing
Report him/her to the instructor, proctor or appropriate authority	40 (3.9)	3 (1.5)	40 (7.3)
Express disapproval to student but not report him/her	136 (13.4)	33 (16.8)	78 (14.3)
Mention the incident to other students but not report him/her	365 (35.9)	73 (37.2)	167 (30.6)
Ignore the incident	477 (46.9)	87 (44.4)	260 (47.7)

X^2 = 18.62 df= 6 Significance= .00**

**Significance at .01 level.

TABLE 43. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on place of residence to the question: Regardless of the action you would take, what feelings would you most likely have toward a cheater

Response	University housing	Greek housing	Off campus housing
Indifference	282 (27.6)	68 (34.5)	142 (25.8)
Sorrow	162 (15.9)	36 (18.3)	113 (20.5)
Disgust	578 (56.6)	93 (47.2)	295 (53.6)

X^2 = 11.31 df= 4 Significance= .02*

Note: Due to less than 20 percent in a cell, the response "admiration" was eliminated.

*Significance at .05 level.

TABLE 44. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on place of residence to the following statement: Under no circumstances is cheating justified

Response	University housing	Greek housing	Off campus housing
Agree	882 (86.0)	159 (80.7)	455 (82.3)
Disagree	144 (14.0)	38 (19.3)	98 (17.7)

$X^2 = 5.75$ df = 2 Significance = .06

TABLE 45. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on place of residence to the following statement: Cheating is justified when a person needs to pass a course to stay in school

Response	University housing	Greek housing	Off campus housing
Agree	120 (11.7)	27 (13.8)	70 (12.7)
Disagree	904 (88.3)	169 (86.2)	481 (87.3)

X^2 = .80 df = 2 Significance = .67

Statement 8E: "Reporting someone for cheating is worse than cheating." Individuals living in off campus housing, disagreed slightly more with this statement than individuals in the other types of residence (83 percent in off campus housing compared to 78 percent in university housing and Greek housing). No significant differences in responses existed however. These data can be observed in Table 46.

Statement 8F: "Among faculty members, there is little uniformity in handling instances of cheating." Data generated responses with highly significant differences between the groups. Approximately three-fourths of the individuals living in Greek housing and in off campus housing agreed with this statement compared to approximately two-thirds of the people living in university housing. These data are presented in Table 47.

Statement 8G: "In general, faculty members do not try very hard to catch cheaters." In Table 48 responses illustrate a highly significant difference between respondents residing in university housing and those residing in Greek housing and in off campus housing. Fifty-four percent of the respondents living in university housing disagreed that faculty members do not try very hard to catch cheaters, while 54 percent of the respondents living in Greek housing and 60 percent of the respondents living in off campus believed this.

TABLE 46. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on place of residence to the following statement: Reporting someone for cheating is worse than cheating

Response	University housing	Greek housing	Off campus housing
Agree	219 (21.6)	47 (24.5)	95 (17.5)
Disagree	794 (78.4)	145 (75.5)	449 (82.5)

$X^2 = 5.67$ df = 2 Significance = .06

TABLE 47. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on place of residence to the following statement: Among faculty members, there is little uniformity in handling instances of cheating

Response	University housing	Greek housing	Off campus housing
Agree	587 (62.8)	135 (73.0)	363 (74.8)
Disagree	348 (37.2)	50 (27.0)	122 (25.2)

$X^2 = 23.99$ df = 2 Significance = .00**

**Significance at .01 level.

TABLE 48. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on place of residence to the following statement: In general, faculty members do not try very hard to catch cheaters

Response	University housing	Greek housing	Off campus housing
Agree	468 (46.3)	105 (54.1)	324 (60.2)
Disagree	542 (53.7)	89 (45.9)	214 (39.8)

$X^2 = 27.70$ df = 2 Significance = .00**

**Significance at .01 level.

Statement 8H: "Some faculty members ignore clear-cut instances of cheating." Data presented in Table 49 revealed that the highest percentage of those individuals responding to the survey (68 percent living in university housing and Greek housing and 63 percent of the individuals living in off campus housing) disagreed that some faculty members ignore cheating instances. No significant differences were found in the responses.

Statement 8I: "Students look the other way when they see someone cheating on an exam." Approximately 80 percent of the respondents living in all the areas believed that students looked the other way when they saw someone cheating on an exam." Again, no significant differences in responses were found. These data are reported in Table 50.

Statement 8J: "Cheating is a serious problem at Iowa State." Approximately 70 percent of the students living in Greek housing and in off campus housing disagreed with this statement, whereas 82 percent of those students living in university housing disagreed with this statement. Significant differences in responses were found at the .05 level. Results may be observed in Table 51.

Again, strong evidence for rejection was received for this hypothesis. Fifty-five percent of the questions and

TABLE 49. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on place of residence to the following statement: Some faculty members ignore clear-cut instances of cheating

Response	University housing	Greek housing	Off campus housing
Agree	308 (31.6)	61 (31.9)	194 (37.5)
Disagree	666 (68.4)	130 (68.1)	324 (62.5)

$X^2 = 5.38$ df = 2 Significance = .07

TABLE 50. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on place of residence to the following statement: Students look the other way when they see someone cheating on an exam

Response	University housing	Greek housing	Off campus housing
Agree	878 (86.6)	173 (87.8)	467 (86.8)
Disagree	136 (13.4)	24 (12.2)	71 (13.2)

X^2 = .28 df = 2 Significance = .90

statements (implied subhypotheses) were significantly different.

Hypothesis Nine

> There will be no significant difference between the attitudes toward cheating of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups in relation to respondents' grade point average.

Ten questions and statements (implied subhypotheses) were used to test this hypothesis.

Question 9A: "What would you do if you saw a student cheating?" The highest percentage of the respondents who said they would ignore the incident had a cumulative grade point average of 1.74 or below (61 percent). The next highest percentage of respondents (51 percent) were those students who had a cumulative grade point average ranging from 3.50 to 3.74. The smallest percentage of the respondents who had a cumulative grade point average ranging from 1.99 or below (between two percent and seven percent) said they would report the student to the proper authority. No significant differences existed in responses as illustrated in Table 52.

Question 9B: "Regardless of the action you would take, what kind of feeling would you most likely have toward a student you observed cheating?" Approximately two-thirds of the students who had a cumulative grade point average

TABLE 51. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on place of residence to the following statement: Cheating is a serious problem at Iowa State

Response	University housing	Greek housing	Off campus housing
Agree	173 (17.6)	46 (24.0)	113 (21.4)
Disagree	812 (82.4)	146 (76.0)	414 (78.6)

$X^2 = 6.05$ df = 2 Significance = .05*

*Significance at .05 level.

TABLE 52. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on GPA to the question: What would you do if you saw a student cheating

Response	3.75 to 4.00	3.50 to 3.74	3.25 to 3.49	3.00 to 3.24
Report him/her to the instructor, proctor or appropriate authority.	7 (6.8)	7 (5.1)	5 (3.0)	18 (7.4)
Express disapproval to the student but not report him/her.	14 (13.6)	9 (6.6)	23 (13.9)	31 (12.7)
Mention the incident to other students but not report him/her.	38 (36.9)	51 (37.5)	61 (36.7)	86 (35.2)
Ignore the incident.	44 (42.7)	69 (50.7)	77 (46.4)	109 (44.7)

$X^2 = 29.82$ df = 27 Significance = .32

2.75 to 2.99	2.50 to 2.74	2.25 to 2.49	2.00 to 2.24	1.75 to 1.99	1.74 or below
12 (3.9)	10 (3.9)	10 (5.0)	4 (2.1)	4 (5.5)	2 (3.0)
42 (13.7)	43 (16.9)	33 (16.6)	29 (15.4)	9 (12.3)	10 (15.2)
144 (37.1)	75 (29.5)	66 (33.2)	67 (35.6)	24 (32.9)	14 (21.2)
139 (45.3)	126 (49.6)	90 (45.2)	88 (46.8)	36 (49.3)	40 (60.6)

between 3.00 and 4.00 reported that they would have feelings of disgust towards and observed cheater. Likewise, nearly half of the students with a cumulative grade point average ranging from 2.00 to 2.99 and about one-third of the students with a cumulative grade point average ranging from 1.74 or below to 1.99 expressed this feeling. Differences in responses were highly significant as can be observed in Table 53.

Respondents were asked to respond to several statements designed to elicit their feelings about academic dishonesty.

Statement 9C: "Under no circumstances is cheating justified." No significant differences in responses were identified. Nearly 80 percent of all the respondents agreed that cheating was not justified under any circumstances. A summary of these data can be observed in Table 54.

Statement 9D: "Cheating is justified when a person needs to pass a course to stay in school." Almost all of the students with a cumulative grade point average ranging from 2.75 to 4.00 disagreed with this statement. Similarly, nearly 80 percent of those with a cumulative grade point average ranging from 1.99 to 2.50, and 77 percent of those with a cumulative grade point average of 1.74 or below disagreed with this statement. Differences in responses were highly significant as illustrated in Table 55.

TABLE 53. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on GPA to the question: What kind of feeling would you most likely have toward a student you observed cheating

Response	3.75 to 4.00	3.50 to 3.74	3.25 to 3.49	3.00 to 3.24
Indifference	17 (16.8)	27 (19.7)	36 (21.7)	58 (23.7)
Sorrow	21 (20.8)	24 (17.5)	29 (17.5)	39 (15.9)
Disgust	63 (62.4)	86 (62.8)	101 (60.8)	148 (60.4)

$X^2 = 60.75$ df = 18 Significance = .00**

Note: Due to less than 20 percent in a cell, the response "admiration" was eliminated.

**Significance at .01 level.

2.75 to 2.99	2.50 to 2.74	2.25 to 2.49	2.00 to 2.24	1.75 to 1.99	1.74 or below
70 (22.2)	83 (32.5)	63 (31.3)	70 (37.4)	31 (42.5)	32 (48.5)
58 (18.4)	41 (16.1)	33 (16.4)	35 (18.7)	14 (19.2)	10 (15.2)
187 (59.4)	131 (51.4)	105 (52.2)	82 (43.9)	28 (38.4)	24 (36.4)

TABLE 54. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on GPA to the following statement: Under no circumstances is cheating justified

Response	3.75 to 4.00	3.50 to 3.74	3.25 to 3.49	3.00 to 3.24
Agree	86 (82.7)	123 (89.1)	149 (88.7)	210 (85.0)
Disagree	18 (17.3)	15 (10.9)	19 (11.3)	37 (15.0)

$X^2 = 13.85$ df = 9 Significance = .13

Note: Due to less than 20 percent in a cell, the response "admiration" was eliminated.

2.75 to 2.99	2.50 to 2.74	2.25 to 2.49	2.00 to 2.24	1.75 to 1.99	1.74 to or below
267 (85.3)	206 (80.8)	170 (85.0)	152 (80.9)	55 (75.3)	56 (84.8)
46 (14.7)	49 (19.2)	30 (15.0)	36 (19.1)	18 (24.7)	10 (15.2)

TABLE 55. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on GPA to the following statement: Cheating is justified when a person needs to pass a course to stay in school

Response	3.75 to 4.00	3.50 to 3.74	3.25 to 3.49	3.00 to 3.24
Agree	5 (4.9)	8 (5.8)	10 (6.0)	21 (8.6)
Disagree	98 (95.1)	130 (94.2)	158 (94.0)	223 (91.4)

$X^2 = 47.11$ df = 9 Significance = .00**

Note: Due to less than 20 percent in a cell, the response "admiration" was eliminated.

**Significance at .01 level.

2.75 to 2.99	2.50 to 2.74	2.25 to 2.49	2.00 to 2.24	1.75 to 1.99	1.74 or below
30 (9.6)	42 (16.4)	35 (17.6)	35 (18.5)	13 (18.1)	15 (22.7)
282 (90.4)	214 (83.6)	164 (82.4)	154 (81.5)	59 (81.9)	51 (77.3)

Statement 9E: "Reporting someone for cheating is worse than cheating." The greatest percentage of all the respondents disagreed with this statement (between 70 and 86 percent). No significant differences were found between responses. Results are presented in Table 56.

Statement 9F: "Among faculty members, there is little uniformity in handling instances of cheating." Data indicate a significant difference at the .01 level. Approximately 70 percent of the students who had a cumulative grade point average ranging from 3.00 to 4.00, and approximately 60 percent of the students with a cumulative grade point average ranging from 1.99 to 2.99 agreed with this statement. On the other hand, 53 percent of those respondents who had a cumulative grade point average of 1.74 or below disagreed with this statement. A summary of these data can be ascertained from Table 57.

Statement 9G: "In general, faculty members do not try very hard to catch cheaters." Data in Table 58 indicate highly significant differences in responses. Seventy-one percent of the individuals with a cumulative grade point average of 1.74 or below and 62 percent of those individuals with a cumulative grade point average between 1.75 and 1.99 disagreed with this statement. However, nearly 60 percent of the respondents with a cumulative grade point average

TABLE 56. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on GPA to the following statement: Reporting someone for cheating is worse than cheating

Response	3.75 to 4.00	3.50 to 3.74	3.25 to 3.49	3.00 to 3.24
Agree	14 (13.9)	22 (16.1)	25 (15.3)	49 (20.2)
Disagree	87 (86.1)	115 (83.9)	138 (84.7)	194 (79.8)

$X^2 = 19.49$ df = 9 Significance = .21

Note: Due to less than 20 percent in a cell, the response "admiration" was eliminated.

2.75 to 2.99	2.50 to 2.74	2.25 to 2.49	2.00 to 2.24	1.75 to 1.99	1.74 or below
59 (19.1)	64 (25.3)	36 (18.6)	49 (26.2)	19 (26.0)	19 (29.2)
250 (80.9)	189 (74.7)	158 (81.4)	138 (73.8)	54 (74.0)	46 (70.8)

TABLE 57. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on GPA to the following statement: Among faculty members there is little uniformity in handling instances of cheating

Response	3.75 to 4.00	3.50 to 3.74	3.25 to 3.49	3.00 to 3.24
Agree	64 (71.1)	88 (75.2)	107 (70.9)	162 (69.5)
Disagree	26 (28.9)	29 (24.8)	44 (29.1)	71 (30.5)

$X^2 = 19.82$ df = 9 Significance = .01**

Note: Due to less than 20 percent in a cell, the response "admiration" was eliminated.

**Significance at .01 level.

2.75 to 2.99	2.50 to 2.74	2.25 to 2.49	2.00 to 2.24	1.75 to 1.99	1.74 or below
182 (65.2)	161 (68.2)	126 (68.1)	116 (67.4)	36 (57.1)	29 (47.5)
97 (34.8)	75 (31.8)	59 (31.9)	56 (32.6)	27 (42.9)	32 (52.5)

TABLE 58. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on GPA to the following statement: In general, faculty members do not try very hard to catch cheaters

Response	3.75 to 4.00	3.50 to 3.74	3.25 to 3.49	3.00 to 3.24
Agree	62 (60.2)	78 (58.6)	87 (54.0)	141 (57.6)
Disagree	41 (39.8)	55 (41.4)	74 (46.0)	104 (42.4)

$X^2 = 35.52$ df = 9 Significance = .00**

Note: Due to less than 20 percent in a cell, the response "admiration" was eliminated.

**Significance at .01 level.

2.75 to 2.99	2.50 to 2.74	2.25 to 2.49	2.00 to 2.24	1.75 to 1.99	1.74 or below
142 (46.0)	140 (55.3)	107 (54.6)	89 (47.6)	25 (37.9)	19 (28.8)
167 (54.0)	113 (44.7)	89 (45.4)	98 (52.4)	41 (62.1)	47 (71.2)

ranging from 3.24 to 4.00, and about 50 percent of the individuals with a cumulative grade point average ranging from 2.00 to 2.75 agreed that faculty members do not try very hard to catch cheaters.

Statement 9H: "Some faculty members ignore clear-cut instances of cheating." Approximately 60 percent of the students with a cumulative grade point average between 3.00 and 4.00, and those individuals with a cumulative grade point average between 2.00 and 2.99 disagreed with this statement. Moreover, 79 percent of the students who had a cumulative grade point average of 1.99 or below disagreed with this statement. No significant differences in responses were found. Results are summarized in Table 59.

Statement 9I: "Students look the other way when they see someone cheating on an exam." Approximately 89 percent of the students agreed with this statement. Highly significant differences in responses were found. These data may be observed in Table 60.

Statement 9J: "Cheating is a serious problem at Iowa State University." More than 80 percent of the respondents with a cumulative grade point average ranging from 1.74 or below to 3.24, and those with a cumulative grade point average ranging from 3.50 to 3.74 disagreed with this statement. Similarly, approximately 70 percent of the

TABLE 59. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on GPA to the following statement: Some faculty members ignore clear-cut instances of cheating

Response	3.75 to 4.00	3.50 to 3.74	3.25 to 3.49	3.00 to 3.24
Agree	32 (33.0)	46 (35.9)	54 (34.6)	88 (37.8)
Disagree	65 (67.0)	82 (64.1)	102 (65.4)	145 (62.2)

$X^2 = 12.47$ df = 9 Significance = .19

Note: Due to less than 20 percent in a cell, the response "admiration" was eliminated.

2.75 to 2.99	2.50 to 2.74	2.25 to 2.49	2.00 to 2.24	1.75 to 1.99	1.74 or below
101 (34.5)	75 (30.5)	63 (33.0)	63 (34.8)	14 (20.9)	13 (21.3)
192 (65.5)	171 (69.5)	128 (67.0)	118 (65.2)	53 (79.1)	48 (78.7)

TABLE 60. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on GPA to the following statement: Students look the other way when they see someone cheating on an exam

Response	3.75 to 4.00	3.50 to 3.74	3.25 to 3.49	3.00 to 3.24
Agree	88 (86.0)	127 (94.1)	145 (89.5)	223 (91.0)
Disagree	12 (12.0)	8 (5.9)	17 (10.5)	22 (9.0)

$X^2 = 22.37$ df = 9 Significance = .01**

Note: Due to less than 20 percent in a cell, the response "admiration" was eliminated.

**Significance at .01 level.

2.75 to 2.99	2.50 to 2.74	2.25 to 2.49	2.00 to 2.24	1.75 to 1.99	1.74 or below
262 (84.8)	211 (83.4)	161 (82.6)	162 (86.6)	56 (78.9)	56 (90.3)
47 (15.2)	42 (16.6)	34 (17.4)	25 (13.4)	15 (21.1)	6 (9.7)

respondents with a cumulative grade point average ranging from 3.25 to 3.49, and from 3.75 to 4.00 also disagreed that cheating at Iowa State was a serious problem. Data in Table 61 indicate highly significant differences in the responses.

Sixty percent of the questions and statements (implied subhypotheses) showed significant differences. Therefore, the hypothesis received strong evidence for rejection.

Hypothesis Ten

> There will be no significant difference between the attitudes toward cheating of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups in relation to respondents' degree aspirations.

Ten questions and statements (implied subhypotheses) were used to test this hypothesis.

Question 10A: "What would you do if you saw a student cheating?" At least 80 percent or more of the respondents who did not plan to complete the bachelor's or master's degree said they would either mention the incident to other students but not report the student or ignore the incident. Likewise, 72 percent of those individuals who planned to complete the Ph.D. or professional degree said they would take this action. Between 13 percent and 18 percent of the students who reported they would not complete the bachelor's degree, but would complete the bachelor's degree and the master's degree said they would either report the student to

TABLE 61. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on GPA to the following statement: Cheating is a serious problem at Iowa State

Response	3.75 to 4.00	3.50 to 3.74	3.25 to 3.49	3.00 to 3.24
Agree	30 (30.9)	21 (16.3)	44 (28.0)	45 (18.9)
Disagree	67 (69.1)	108 (83.7)	113 (72.0)	193 (81.1)

$X^2 = 24.72$ df = 9 Significance = .00**

Note: Due to less than 20 percent in a cell, the response "admiration" was eliminated.

**Significance at .01 level.

2.75 to 2.99	2.50 to 2.74	2.25 to 2.49	2.00 to 2.24	1.75 to 1.99	1.74 or below
56 (18.6)	47 (19.0)	37 (19.6)	27 (14.8)	8 (11.6)	7 (11.1)
245 (81.4)	201 (81.0)	152 (80.4)	155 (85.2)	61 (88.4)	56 (88.9)

the appropriate authority or express disapproval to the student, but not report him or her. Similarly, 28 percent of the students who planned to complete the Ph.D. or professional degree said they would take this action. Differences in responses were highly significant. Table 62 presents data relative to these responses.

Question 10B: "Regardless of the action you would take, what kind of feeling would you most likely have toward a student you observed cheating?" Table 63 indicates that the chi-square test was significant at the .01 level.

Approximately 56 percent of the students who planned to received the bachelor's degree, the master's degree, the Ph.D. or a professional degree said they would have feelings of disgust for observed cheaters. Related to this question 38 percent of those students who did not intend to complete the bachelor's degree also said they would have this feeling. Nearly 25 percent of the respondents in all four categories reported that they would feel indifferent toward a student they observed cheating. Nevertheless, around 17 percent of the respondents who planned to receive the bachelor's degree, the master's degree, the Ph.D. or a professional degree said they would feel sorrow for an observed cheater. Likewise, 38 percent of the respondents who did not plan to complete the bachelor's degree said they would also feel sorrow for someone they observed cheating.

TABLE 62. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on degree aspirations to the question: What would you do if you saw a student cheating

Response	Will not complete BS/BA degree	BS/BA degree only	MS/MA degree	Ph.D./ Profes. degree
Report him/her to instructor, proctor or appropriate authority	1 (4.2)	36 (3.3)	23 (5.6)	22 (10.4)
Express disapproval to student but not report him/her.	2 (8.3)	155 (14.1)	51 (12.3)	38 (18.0)
Mention the incident to other students but not report him/her.	8 (33.3)	375 (34.1)	159 (38.4)	58 (27.5)
Ignore incident	13 (54.2)	535 (48.6)	181 (43.7)	93 (44.1)

$X^2 = 11.19$ df = 3 Significance = .01**

**Significance at .01 level.

TABLE 63. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on degree aspirations to the question: What kind of feeling would you most likely have toward a cheater

Response	Will not complete BS/BA degree	BS/BA degree only	MS/MA degree	Ph.D./ Profes. degree
indifference	6 (25.0)	322 (29.0)	109 (26.5)	43 (20.2)
sorrow	9 (37.5)	182 (16.4)	79 (19.2)	38 (17.8)
disgust	9 (37.5)	597 (53.7)	224 (54.4)	132 (62.0)

X^2 = 170.01 df = 6 Significance = .01**

Note: Due to less than 20 percent in a cell, the response "admiration" was eliminated.

Respondents were asked to give their feelings on several statements related to academic dishonesty.

Statement 10C: "Under no circumstances is cheating justified." Data in Table 64 reveal that almost all of all of the respondents in all the categories agreed that cheating was not justified under any circumstances. Thus, no significant differences in responses were found.

Statement 10D: "Cheating is justified when a person needs to pass a course to stay in school." Almost all of the respondents in all of the categories disagreed with this statement. Again, no significant differences in responses were found. These data can be reviewed in Table 65.

Statement 10E: "Reporting someone for cheating is worse than cheating." About 79 percent of the students who planned to complete the bachelor's, master's, the Ph.D. or a professional degree disagreed with this statement. Data in Table 66 report that highly significant differences in responses existed.

Statement 10F: "Among faculty members there is little uniformity in handling instances of cheating." Close to 70 percent of the respondents in all categories agreed that little uniformity existed among faculty members in handling cheating instances. Hence, no significant differences in responses were noted as demonstrated in Table 67.

TABLE 64. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on degree aspirations to the following statement: Under no circumstances is cheating justified

Response	Will not complete BS/BA degree	BS/BA degree only	MS/MA degree	Ph.D./ Profes. degree
agree	21 (87.5)	948 (85.1)	339 (81.7)	181 (84.6)
disagree	3 (12.5)	166 (14.9)	76 (18.3)	33 (16.4)

$X^2 = 2.87$ df = 3 Significance = .41

TABLE 65. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on degree aspirations to the following statement: Cheating is justified when a person needs to pass a course to stay in school

Response	Will not complete BS/BA degree	BS/BA degree only	MS/MA degree	Ph.D./ Profes. degree
agree	5 (20.8)	142 (12.8)	47 (11.4)	22 (10.2)
disagree	19 (79.2)	967 (87.2)	366 (88.6)	104 (89.8)

$X^2 = 3.11$ df = 3 Significance = .38

TABLE 66. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on degree aspirations to the following statement: Reporting someone for cheating is worse than cheating

Response	Will not complete BS/BA degree	BS/BA degree only	MS/MA degree	Ph.D./ Profes. degree
agree	10 (41.7)	226 (20.7)	95 (23.1)	29 (13.8)
disagree	14 (58.3)	868 (79.3)	317 (76.9)	181 (86.2)

$X^2 = 13.90$ df = 3 Significance = .00**

**Significance at .01 level.

TABLE 67. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on degree aspirations to the following statement: Among faculty members there is little uniformity in handling instances of cheating

Response	Will not complete BS/BA degree	BS/BA degree only	MS/MA degree	Ph.D./ Profes. degree
agree	17 (25.0)	653 (29.9)	269 (26.5)	140 (20.2)
disagree	7 (29.2)	348 (34.8)	110 (29.0)	54 (27.8)

$X^2 = 6.48$ df = 3 Significance = .09

Statement 10G: "In general, faculty members do not try very hard to catch cheaters." In Table 68, responses illustrate that the chi-square test was significant at the .01 level. Approximately 56 percent of the students who did not plan to complete the bachelor's degree or who planned to complete the master's degree, the Ph.D. or a professional degree were in agreement with this statement. On the contrary, 51 percent of those students who planned only to complete the bachelor's degree disagreed that faculty members do not try hard to catch cheaters.

Statement 10H: "Some faculty members ignore clear-cut instances of cheating." Data presented in Table 69 indicate that roughly two-thirds of the respondents who planned to complete the bachelor's degree, master's degree, Ph.D. or a professional degree disagreed with this statement. Similarly, 53 percent of the respondents who did not plan to complete the bachelor's degree disagreed with this statement. No significant differences in responses were found.

Statement 10I: "Students look the other way when they see someone cheating on an exam." Again, no significant differences in responses were found. Data in Table 70 indicate that almost all of the respondents in all categories agreed with this statement.

TABLE 68. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on degree aspirations to the following statement: In general, faculty members do not try very hard to catch cheaters

Response	Will not complete BS/BA degree	BS/BA degree only	MS/MA degree	Ph.D./ Profes. degree
agree	13 (54.2)	531 (48.6)	236 (58.1)	117 (55.7)
disagree	11 (45.8)	562 (51.4)	170 (41.9)	93 (44.3)

$X^2 = 12.39$ df = 3 Significance = .01**

**Significance at .01 level.

TABLE 69. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on degree aspirations to the statement: Some faculty members ignore cheating instances

Response	Will not complete BS/BA degree	BS/BA degree only	MS/MA degree	Ph.D./ Profes. degree
agree	11 (47.8)	338 (32.2)	138 (35.4)	70 (34.7)
disagree	12 (52.2)	713 (67.8)	252 (64.6)	132 (65.3)

$X^2 = 3.71$ df = 3 Significance = .29

TABLE 70. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on degree aspirations to the following statement: Students look the other way when they see someone cheating on an exam

Response	Will not complete BS/BA degree	BS/BA degree only	MS/MA degree	Ph.D./ Profes. degree
agree	22 (95.7)	944 (86.7)	352 (85.2)	181 (87.4)
disagree	1 (4.7)	145 (13.3)	61 (14.8)	26 (12.6)

$X^2 = 2.41$ df = 3 Significance = .49

Statement 10J: "Cheating is a serious problem at Iowa State University." Table 71 presents data showing how students perceived cheating at Iowa State. Significant differences in responses exist at the .01 level. Nearly 79 percent of the respondents in all the categories disagreed that cheating was a serious problem at Iowa State.

Since 50 percent of the questions and statements (implied subhypotheses) were significantly different, the general hypothesis received strong evidence for rejection.

Hypothesis Eleven

> There will be no significant difference between the attitudes toward cheating of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups in relation to respondents' size of hometown community.

Ten questions and statements were utilized to test this hypothesis.

Question 11A: "What would you do if you saw a student cheating." The highest percentage of the respondents (approximately 80 percent) in all the categories said they would either mention the incident to other students but not report the students or ignore the incident. The second highest percentage of respondents (approximately 15 percent) in all the categories reported they would express disapproval to the student but not report him or her,

TABLE 71. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on degree aspirations to the following statement: Cheating is a serious problem at Iowa State

Response	Will not complete BS/BA degree	BS/BA degree only	MS/MA degree	Ph.D./ Profes. degree
agree	4 (17.4)	188 (17.6)	82 (20.7)	54 (27.6)
disagree	19 (82.6)	882 (82.4)	315 (79.3)	142 (72.4)

$X^2 = 11.05$ df = 3 Significance = .01**

**Significance at .01 level.

whereas, approximately five percent of the respondents said they would report the student to the appropriate authority. The chi-square test was significant at the .05 level. These data can be observed in Table 72.

Question 11B: "Regardless of the action you would take, what kind of feeling would you most likely have toward a student you observed cheating?" Nearly 54 percent of the respondents in all categories reported that they would have feelings of disgust toward an observed cheater, while approximately 17 percent of the respondents reported that they would have feelings of sorrow toward a student for this behavior. Nevertheless, approximately 29 percent of those responding said they would feel indifferent towards someone they observed cheating. Data in Table 73 report no significant differences in responses.

Respondents feeling toward academic dishonesty were elicited by having them respond to several statements.

Statement 11C: "Under no circumstances is cheating justified." The majority of the respondents (approximately 83 percent) in percent) in all the categories agreed with this statement. Again, no significant differences in responses were found as can be observed in Table 74.

11D: "Cheating is justified when a person needs to pass a course to stay in school." As can be observed in

TABLE 72. Differences in response among the 1980 and 1983 class groups based on size of hometown to the question: What would you do if you saw a student cheating

Response	Rural farm open country or village	Under 2,000	2,000 to 10,000
Report him/her to the instructor, proctor or appropriate authority	19 (4.1)	7 (4.9)	9 (3.4)
Express disapproval to the student but not report him/her	57 (12.2)	23 (16.2)	40 (15.3)
Mention the incident to other students but not report him/her	185 (39.6)	47 (33.1)	95 (36.4)
Ignore the incident	206 (44.1)	65 (45.8)	117 (44.8)

$X^2 = 32.63$ df=21 Significance = .05*

*Significance at .05 level.

10,00 to 30,000	30,000 to 100,000	100,000 to 500,000	50,000 and over	Suburb of a large city of 500,000 or more
7 (3.3)	15 (5.2)	11 (4.9)	3 (6.1)	12 (10.1)
35 (16.5)	50 (17.5)	21 (9.4)	10 (20.4)	12 (10.1)
68 (32.1)	88 (30.8)	74 (33.0)	11 (22.4)	36 (30.3)
102 (48.1)	133 (46.5)	118 (52.7)	25 (51.0)	59 (49.6)

TABLE 73. Differences in response of the combined 1980 and 1983 class groups based on size of hometown to the question: What kind of feeling would you most likely have toward an observed cheater

Response	Rural farm open country or village	Under 2,000	2,000 to 10,000	10,000 to 30,000
Indifference	128 (27.8)	34 (24.1)	64 (24.4)	54 (25.2)
Sorrow	90 (19.1)	19 (13.5)	40 (15.3)	40 (18.7)
Disgust	254 (53.8)	88 (62.4)	158 (60.3)	128 (56.1)

$X^2 = 15.16$ df= 14 Significance = .37

Note: Due to less than 20 percent in a cell, the response "admiration" was eliminated.

30,000 to 100,000	100,000 to 500,000	50,000 and over	Suburb of a large city of 500,000 or more
86 (29.9)	67 (29.9)	18 (37.5)	41 (33.9)
49 (17.0)	42 (18.8)	9 (18.8)	21 (17.4)
153 (53.1)	115 (51.3)	21 (43.8)	59 (48.8)

TABLE 74. Differences in response among the 1980 and 1983 class groups based on size of hometown to the following statement: Under no circumstances is cheating justified

Response	Rural farm open country or village	Under 2,000	2,000 to 10,000
Agree	405 (85.6)	124 (86.1)	219 (83.6)
Disagree	68 (14.4)	20 (13.9)	43 (16.4)

$X^2 = 5.19$ df=7 Significance = .64

10,000 to 30,000	30,000 to 100,000	100,000 to 500,000	50,000 and over	Suburb of a large city of 500,000 or more
183 (85.1)	246 (84.8)	183 (82.1)	37 (75.5)	100 (82.6)
32 (14.9)	44 (15.2)	40 (17.9)	12 (24.5)	21 (17.4)

Table 75, almost all of the respondents in the categories disagreed with this statement. No significant difference were found between the responses.

Statement 11E: "Reporting someone for cheating is worse than cheating." Again, almost all of the respondents in all the categories disagreed with this statement. These data are reported in Table 76. The responses did not differ significantly.

Statement 11F: "Among faculty members, there is little uniformity in handling instances of cheating." Nearly two-thirds of the individuals in all the categories agreed with this statement. The results of these responses are presented in Table 77. No significant differences were found in the responses.

Statement 11G: "In general, faculty members do not try very hard to catch cheaters." Data presented in Table 78 reveal that no significant differences in the responses existed.

Statement 11H: "Some faculty members ignore clear-cut instances of cheating. As described in Table 79, the differences in responses were significant at the .05 level.

Statement 11I: "Students look the other way when they see someone cheating on an exam." Approximately 86 percent of the respondents in all the areas agreed that students

TABLE 75. Differences in response among the 1980 and 1983 class groups based on size of hometown to the following statement: Cheating is justified when a person needs to pass a course to stay in school

Response	Rural farm open country or village	Under 2,000	2,000 to 10,000
Agree	66 (14.0)	15 (10.5)	28 (10.7)
Disagree	407 (86.0)	128 (89.5)	233 (89.3)

$X^2 = 6.90$ df=7 Significance = .44

10,000 to 30,000	30,000 to 100,000	100,000 to 500,000	50,000 and over	Suburb of a large city of 500,000 or more
29 (13.5)	37 (12.9)	20 (8.9)	9 (18.4)	13 (10.8)
186 (86.5)	250 (87.1)	204 (91.1)	40 (81.6)	107 (89.2)

TABLE 76. Differences in response among the 1980 and 1983 class groups based on size of hometown to the following statement: Reporting someone for cheating is worse than cheating

Response	Rural farm open country or village	Under 2,000	2,000 to 10,000
Agree	84 (18.2)	27 (19.0)	50 (19.3)
Disagree	378 (81.8)	115 (81.0)	209 (80.7)

$X^2 = 8.32$ df=7 Significance = .30

10,000 to 30,000	30,000 to 100,000	100,000 to 500,000	50,000 and over	Suburb of a large city of 500,000 or more
52 (24.5)	54 (18.9)	53 (23.7)	9 (19.9)	31 (26.3)
160 (75.5)	232 (81.1)	171 (76.3)	38 (80.9)	87 (73.7)

TABLE 77. Differences in response among the 1980 and 1983 class groups based on size of hometown to the statement: Among faculty members, there is little uniformity in handling instances of cheating

Response	Rural farm open country or village	Under 2,000	2,000 to 10,000
Agree	292 (69.0)	94 (71.2)	159 (66.0)
Disagree	131 (31.0)	38 (28.8)	82 (34.0)

$X^2 = 4.09$ df=7 Significance = .77

10,000 to 30,000	30,000 to 100,000	100,000 to 500,000	50,000 and over	Suburb of a large city of 500,000 or more
126 (67.7)	173 (66.5)	136 (64.5)	34 (75.6)	72 (65.5)
60 (32.3)	87 (33.5)	75 (35.5)	11 (24.4)	38 (34.5)

TABLE 78. Differences in response among the 1980 and 1983 class groups based on size of hometown to the following statement: In general, faculty members do not try very hard to catch cheaters

Response	Rural farm open country or village	Under 2,000	2,000 to 10,000
Agree	223 (48.3)	83 (58.0)	130 (51.0)
Disagree	239 (51.7)	60 (42.0)	125 (49.0)

$X^2 = 5.83$ df=7 Significance = .56

10,000 to 30,000	30,000 to 100,000	100,000 to 500,000	50,000 and over	Suburb of a large city of 500,000 or more
107 (51.0)	155 (54.8)	117 (51.8)	24 (49.0)	61 (52.6)
103 (49.0)	128 (45.2)	109 (48.2)	25 (51.0)	55 (47.4)

TABLE 79. Differences in response among the 1980 and 1983 class groups based on size of hometown to the following statement: Some faculty members ignore clear cut instances of cheating

Response	Rural farm open country or village	Under 2,000	2,000 to 10,000
Agree	164 (37.1)	58 (42.6)	81 (32.4)
Disagree	278 (62.9)	78 (57.4)	169 (67.6)

X^2 =15.10 df=7 Significance = .03*

*Significance at .05 level.

10,000 to 30,000	30,000 to 100,000	100,000 to 500,000	50,000 and over	Suburb of a large city of 500,000 or more
63 (30.7)	78 (28.9)	61 (28.1)	13 (28.3)	41 (36.9)
142 (69.3)	192 (71.1)	156 (71.9)	33 (71.7)	70 (63.1)

look the other way when they observe someone cheating on an exam. These data are reported in Table 80. No significant differences were found in the responses.

Statement 11J: "Cheating is a serious problem at Iowa State University." Around 80 percent of the respondents in all the areas disagreed with this statement. Data can be observed in Table 81. No significant differences were found between the responses.

Twenty percent of the questions and statements (implied hypotheses) were significantly different. Therefore, based on the criteria established for interpreting the hypotheses, hypothesis eleven received mild evidence for rejection.

Factor Analysis

Factor analysis procedures were conducted to determine if the four factors: attitudes toward academic dishonesty, attitudes towards sanction for academic dishonesty, observation of academic dishonesty and definition of cheating behaviors would load in their predetermined categories. The results of the factor loading will be used to confirm if appropriate questions and statements were used to test a specific hypothesis.

Various survey items were subjected to factor analysis employing the method of principal component with varimax

TABLE 80. Differences in response among the 1980 and 1983 class groups based on size of hometown to the following statement: Students look the other way when they see someone cheating on an exam

Response	Rural farm open country or village	Under 2,000	2,000 to 10,000
Agree	400 (86.2)	122 (87.1)	220 (85.6)
Disagree	64 (13.8)	18 (12.9)	37 (14.4)

X^2 =10.79 df=7 Significance = .15

10,000 to 30,000	30,000 to 100,000	100,000 to 500,000	50,000 and over	Suburb of a large city of 500,000 or more
183 (87.1)	244 (85.6)	204 (92.3)	41 (87.2)	94 (80.3)
27 (12.9)	41 (14.4)	17 (7.7)	6 (12.8)	23 (19.7)

TABLE 81. Differences in response among the 1980 and 1983 class groups based on size of hometown to the following statement: Cheating is a serious problem at Iowa State

Response	Rural farm open country or village	Under 2,000	2,000 to 10,000
Agree	86 (19.2)	17 (12.7)	53 (20.9)
Disagree	361 (80.8)	117 (87.3)	200 (79.1)

$X^2 = 6.69$ df=7 Significance = .46

10,000 to 30,000	30,000 to 100,000	100,000 to 500,000	50,000 and over	Suburb of a large city of 500,000 or more
47 (22.8)	52 (18.6)	43 (19.7)	11 (24.4)	21 (18.4)
159 (77.2)	227 (81.4)	175 (80.3)	34 (75.6)	93 (81.6)

rotation. Items with factor loadings of .50 or greater were considered high and were used in the identification of a particular factor. However, items loading between .40 and .50 were also used especially if they seemed to fit with other items in that particular factor. Items with loadings less than .40 were not included in the interpretation of a factor.

As can be seen in Table 82, factor 1 tends to be an observation factor. Question 11, "Since you have been at Iowa State, how often have you seen another student cheating during an exam?" is an example of the questions used for this factor. Items loading heavily on this factor tend to be questions dealing with the actual observation of academic dishonesty. Factors two and three are attitude factors. Questions dealing with attitudes toward sanctions loaded higher on factor 2 than any other questions even though other attitude questions did load on this factor. For example, students were asked to choose what disciplinary measure should be taken for someone caught cheating. Questions dealing with attitude toward academic dishonesty loaded highest on Factor 3. One question used to measure this factor was, question 13 "Regardless of the action you would take, what kind of feeling would you most likely have toward a student you observed cheating." Factor 4 is the

definition factor which consists of items regarding students' perceptions of behaviors that constitute academic dishonesty. Some questions used for this factor: "Giving answers to other students during an exam," "taking an exam for another student," and "copying from someone's exam paper without his/her knowledge."

Reliability of the Instrument

Reliability procedures were used to estimate the percentage of score variance attributable to different sources. Thus, a reliability coefficient of .50 indicates that 50 percent of the variance of the test scores depends on true variance of the trait measured, and 50 percent depends on error variance.

Cronbach's alpha formula was used to test for reliability of the data collected on the four factors: Attitudes toward academic dishonesty, Attitudes towards sanctions for academic dishonesty, observations of academic dishonesty and definition of academic dishonesty. These results are reported in Table 83.

In summary, one factor was highly reliable (Factor 1, observation) two factors were moderate highly reliable (Factors 3 and 4, cheating attitudes and definition of cheating behaviors) and one factor yield weak relaibility estimates (Factor 2, sanction attitudes).

TABLE 82. Factor Analysis Matrix

Item	Factor 1 Observation	Factor 2 Sanction attitudes	Factor 3 Cheating attitudes	Factor 4 Definition
Q 11	-.44[1]	.13	-.32	-.04
Q 12	-.01	.40[1]	.04	-.03
Q 13	-.01	-.51[1]	.07	-.07
Q 14	-.33	.15	-.25	.03
Q 16	-.10	.59[1]	.00	.14
Q 17	.09	-.52[1]	-.06	-.14
Q 18	.02	-.50[1]	-.00	-.06
Q 19	.14	-.03	.54[1]	.11
Q 20	.14	.01	.70[1]	.07
Q 21	.24	.00	.57[1]	.03
Q 22	.16	.00	.20	.19
Q 23	.34	.25	.35	.05
Q 24	.05	.63[1]	-.01	-.09
Q 25	-.06	-.66[1]	-.03	-.04
Q 26	-.00	-.54[1]	-.03	-.13
Q 31	.52[1]	-.10	.15	.01
Q 32	.59[1]	-.09	.14	.03
Q 33	.57[1]	-.09	.12	.01
Q 34	.65[1]	-.07	.10	.05
Q 35	.68[1]	-.05	.15	.04
Q 36	.70[1]	-.08	.13	.02
Q 37	.67[1]	-.07	.14	.05
Q 38	.66[1]	.01	.05	.03
Q 39	.65[1]	-.02	.09	-.09
Q 40	.68[1]	-.01	-.04	-.12
Q 41	.58[1]	.01	-.11	-.17
Q 42	.61[1]	-.02	-.05	-.14
Q 43	-.03	-.05	-.05	.70[1]
Q 44	-.04	.10	-.04	.62[1]
Q 45	-.07	.04	-.00	.61[1]
Q 46	.04	.16	-.06	.46[1]
Q 47	-.07	.21	-.04	.37
Q 48	.06	.21	-.05	.38
Q 49	.01	.10	-.06	.52[1]
Q 50	-.06	.23	.00	.39

[1]High loading items on that factor.

TABLE 82. Continued

Item	Factor 1 Observation	Factor 2 Sanction attitudes	Factor 3 Cheating attitudes	Factor 4 Definition
Q 51	-.04	.45[1]	.02	.08
Q 52	-.05	.42[1]	-.03	.15
Q 53	-.07	.53[1]	.01	-.02
Q 54	-.09	.51[1]	-.05	.02
Q 56	.00	.08	-.23	-.04
Q 57	.17	-.05	-.33	.13
Q 58	.08	.07	.32	-.11
Q 59	-.09	.01	-.71[1]	-.03
Q 60	.05	.01	.21	-.04
Q 61	.02	.02	.20	-.13
Q 62	.07	-.05	-.32	.05
Q 63	.36	-.02	.32	.06
Q 64	.12	-.02	.32	.05
Q 65	.22	-.03	.16	.11
Q 66	.08	.07	.40[1]	-.17
Q 67	.14	.09	.27	-.15
Q 68	.14	-.07	-.19	.23
Q 69	.15	.05	.01	.01
Q 70	.23	.05	-.03	.03

TABLE 83. Reliability Results for Factors

Factor	Number of Items	Alpha
1	16	.81
2	12	.21
3	4	.56
4	5	.56
Overall Instrument	64	.56

CHAPTER V

Summary, Discussion, Conclusions, Recommendations

The purpose of this study was to determine how selected variables could be related to students' perceptions and attitude toward academic dishonesty at Iowa State University, and what changes have occurred in these attitudes and perceptions during the three year period from 1980 to 1983.

This perceptual study was a replication of one conducted at Iowa State University in 1980 by Barnett and Dalton. Barnett and Dalton surveyed a random sample of 1500 freshmen and seniors enrolled in the spring quarter of 1980. A replication of the Barnett and Dalton instrument was used to randomly survey 1500 freshmen and seniors enrolled in the spring semester of 1983.

A questionnaire using Likert-type scale and multiple choice items were used to elicit respondent response regarding their perceptions and attitudes toward academic dishonesty, attitudes toward sanctions for academic dishonesty, definition of what behaviors constitute academic dishonesty and observations of academic dishonesty.

The replicated study provided for comparison in students' perceptions and attitudes toward academic

dishonesty as well as established data for a cross sectional study on a particular group. Data will also be available for a longitudinal study on students perceptions and attitudes toward academic dishonesty at Iowa State University.

Data collected in 1980 and 1893 were statistically treated using the chi-square analysis test to determine if the perceptions and attitudes toward academic dishonesty differed significantly between the two class groups surveyed Cronbach's test of reliability and factor analysis were also used to test the identified variables.

The summary is presented in this chapter and includes major findings, conclusions recommendations for future research studies.

In examining respondent attitudes and perceptions toward academic dishonesty, the review literature noted a study done by Steininger, Johnson and Kirts (1964) which stated that students believed cheating to be justified under certain conditions and situations. On the contrary, findings from this study revealed that the respondents in both class groups believed that cheating was not justified under any circumstances (84 percent in 1980 and 85 percent in 1983).

This investigator also found that the majority of the respondents in both class groups (78 percent in 1980 and 81 percent in 1983) disagreed that reporting someone for cheating is worse than cheating. Nevertheless, the majority of the respondents in both class groups (81 percent in both years) said if they observed someone cheating, they would either mention the incident to other students but not report the student, or ignore the incident. A very small percentage of the respondents (19 percent in both class groups) said they would either report the student to the appropriate authority or express disapproval to the student but not report him or her. Yet, 55 percent of the respondents in both class groups said they would feel disgust toward someone they observed cheating.

These findings are similar to Baird's (1980) study which found that 41 percent of the students would not be disturbed and would do nothing about an observed cheater, and 40 percent would be disturbed if observed cheating, but would not take any action.

It was also noted that respondents in both class groups believed that little uniformity in handling cases of cheating existed between faculty members (68 percent in 1980 and 67 percent in 1983). Further investigation revealed that in 1980, 58 percent of the respondents thought faculty

members in general do not try very hard to catch cheaters compared to 54 percent of the respondents in 1983 who thought this was not true. This difference in response could be related to the increased number of academic dishonesty cases reported to the Dean of Student Life office after 1980. According to an 1982-83 annual report compiled by the Dean office, during the academic school terms of 1980-81, 1981-82 and 1982-83, 40, 69 and 55 academic dishonesty cases were reported respectively. Sixty-two percent in 1980 and 70 percent of the respondents in 1983 said that some faculty members ignore obvious instances of cheating.

Findings on the class groups' attitudes toward sanctions for academic dishonesty revealed that respondents would not readily expell, if at all, someone from the university for academic dishonesty. The responses suggest that "failure of the course or exam" be the disciplinary measures used most often for cheating on a final exam, a midterm exam and plagiarizing a term paper. These types of sanctions may suggest a more lenient environment. Such an environment, according to Uhlig and Howes (1967) and Budig (1979) produces more cheating.

When asked to indicate what behaviors constituted cheating, a little over half of the respondents in 1980 (52

percent) said it was not dishonest to work on a homework assignment when the instructor does not allow it, and over half of the respondents (55 percent) did not consider copying a few sentences from a source without footnoting it in a paper to be dishonest. These findings could indicate that some instances of cheating occur because students are not aware that the act is dishonest. These findings are similar to those found by Uhlig and Howes (1967) and Montor (1971).

In reviewing the respondents' responses regarding observations of academic dishonesty, slightly over half of the respondents (53 percent in 1980 and 52 percent in 1983) had observed an ISU student cheating on an exam a few times compared to approximately one-fourth of the respondents (26 percent in 1980 and 28 percent in 1983) who had never observed a student cheating.

The literature review also revealed that cheating flourished in a less structured environment. Steininger, Johnson and Kirts (1964) and Stafford (1976) studies found that the professor's leaving the room and lack of sufficient proctors or monitors during an exam caused cheating to increase. In this study, the investigator found that when asked if a graduate assistant proctored the exam, nearly 47 percent in 1980 and 43 percent in 1983 said that this was

frequently descriptive of the test environment. In addition, a larger percentage of the respondents (83 percent in 1980 and 85 percent in 1983) reported that no proctor in the room during an exam was rarely or never descriptive of the test environment. On the other hand, when asked if the proctor remained alert throughout the exam in order to spot cheaters, approximately 40 percent of the respondents in both class groups said this was frequently descriptive of the test environment. In general, respondents tend to view the test environment as being somewhat lenient and unstructured.

Respondents' attitudes toward academic dishonesty based on college affiliation were also solicited. More students from the College of Veterinary Medicine said they would report a student to the appropriate authority for cheating than from any other college (24 percent compared to between one and seven percent). Students from the college of Veterinary Medicine also said they would have feelings of sorrow toward an observed cheater compared to students from other colleges who said they would have feelings of disgust toward an observed cheater (29 percent compared to between 47 and 67 percent).

Fifty-five percent of the students from the College of Engineering thought that in general, faculty members do not

try very hard to catch cheaters, whereas, 57 percent of the students from the College of Agriculture thought they did. The majority of the students from all the colleges agreed that little uniformity existed among faculty members in handling instances of cheating. Students from all the colleges disagreed that some faculty members ignore clear-cut instances of cheating.

The respondents' classification (year in school) and attitudes and perceptions toward academic dishonesty were also investigated. Results indicate some conflicting views between freshmen and seniors. Fifty-nine percent of the seniors said that some faculty members do not try very hard to catch cheaters, while 57 percent of the freshmen said they do. These differences could be related to the students' years of experience in ISU classroom. For the most part, freshmen had been at ISU for one semester or two quarters depending on the year the survey was given.

Slightly more seniors (40 percent) than freshmen (26 percent) reported that some faculty members ignore clear cut cheating instances, and that little uniformity in handling cheating cases exist among the faculty members (73 percent of the seniors and 61 percent of the freshmen). However, a large percentage of freshmen and seniors in both class groups reported that cheating is not a serious problem at

ISU (87 percent of the freshmen and 75 percent of the seniors).

The respondents' sex and attitudes and perceptions toward academic dishonesty were also investigated. More females (72 percent) than males (59 percent) said that some faculty members ignore obvious cheating instances. These findings support Uhlig and Howes (1967) and Anderson (1957) studies which found that females have more strict attitudes and feelings toward cheating than males.

Respondents' place of residence and attitudes toward academic dishonesty were also studied. Slightly more students (83 percent) living in off campus housing than students living in university or Greek housing (78 percent and 76 percent) disagreed that reporting someone for cheating is worse than cheating. However, respondents living in all three type of housing said they would feel disgust toward an observed cheater.

Fifty-four percent of the students living in university housing did not think that faculty members try very hard to catch cheaters, whereas 54 percent of the students living in Greek housing and 60 percent of the students living in off campus housing thought they did. More students living in all the areas disagreed that some faculty members ignore clear-cut instances of cheating. Approximately, three-

fourths of the students living in Greek housing and in off campus housing agreed that among faculty members, little uniformity existed in handling cheating instance. Approximately two-thirds of the student living in university housing who also agreed with this statement.

Most of the literature investigated regarding the students' grade point average or intelligence level and attitudes toward cheating appeared to report some correlation between the two. Findings from this study found that respondents with a cumulative grade point average of 1.74 or below thought faculty members handled instances of cheating in a similar manner (53 percent). Likewise, respondents with a cumulative grade point average of 1.74 or below (71 percent) and a cumulative grade point average raging from 1.75 to 1.99 (62 percent) said that faculty members try hard to catch cheaters. Yet, 79 percent of these students also thought that some faculty members ignore obvious instances of cheating.

The respondents' size of hometown and attitudes toward academic dishonesty was compared. Nearly, half of the respondents from a community size ranging from under 2,000 to 500,000 and from a suburb of a large city of 50,000 or more believe that in general, faculty members do not try very hard to catch cheaters. On the whole, students from

all the communities agreed that little uniformity exists among faculty members in handling instances of cheating, and disagreed that some faculty members ignore clear-cut instances of cheating.

No significant differences in responses were found when respondents were asked if cheating was a serious problem at ISU. The overall responses from both class groups indicates that cheating was not a serious problem at ISU. This response was also the same when the respondents' college affiliation, classification (year in school), sex, place of residence, grade point average, degree aspirations and size of hometown community were included.

One of the major findings of this study was that during a three period, freshmen and senior perceptions and attitudes toward academic dishonesty, attitudes toward sanctions for academic dishonesty, observations of academic dishonesty and definition of academic dishonesty did not change significantly.

Other findings revealed that students, for the most part, will not report another student for cheating to the appropriate authority, and would look the other way if they saw someone cheating. Nonetheless, they would feel disgust toward a student they observed cheating and do not think that reporting someone for cheating is worse than cheating.

Although only small differences were revealed, the 1983 class group seemed to be more unaccepting of dishonest acts than the 1980 class group. (Refer to Tables 2, 3 and 4). Students living in university and Greek housing are somewhat more lenient toward cheating than students living in off campus housing. This may be related to environmental factors. Students with a high cumulative grade point average seem to have a more serious attitude toward academic dishonesty than students with a low cumulative grade point average. Several studies reviewed reported similar findings.

On the average, seniors appeared to show more concern than freshmen in their attitudes toward academic dishonesty, and more females than males appeared to show more sympathy in their attitudes toward academic dishonesty.

Based on this study, the following recommendations are made for judicial boards, university committees and departmental officers responsible for adjudicating academic cases. Similarly, recommendations are made for students observing instances of academic dishonesty, and for students participating in this act. The recommendations are:

1. Written policies on the definition of academic dishonesty and the sanctions for academic dishonesty should be distributed to faculty,

administrators and students as well as published in the appropriate media forms.

2. A brochure outlying definitions, sanctions, causes, detections, policy and consequences of academic dishonesty should be written.
3. Instructors should inform students of their policies regarding academic dishonesty on the first day of class and before each exam.
4. Students caught cheating should be required to attend seminars, workshops, and other programs on academic dishonesty to help them assess the cause of this behavior.
5. Advisors should encourage students to attend assertiveness training workshops to help them better confront an observed cheater.
6. Programs on academic dishonesty should be a part of freshmen orientation.
7. Staff development seminars on academic dishonesty should be implemented for faculty, staff and administrators.
8. Faculty members should follow the policy on academic dishonesty in a uniform manner.
9. A training manual and programs for judicial board members handling academic dishonesty cases should be developed.

Recommendations for Future Study

The research instrument used in this study generated a considerable amount of data. These data in turn generated several questions regarding academic dishonesty and its impact on the integrity of an institution of higher learning.

In order to respond to these questions future studies may include:

1. Freshmen and seniors' attitudes and perceptions toward sanctions for academic dishonesty based on their: college affiliation, classification (year in school), sex, place of residence, grade point average, degree aspirations, and size of hometown community.
2. Freshmen and seniors' definition of cheating behaviors based on their: college affiliation, classification (year in school), sex, place of residence, grade point average, degree aspirations and size of hometown.
3. Other selected variables such as age group, religion, ethnic group, parents or legal guardians income level.
4. Departmental comparisons of the number of reported cases of academic dishonesty.

5. A comparison of faculty and undergraduate students' perceptions of academic dishonesty.
6. A comparison of faculty, administrators and students perceptions of academic dishonesty.
7. Perceptions of academic dishonesty among graduate students.
8. Perceptions of academic dishonesty based on student involvement in: leadership positions, activities and employment.
9. Comparison of International students and American students' attitudes and perceptions toward academic dishonesty.
10. A longitudinal study of the attitudes and perceptions toward academic dishonesty be done on a group of students from their freshmen year through their senior year on such variables as: college affiliation, classification (year in school), sex, place of residence, grade point average, degree aspirations, and size of hometown community.
11. The 1983 study be replicated in 1986 to measure changes in attitudes and perceptions toward academic dishonesty.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ackerman, P. D. (1971). The effect of honor-grading on students' test scores. American Educational Research Journal, 8 (2), 321-332.

Anderson, W. F., Jr. (1957). Attitudes of university students toward cheating. Journal of Educational Research, 50, 581-588.

Annual Report. (1982-83). Student Conduct Violations Iowa State University. Office of Student Life, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa.

Astin, A. W. (1968). The College Environment. Washington: D.C.: The American Council on Education.

Atkins, B. E., and Atkins, R. E. (1936). A study of the honesty of prospective teachers. Elementary School Journal, 36, 595-603.

Baird, J. S., Jr. (1980). Current trends in college cheating. Psychology in the Schools, 17 (4), 515-522.

Barnett, D. C., and Dalton, J. C. (1981). Why college students cheat. Journal of College Student Personnel, 22, 545-551.

Black, D. B. (1962). The falsification of reported examination marks in a senior university education course. Journal of Educational Sociology, 35, 346-354.

Bonjean, C., and McGee, R. (1965). Scholastic dishonesty among undergraduates in difference systems of social control. Sociology of Education, 38, 127-137.

Boodish, H. M. (1962). The teacher's page: School vs life. The Social Studies, 53, 149-153.

Borg, W. and Gall, M. (1983). Educational Research (4th ed.). New York: Longman, Inc.

Bowers, W. J. (1964). Student dishonesty and its control in college. (ERIC ED 003 834).

Bronzaft, A. L., Stuart, I. R., and Blum, B. (1973). Test anxiety and cheating on college examinations. Psychological Reports, 32, 149-150.

Budig, G. (1979). The prevalence of cheating in college. Phi Delta Kappan, 60, 754.

Burch, B. A. (1968). Dishonesty as expressed in the attitudes and behavioral responses of elementary and secondary school children in the classroom testing situation. Dissertation Abstracts International, 29 (6A), 1671.

Bushway, A. and Nash, W. R. (1977). School cheating behavior. Review of Educational Research, 47 (4), 623-632.

Burton, R. V. (1963). Generality of honesty reconsidered. Psychological Review, 70 (6), 481-499.

Campell, W. G. (1933). Measurement in determining the personality and behavior of the college cribber. Education, 53, 403-408.

Canning, R. (1956). Does an honor system reduce classroom cheating? Journal of Experimental Education, 24, 291-296.

Corey, S. M. (1936). Attitudes differences between college classes: A summary and criticism. Journal of Educational Psychology, 27, 321-330.

Crowne, D. P. and Marlowe, D. (1964). The approval motive. New York: Wiley.

David, K. H. (1967). Sex difference in cheating and judgement discrepancy on Barron's ES scale. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 24, 1154.

DeVries, D. L. and Ajzen, I. (1971). The relationship of attitudes and normative beliefs to cheating in college. The Journal of Social Psychology, 83, 199-207.

Dickstein, L. S., Montoya, R., and Neitlich, A. (1977). Cheating and fear of negative evaluation. Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 10, 319-320.

Drake, C. A. (1941). Why students cheat. Journal of Higher Education, 12, 418-420.

Ellenburg, F. C. (1973). Cheating on tests: Are high achievers greater offenders than low achievers? Clearing House, 47 (7), 427-429.

Feldman, S. E. and Feldman, M. T. (1967). Transition of sex differences in cheating. Psychological Reports, 20 (3), 957-958.

Fischer, C. T. (1970). Levels of cheating under conditions of informative apeal to honesty, public affirmation of value and threats of punishment. Journal of Education Research, 64 (1), 12-16.

Frymier, J. R. (1960). Faculty and student perceptions of cheating. Journal of Educational Research, 54, 118-120.

Garfield, Cohen and Roth. (1967). A correlative study of cheating in college students. The Journal of Educational Research, 61 (4), 172-173.

Gross, M. M. (1946). The effect of certain types of motivation on the "honesty" of children. Journal of Educational Research, 40, 133-140.

Harp, J. and Taietz, P. (1966). Academic integrity and social structure: A study of cheating among college students. Social Problems, 13 (4), 365-373.

Hartshorne, H. and May, M. A. (1928). Studies in the Nature of Character, Volume I: Studies in Deceit. New York: Macmillan.

Hartshorne, H., May, M. A., and Shuttleworth, F. K. (1930). Studies in the Nature of Character, Volume 3: Studies in the Organization of Character. New York: Macmillan.

Heisler, G. (1974). Ways to deter law violators: Effects of levels threat and vicarious punishment on cheating. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42, 557-582.

Hersch, R. H., Paolitto, D. P., and Reimer, J. (1979). Promoting Moral Growth from Piaget to Kohlberg. New York: Longman, Inc.

Hetherington, E. M. and Feldman, S. E. (1964). College cheating as a function of subject and situational variables. Journal of Educational Psychology, 55, 212-218.

Hoff, A. G. (1940). A study of honesty and accuracy found in pupil checking of examination papers. Journal of Educational Research, 34, 127-129.

Houston, J. P. (1983). College classroom cheating, threat, sex and prior performance. College Student Journal, 17, (3), 229-235.

Houston, J. P. (1978). Curvilinear relationships among anticipated success, cheating behavior, temptation to cheat, and perceived instrumentality of cheating. Journal of Educational Psychology, 70 (5), 758-762.

Houston, J. P. (1976). The assessment and prevention of answer copying on undergraduate multiple-choice examinations. Research in Higher Education, 51, 301-311.

Houston, John P. and Ziff, T. (1976). The effects of success and failure on cheating behavior. Journal of Educational Psychology, 68 (3), 371-376.

Huntley, C. W. (1965). Changes in study of values scores during the four years of college. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 71, 349-383.

Iowa State University Information Handbook 1984-85. (1984). University Publications Office, Ames, Iowa.

Jacobson, L. I., Berger, S. E., and Milliham, J. (1970). Individual differences in cheating during a temptation period when confrontation failure. Journal of Personality and social Psychology, 15, 48-56.

Jenson, L. M. (1972). Students and faculty attitudes toward academic dishonesty offenses. College Student Journal, 6 (2), 137-141.

Johnson, C. D. and Gormly, J. (1968). Achievement, Sociability and task importance in relation to academic cheating. Psychological Reports, 28, 302.

Johnson, C. D. and Gormly, J. (1971). Academic cheating: The contribution of sex, personality and situational variables. Developmental Psychology, 6 (2), 320-325.

Johnson, R. E. and Klores, M. S. (1968). Attitudes toward cheating as a function of classroom dissatisfaction and peer norms. Journal of Educational Research, 62, 60-64.

Kanfer, F. H. and Dverfeldt, P. H. (1968). Age, class standing and commitment as determinants of cheating in children. Child Development, 39 (2), 545-557.

Karabenick, S. A. and Srull, T. K. (1978). Effects of personality and situational variation in locus of control on cheating: Determinants of the "congruence effect". Journal of Personality, 46, 72-95.

Keller, M. (1976). Academic dishonesty at Miami. Student Life Research, 1-16.

Kelly, J. and Worell, L. (1978). Personality characteristics, parent behaviors and sex of subjects in relation to cheating. Journal of Research in Personality, 12, 179-188.

Knowlton, J. and Homerlynch, L. (1967). Perception of deviant behavior: A study of cheating. Journal of Educational Psychology, 58 (6), 379-385.

Lehmann, I. J. (1963). Changes in critical thinking, attitudes, and values from freshman to senior years. Journal of Educational Psychology, 54, 305-315.

Leming, J. (1978). Cheating behavior, situational influence, and moral development. Journal of Educational Research, 71, 214-217.

Levin, A. (1981). When Dreams and Heroes Died. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ludeman, W. W. (1938). A study of cheating in public schools. American School Board Journal, 96, 45.

McClintock, C. G. and Turner, H. A. (1962). The impact of college upon political knowledge, participation, and values. Human Relations, 15, 163-176.

McIntire, W. G. (1968). A comparative study of selected personality characteristics of students who cheat and do not cheat in an academic situation. Dissertation Abstracts International, 29 (8B), 3079-3080.

Miller, E. O. (1959). Nonacademic changes in college students. Educational Records, 40, 118-122.

Milliham, J. F. (1972). Evaluative dependence and cheating. Dissertation Abstracts International, 33, (9B), 4522-B.

Milliham, J. (1974). Two components of need for approval scores and their relationship to cheating following success and failure. Journal of Research in Personality, 8 (4), 378-392.

Montor, K. (1971). Cheating in high school. School and Society, 99, 96-98.

Mulcahy, G. (1967). The relationship between overt verbal attitude responses toward cheating behavior, achievement needs and cheating on test Dissertation Abstracts International, 28, (11A), 4488-4489.

Nuss, E. M. (1981). Undergraduate moral development and academic dishonesty. Dissertation Abstracts International, 42 (08), 3463.

Ott, L. (1977). An Introduction to Statistical Methods and Data Analysis. North Scituate, Massachusetts: Duxbury Press.

Parr, F. W. (1936). The problem of student honesty. Journal of Higher Education, 7, 318-326.

Peterson, P. and Walberg, H. J. (1979). Research on Teaching. Berkeley California: McCutchan Publishing Corp.

Renaud, R. E. (1979). Academic dishonesty as defined and reported by students and faculty from selected colleges at Michigan State University. Dissertation Abstracts International, 40(3), 1306.

Riley, R. H. (1967). Cheating propensity of high school students as a function of certain key perceptions. Dissertation Abstracts International, 28 (7A), 2455-2456.

Rokeach, M. (1973). The Nature of Human Values. New York: Collier Macmillan Publishers.

Roskens, R. W. and Dizney, H. F. (1966). A Study of unethical academic behavior in high school and college. The Journal of Educational Research, 59 (5), 231-234.

Schab, F. (1969). Cheating among college and noncollege bound pupils. The Clearing House, 34, 179-181.

Schwartz, S. H., Feldman, K. A., Braum, M. E. and Heitgartner, A. (1969). Some personality correlates of conducts in two situations of moral conduct. Journal of Personality, 37, 42-57.

Shelton, L. G. (1971). The role of anxiety and social comparison in the instigation of cheating. Dissertation Abstracts International, 31 (7B), 4371-B.

Sherrill, D., Salisbury, J. L., Horowitz, B. and Friedman, S. T. (1971). Classroom cheating: Consistent attitude, perceptions and behavior. American Educational Research Journal, 8 (3), 503-510.

Singhal. A. C. and Johnson, Patli. (1983). How to halt student dishonesty. College Student Journal, 17 (1), 13-19.

Skirt, E. and Hoffman, R. W. (1961). The academic setting of the dishonest student. Improving College and University Teaching, 9, 130-134.

Smith, C. P., Regen, E. and Diggins, D. R. (1972). Moral decicion making: Cheating on examinations. (ERIC, ED 053 406).

Stafford, T. H., Jr. (1976). Academic dishonesty at North Carolina State University: A student faculty response. North Carolina. (ERIC, ED 169 846).

Stannard, C. I. and Bowers, W. J. (1970). The college fraternity as an opportunity structure for meeting academic demands. Social Problems, 17 (3), 371-390.

Steininger, M. (1968). Attitudes toward cheating: General and specific. Psychological Reports, 22, 1101-1107.

Steininger, M., Johnson, R. E., and Kirts, D. K. (1964). Cheating on college examinations as a function of situationally aroused anxiety and hostility. Journal of Educational Psychology, 55, 317-324.

Thurstone, L. L. (1946). Comment. American Journal of Sociology, 52, 39-40.

Title, C. R. and Rowe, A. R. (1974). Research, fear and the student cheater. Change, 6 (3), 47-48.

Uhlig, G. E. and Howes, B. (1967). Attitudes toward cheating and opportunistic behavior. Journal of Educational Research, 60 (9), 411-412.

Vitro, F. T. (1971). The relationship of classroom dishonesty to perceived parental discipline. Journal of College Student Personnel, 12, (6), 427-429.

Vitro, F. T. and Schoer, L. A. (1972). The effects of probability of test success, test importance, and risk of detection of the incidence of cheating. Journal of School Psychology, 10 (3), 269-277.

Walsh, R. P. (1967). Sex, age and temptation. Psychological Reports, 21, 625-629.

Weldon, L. L. (1966). Cheating in school: Teachers are partners in crime. Clearing House, 40, 462-463.

Wilkinson, J. M. (1973). The relationship of two variations of classroom conditions, attitudes toward cheating, levels of self-actualization, and certain demographic variables to the cheating behavior of college students. Dissertation Abstracts International, 34 (9A-Pt. 1), 5671.

Williams, F. N. (1969). Cheating in the classroom. Improving College University Teaching, 17 (3), 183-184.

Woods, R. C. (1957). Factors affecting cheating and their control. West Virginia Academy of Science Proceedings, 29, 79-82.

Wright, J. C. and Kelly, R. (1974). Cheating: Student/faculty views and responsibilities. Improving College and University Teaching, 22 (1), 31 & 33.

Zastrow, C. H. (1970). Cheating among college graduate students. Journal of Educational Research, 64 (4), 157-160.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Praise God for all the people He has brought into my life to make this study a reality.

I extend deepest appreciation to my advisors, Dr. Larry Ebbers and Dr. Jon Dalton, for their guidance, dedication and valuable advice from the beginning to the end. The other members of my committee, Dr. Stanley Ahmann, Dr. George Kizer and Dr. Ted Solomon also deserve recognition. Special thanks go to Dr. Dan Robinson and Dr. Richard Deems for serving as interim committee members.

I am forever grateful and indebted to Kim Kateregga for the many long and hard hours of computer assistance. Special appreciation goes to Jackie Martin, Maurice Awiti, Manuel Cerrato, Sheryl Moore, Reinford Brevett, Mary Jane Fryer, plus Diane and Charles James for their assistance in typing, proof reading and critiquing this manuscript.

Without the many prayers and spiritual guidance of Pastor Tom Nesbitt and my friends at Grand Avenue Baptist Church this study would have been impossible to accomplish. I am especially grateful to Augustine Pounds, Daisy Kabagarama, Equilla Luke-Johnson, Robert DeMarzo, Kathy Mathew-Sharp, Virgina Arthur, Ted Johnson and all of my many friends for their support and encouragement.

Special gratitude is extended to Chuck Frederiksen, Carl Moen and the Department of Residence staff for their moral and financial support. Mrs. Alice Y. Hester, my high school teacher, needs special thanks for encouraging me to pursue my educational goals.

I enthusiastically thank my parents, Mrs. Eva King and Mr. Frank Rice for their love, support and inspiration. My sixteen sisters and brothers, my favorite aunt, Ms. Willia Hall, and all the members of my extended family also deserve appreciation for their sacrifices.

I praise God especially for His precious gift, my husband Alex, who has exemplified the characteristics and love of the husband described by the Apostle Paul. Alex, because you continued to walk humbly with God, you faithfully motivated me to persevere during the difficult and trying moments of this study.

Last, but not forgotten, I sincerely acknowledge my late grandmother, Mrs. Ruthie L. Hall, best known as "Sister" for her immeasurable love, discipline and wisdom. It is to her that this study is dedicated.

APPENDIX A: SURVEY INSTRUMENT

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
STUDENT SURVEY ON ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

This questionnaire is designed to determine what Iowa State students think about academic dishonesty. Please complete the form by circling the number next to the answer which best describes your feelings or by checking the appropriate box. Replies are confidential.

1. In which College are you registered?

1) Agriculture
2) Design
3) Education
4) Engineering
5) Home Economics
6) Sciences and Humanities - Major in Humanities
7) Sciences and Humanities - Major in Social Sciences
8) Sciences and Humanities - Major in Physical and Natural/ Mathematical Sciences
9) Veterinary Medicine

2. What is your classification?

1) Freshman
2) Sophomore
3) Junior
4) Senior
5) Special
6) Graduate - Master's
7) Graduate - Ph.D.

3. What is your sex?

1) Male
2) Female

4. Are you a member or a pledge of a social fraternity or sorority?

1) Yes
2) No

5. Which of the following best describes your local residence status?

1) Richardson Court
2) Towers
3) Union Drive
4) Fraternity House
5) Sorority House
6) Buchanan Hall
7) University Student Apartments
8) Off Campus housing in Ames
9) Live with parents or relatives in Ames
10) Live with parents or relatives outside of Ames and/or commute to Ames

6. Which of the following best describes your status?

1) Was a student at another college, university or community college before attending Iowa State
2) Iowa State is the first college or university attended

7. What is your cumulative grade point average?

1) 3.75 to 4.00
2) 3.50 to 3.74
3) 3.25 to 3.49
4) 3.00 to 3.24
5) 2.75 to 2.99
6) 2.50 to 2.74
7) 2.25 to 2.49
8) 2.00 to 2.24
9) 1.75 to 1.99
10) 1.74 or below

8. What are your degree aspirations?

1) Do not intend to complete the baccalaureate degree
2) A baccalaureate degree only
3) A master's degree
4) A Ph.D. or professional degree (M.D., D.V.M., D.D.S., etc.)

9. In which of the following kind of community did you spend the majority of your childhood? (Check one most appropriate)

1) Rural farm, open country or village
2) Under 2,000
3) 2,000 to 10,000
4) 10,000 to 30,000
5) 30,000 to 100,000
6) 100,000 to 500,000
7) 500,000 and over
8) suburb of a large city of 500,000 or more

10. What is the highest educational level attained by either of your parents?

1) Non-High School graduate
2) High School graduate
3) Associate degree
4) Attended some college but received no degree
5) Baccalaureate degree
6) Master's degree
7) Ph.D. or professional degree

11. Since you have been at Iowa State, how often have you seen another student cheating during an exam?

1) Never
2) Once
3) A few times
4) Many times

12. What would you do if you saw a student cheating?

1) Report him/her to the instructor, proctor or appropriate authority
2) Express disapproval to the student but not report him/her
3) Mention the incident to other students but not report him/her
4) Ignore the incident

13. Regardless of the action you would take, what kind of feeling would you most likely have toward a student you observed cheating?

1) Admiration
2) Indifference
3) Sorrow
4) Disgust

14. Since you have been in college, how often has another student asked you for help which you knew was not legitimate during an exam?

1) Never
2) Once
3) A few times
4) Many times

15. If someone asked you for help during an exam, what would you do?

1) Give him/her the answer
2) Say nothing but expose the paper so he/she can copy the answer
3) Ignore or turn down the request
4) Express disapproval to the student but not report him/her
5) Report the student to the instructor

Please indicate by checking the appropriate box how you feel about each of the following statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
16. Under no circumstances is cheating justified.				
17. Cheating is justified when a person needs to pass a course to stay in school.				
18. Reporting someone for cheating is worse than cheating.				
19. Among faculty members, there is little uniformity in handling instances of cheating.				
20. In general, faculty members do not try very hard to catch cheaters.				

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
21. Some faculty members ignore clear-cut instances of cheating.				
22. Students look the other way when they see someone cheating on an exam.				
23. Cheating is a serious problem at Iowa State				

Which of the following disciplinary measures <u>should</u> be taken at Iowa State when a student is caught cheating:

24. Cheating on a final exam

1) No disciplinary action at all
2) A reprimand and a warning not to repeat the act
3) A choice of taking the exam over or taking a make-up
4) Failure of the examination
5) Failure of the course
6) Suspension from the university
7) Permanent expulsion from the university

25. Cheating on a midterm or hourly examination

1) No disciplinary action at all
2) A reprimand and a warning not to repeat the act
3) A choice of taking the exam over or taking a make-up
4) Failure of the examination
5) Failure of the course
6) Suspension from the university
7) Permanent expulsion from the university

26. Plagiarizing a term paper

1) No disciplinary action at all
2) A reprimand and a warning not to repeat the act
3) A choice of re-writing the paper or doing a new paper
4) A grade of "F" on the paper
5) Failure of the course
6) Suspension from the university
7) Permanent expulsion from the university

If you cheated on a course at Iowa State and the following individuals knew about it, how strongly would they disapprove?

	Very Strongly	Fairly Strongly	Not Strongly	Not at all
27. A close friend				
28. A fraternity brother or sorority sister				
29. Your parents				
30. A faculty member				

From your own knowledge and experience, to what extent do Iowa State students engage in the following practices in their academic work?

	A great deal	A fair amount	Not much	Not at all	Don't know
31. Getting questions or answers about an exam from someone who had already taken it the same day.					
32. Copying a few sentences of material from a source without footnoting it in a paper.					
33. Working together with several students on a homework assignment when the instructor does not allow it.					
34. Adding a few items to a bibliography that they did not use in writing the paper.					
35. Copying from someone's exam paper without his/her knowledge.					
36. Arranging to sit next to someone in order to copy from his/her exam paper.					

	A great deal	A fair amount	Not much	Not at all	Don't know
37. Giving answers to other students during an exam.					
38. Turning in a paper that has been written entirely or in part by another student.					
39. Using unauthorized notes during an examination.					
40. Arranging with other students to give or receive answers by signals during an exam.					
41. Turning in a paper that one has purchased from a commercial research firm.					
42. Taking an examination for another student.					

Do you consider each of the following to be cheating?

	Yes	No
43. Arranging with other students to give or receive answers by signals during an exam.		
44. Copying from someone's exam paper without his/her knowledge.		
45. Taking an examination for another student.		
46. Using unauthorized notes during an examination.		
47. Turning in a paper that one has purchased from a commercial research firm.		
48. Giving answers to other students during an exam.		
49. Arranging to sit next to someone in order to copy from his/her paper.		
50. Turning in a paper that has been written entirely or in part by another student.		
51. Getting questions or answers about an exam from someone who has already taken it.		
52. Adding a few items to a bibliography that they did not use in writing the paper.		

	Yes	No
53. Working together with several students on a homework assignment when the instructor does not allow it.		
54. Copying a few sentences of material from a source without footnoting it in a paper.		

55. How do you typically learn about most of the cases of cheating you know about?

1) Observing the instances yourself
2) Hearing about them from the offenders
3) Hearing about them from other students on the grapevine
4) Hearing about them through official channels (the Daily, a dean's office, a faculty member, residence hall, advisor, etc.)

To what extent are each of the following statements descriptive of the conditions under which you have taken tests and examinations at Iowa State?

	Always or almost always	Frequently	Sometimes	Rarely or Never
56. The instructor proctors the exam.				
57. Graduate assistants proctor exam.				
58. There is no proctor in the room during the exam.				
59. Proctors remain alert throughout the exam in order to spot cases of cheating.				
60. Students may leave their seats without permission from the proctor.				
61. Students may leave the room without permission from the proctor.				
62. Seating is staggered.				
63. Instructors use the same exams they gave in previous years.				
64. Copies of past exams are routinely available from the instructor in studying for exams.				
65. Instructors give the same exam to more than one section of the same class.				

To what extent have you come in contact with the following types of examinations and examination questions at Iowa State?

	Frequently	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
66. Open-book exams				
67. Take home exams				
68. Objective questions (true-false, multiple choice or matching)				
69. Short answer or problem solving questions				
70. Essay questions				

To what degree are the following statements descriptive of the classes you have taken at Iowa State?

	Very descriptive	Somewhat descriptive	Not at all descriptive
71. Was able to keep up with the reading, homework and lab assignments			
72. Always had enough time to finish exams.			
73. The final exam determined more than a third of the final course grade.			
74. Had more than 40 students in the class.			
75. Had less than 20 students in the class.			

Thank you for your help!

APPENDIX B: LETTER TO STUDENTS

Iowa State University of Science and Technology Ames, Iowa 50011

Office of Student Life
206 Student Services Building
Telephone 515-294-1020
TTY or Voice

March 21, 1983

Dear Student:

We are conducting a study of the perceptions of freshmen and seniors regarding academic dishonesty at Iowa State University. We conducted a similar study in 1980. The data collected from this study will be compared with the 1980 data in order to identify changes in student attitudes and preceptions regarding academic dishonesty.

Your name was selected from a computer-generated random sample of Iowa State University freshmen and seniors. Enclosed is the questionnaire we would like for you to complete and return in the prepaid postal envelope. Your cooperation will be most helpful to us in learning more about perceptions of academic dishonesty.

Your responses will be kept confidential. The identification number on the questionnaire will allow us to follow up on unreturned surveys.

We are interested in your responses and hope you will take the time to complete and return this survey as soon as possible. If you have any questions, please feel free to let us know.

Sincerely,

Jon Dalton
Dean of Student Life

DeLores Rice
Graduate Student, Education
(294-5360)

Enc.

APPENDIX C: FOLLOW UP LETTER TO STUDENTS

Iowa State University of Science and Technology Ames, Iowa 50011

Office of Student Life
206 Student Services Building
Telephone 515-294-1020
TTY or Voice

May 9, 1983

Dear Student:

Recently you received a questionnaire regarding your perceptions of academic dishonesty at Iowa State University.

If you have not mailed your questionnaire, we would appreciate your help in filling out and returning the enclosed questionnaire in the prepaid postal envelope. We would like to include your responses in our survey.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Jon Dalton
Dean of Student Life

DeLores Rice
Graduate Student - Education

Enc.