

Journal of Business & Leadership: Research, Practice, and Teaching (2005-2012)

Volume 3
Number 1 *Journal of Business & Leadership*

Article 28

1-1-2007

Cheating In Academia- Different Attitudes and Remedies

Robert Kitahara
Troy University

Frederick Westfall
Troy University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholars.fhsu.edu/jbl>



Part of the [Business Commons](#), and the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kitahara, Robert and Westfall, Frederick (2007) "Cheating In Academia- Different Attitudes and Remedies," *Journal of Business & Leadership: Research, Practice, and Teaching (2005-2012)*: Vol. 3: No. 1, Article 28.
DOI: 10.58809/JASY8369
Available at: <https://scholars.fhsu.edu/jbl/vol3/iss1/28>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Peer-Reviewed Journals at FHSU Scholars Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Business & Leadership: Research, Practice, and Teaching (2005-2012) by an authorized editor of FHSU Scholars Repository. For more information, please contact ScholarsRepository@fhsu.edu.

CHEATING IN ACADEMIA - DIFFERENT ATTITUDES AND REMEDIES

Robert Kitahara, Troy University
Frederick Westfall, Troy University

Universities have taken vastly different approaches to curbing cheating and maintaining academic integrity throughout their academic programs in both traditional (in-class) and Distance Learning (online) offerings. This ongoing research is focused upon assessing the wide spectrum of (technology-based and non-technology-based) approaches addressing these problems. In this paper the authors identify the research methods being used to develop an understanding of the extent of the problem and to identify reasonable solutions. The research tools include surveys of university students, instructors, and administrators, as well as select business organizations. Preliminary results for the student survey are presented.

INTRODUCTION

The authors' recent experiences with cheating in the Distance Learning environment were described in a preceding case-based paper. The associated review of the literature suggests that nationwide violations of academic integrity are at record levels (Harding, et. al. 2001; McCabe, et. al. 2001). As many as 75% of undergraduate students surveyed admit to some form of cheating. 50% of undergraduates admit to repeated acts of cheating. These violations appear to be on the rise at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Some research reported that the incidence rate of cheating is in the order of 40% at the graduate level. Students cheat for a multitude of reasons. Many investigators have found interesting correlations between the propensity to cheat and a multiplicity of factors that may constitute predictive variables in certain cases. The observed trends include (Butterfield, et. al., 1999; Jordan, 1997; McCabe, et. al. 1997):

- Underclassmen cheat more than upperclassmen
- Students with lower grade point averages (GPAs) cheat more than those with higher GPAs
- Cheating is more prominent among fraternity and sorority members and athletes
- Students who perceive that peers cheat without getting caught are more likely to cheat themselves
- Younger students tend to cheat more than older students
- Some surveys show that more than 80% of faculty reported they observed some form of serious cheating, yet more than 30% never did anything about it
- Substantially less cheating occurs at institutions employing strong academic honor codes
- It is clear, that dishonest behavior is persistent in middle school, continues through high school, college, graduate school and often into the business world.

The methods students use to cheat are dramatically changing with the introduction of new technologies (Conradson, Hernandez-Ramos, 2004; Argetsinger, 2003). As data storage, access, distribution and communication technologies have advanced so too has the sophistication of the methods by which offending students practice their deceptions. The tools employed by dishonest students have evolved far

beyond crib notes on small pieces of paper, writing on the palms of hands and tapping Morse code. It now includes sophisticated technology such as: cell phones, PDA devices, programmable calculators with expanded memories, iPods, walkie-talkies, internet connected laptops, mobile internet devices, hand-held Blackberry units, digital media (CDs, DVDs, flash drives, miniature hard drives, tape recorders, small video cameras, etc.) and, most recently, iPhones. It is imperative that instructors improve their technological knowledge and keep pace with the offenders.

Growing pressures in the classroom, at home and in the workplace are often cited as reasons for increases in the tendency to cheat (Read, 2004). A major concern is that the trend may, in fact, be an indication of a blossoming "cheating culture" and a corresponding collapse of individual and, perhaps, societal values. Many students justify their actions because of perceived changes in society's acceptance of such practices and often respond, "Everyone is doing it." Several studies indicate that the basic attitudes of students about cheating are changing, much to the detriment of academic norms (Schreiner, 1999). Some studies indicate that hard-core cheaters are not concerned with long-term consequences (Smale, 2004). Levels of mastery and extrinsic factors strongly influence cheating as do perceived social norms regarding cheating, knowledge of institution policy regarding cheating, and student attitudes toward cheating (Jordan, 2001).

There is as yet insufficient evidence that the problem is more prevalent in the Distance Learning environment than in the traditional classroom. It is certainly true, however, that the Distance Learning environment presents many new opportunities for students to cheat and corresponding new challenges to academic integrity. The non-technology based techniques of the past are tried and true and still widely practiced. For in-class offerings these methods include:

- Clearing desks and removing unapproved items and aids
- Banning electronic devices from the examination room
- Multiple versions of exams
- Strategically arranged exam room seating to prevent copying and talking
- Close proctoring of the exam for suspicious behavior
- Numbering the examination copies and using corresponding sign-up sheets

- Requiring students to sign each page in ink
- Restricting students from leaving the examination room
- Comparing exams to samples of student writing style

For online offerings additional preventive measures include (Read, 2004):

- Strictly limiting the time for an exam
- Requiring proctored examinations
- Implementing software controls of online assessments (number of attempts, presentation of exams, large test banks, randomized questions)
- Using commercial software to detect plagiarism
- Obtaining student writing samples for comparison with written examinations

New technology-based approaches are influencing both take-home assignments and assessments and in-class (or online) quizzes and examinations. Such approaches include:

- Biometric verification hardware and software, e.g. fingerprint scanners integrated with corresponding identification systems
- Specialized software to disable computer functions which may be exploited for purposes of cheating
- 360 degree view cameras and video recorders to record student activity
- Omni-directional microphones and audio recorders
- Faraday cages to render wireless cheating in specific testing sites unusable

The research on gender as a discriminator for cheating has yielded mixed results and may necessitate secondary gender-

related factors (Ruegger, et. al., 1992). Whatever the influencing variables, most research indicate that cheaters are generally; less mature, less reactive to observed cheating, less deterred by social stigma and guilt; less personally invested in their education; and more likely to be receiving scholarships but performing more poorly (Diekhoff, et. al., 1996). Not surprisingly cheaters tend to shun accountability for their actions and blame their parents and teachers for widespread cheating, citing increased pressure on them to perform well. Worse yet, society as a whole has become increasingly more tolerant and even accepting of the practice of cheating, often citing the need to survive in today's competitive environment as justification for that shift in attitude (Callahan, 2004).

Background

Some of the most disturbing aspects of the case study were; the offending students' blatant disregard for published standards of conduct, the many persistent yet baseless appeals, the brazen willingness to escalate appeals to the highest administrative levels, and the propensity to involve lawyers. These students firmly believed that through continued appeals up to and including the highest administrative levels, the University would eventually back down, particularly in the face of potential lawsuits.

In the cited case, 6 students were using unapproved materials (files of instructor examinations and publisher test banks) to secure an unfair and unethical advantage over the rest of the class. Using these illegal sources they were taking 1-hour quizzes in 2-3 minutes, compared to the 30 to 45 minutes taken by the typical student, and 3-hour exams in 30 to 45 minutes, compared to the 2 to 2 1/2 hours taken by the average student as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Summary of Quiz Timing Irregularities (QM3341 Business Statistics II - Term 2/05)

Timings (Minutes: Seconds) and Scores (*Administratively Changed to 0)

QM3341	Quiz 1	Quiz 2	Quiz 3	Quiz 4	Quiz 5	Quiz 6	PE	Quiz 8	Final
Student 1	2:19 100	2:03 100	3:53 100	33:24 95	36:11 75	8:46 95	56/0*	17:07 100	35:36 96
Student 2	1:57 100	3:30 90	3:02 100	26:14 95	24:49 95	12:59 90	56/0*	21:10 95	37:37 92
Student 3	2:57 100	2:25 95	1:47 100	25:50 20	22:55 65	23:25 85	56/0*	11:15 95	30:39 94
Student 4	2:01 100	3:25 100	5:37 100	L 39:23 90	42:57 85	32:02 90	56/0*	38:48 40	46:48 94
Student 5	1:47 100	2:05 100	1:53 100	53:53 90	56:05 85	35:56 90	41/0*	9:05 95	73:38 60
Student 6	1:38 100	1:51 100	1:47 100	48:04 15	71:11 95	31:32 90	41/0*	3:56 100	46:39 94

The 6 offending students submitted virtually identical answer sheets for both parts (multiple choice and problem sections) of the written proctored examination as shown in Table 2. When confronted with these irregularities they vehemently denied any wrongdoing and immediately threatened lawsuits. Astonishingly, some of these students relentlessly escalated their appeals through all levels of University administration up to and including the Chancellor

of the University. Following 6 months of such ill-considered appeals, given the preponderance of clear evidence proving their shameless violations of the University's academic code, all 6 students received failing grades. Even more amazing is the fact that several of these students later repeated the course with the same instructor, repeated their acts of cheating, were once again caught, and again received failing grades.

Table 2: Proctored Exam Irregularities (QM 3341 Business Statistics II: Term 2/05)

Proctored Exam Answer Sheets - QM3341 Term T2/05

QM3341 Answer Sheets	Group A (Students 1,2,3,4)	Group B (Students 5,6)	Rest of Class	Historically
Part 1 25 Multiple Choice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same 2 Errors • Same 2 Erroneous Choices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same 2 Errors (Same as Group A) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No student missed both questions as A,B • No other pair had identical MC sheets 	No pair had identical sheets
Part 2 5 Quantitative Problems	Virtually identical: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers • Layout • Detail • Errors • Omissions • Inclusions • Decimal place rounding • Wording (90%) 	Virtually identical: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers • Layout • Detail • Errors • Omissions • Inclusions • Decimal place rounding • Wording (90%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None matched A,B • No other pair had matching answer sheets • No other student presented an answer to ANY of the problems which matched these students' responses in style or format 	No pair had matching answer sheets

Research Tools - Surveys

The authors have developed a set of short surveys, now being administered to several groups of students, instructors, administrators and local businesses, to probe the basic attitudes of these target groups. Using these surveys the authors will identify and verify significant trends in cheating and develop

strategies to mitigate them. The surveys contain sections for respondents to provide individual, free-form comments beyond the specific Yes/No questions. Examples of student, instructor, administrator and business surveys are presented in appendix A.

Table 3: Preliminary Aggregate Student Survey Results

45 Respondents/221 Enrollment

Which of the following do you consider to be cheating (Indicate all that apply)													
• Copying another student's assignment (homework, project, report, etc.)	Unanimously Yes												
• Using material (e.g. from internet) for assignments without acknowledging the source(s)	7% No												
• Copying another student's exam	Unanimously Yes												
• Using unapproved materials (of any type) on an exam	4% No												
• Using files on previous exams (which the instructor did not approve for distribution) on an exam	Unanimously Yes												
• Using materials provided by textbook publisher to instructor (not for student distribution) on an exam	9% No												
• Receiving assistance from a friend on an exam	4% No												
• Providing assistance to a friend on an exam	2% No												
Have you ever cheated? Why? (Indicate all that apply) ++													
• Homework	22% Yes												
• Project	7% Yes												
• Report	7% Yes												
• Quiz/Exam	18% Yes												
Are you aware of others cheating in your classes? (If yes, what % do you estimate cheat?) **	11% Yes												
Have you read the University's Standards of Conduct?	4% No												
Are you aware of the University's Student Honor Code?	9% No												
What do you feel is the best deterrent to cheating?	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Nothing</td><td>Controls</td></tr> <tr> <td>Fail/Expel</td><td>Close monitoring</td></tr> <tr> <td>Getting Caught</td><td>Proctored Exams</td></tr> <tr> <td>Honor System</td><td>Detailed Questions</td></tr> <tr> <td>Trust</td><td>Test Banks/Random Draw</td></tr> <tr> <td>Pride</td><td></td></tr> </table>	Nothing	Controls	Fail/Expel	Close monitoring	Getting Caught	Proctored Exams	Honor System	Detailed Questions	Trust	Test Banks/Random Draw	Pride	
Nothing	Controls												
Fail/Expel	Close monitoring												
Getting Caught	Proctored Exams												
Honor System	Detailed Questions												
Trust	Test Banks/Random Draw												
Pride													
General Comments	Most non-traditional students: Older, Wiser All exams should be proctored Cheating diminishes degree for everyone												
Footnoted Items Above	++ Overwhelmed Survival – others doing it ** Numbers cheating: Online = 20-70%, In-Class > 25%												

Table 4: Comparison of Policies for Handling Violations of Academic Integrity

	City University	Troy University
Instructors informed of "duty", not option, when hired	Yes	No
Well published Honor Code		
• University Catalog	Yes	Yes
• Course Syllabi	Yes	Yes
Communication with accused students		
• Handled by instructor	No	Yes – Initial attempt at resolution is with the instructor
• Immediately referred to SHB	Yes	No
Scholastic Honesty Board (SHB)	• Chaired by VP External Relations • 3 Voting members (Academics, Advising, Registrar)	Several levels of adjudication and appeals. (See comments below)
• Centralized	Pre-October 2006	Post-2006
• Decentralized to sites	Post-October 2006	Pre-2006
• Regular meetings (e.g. monthly)	Yes	Yes
• Convened as required	Yes	Yes
• Documentation	Submitted in advance by instructor and student	Submitted in advance by instructor and student
• Student present	Yes (or by phone)	Yes
Penalties		
• Zero on assignment	Yes depending on circumstances	Yes depending on circumstances
• Failing grade for course	Yes depending on circumstances	Yes depending on circumstances
• Suspension	Yes depending on circumstances	Yes depending on circumstances
• Expulsion	Yes for repeat offenders	Yes for repeat offenders
• Other (e.g. redo assignment on different topic)	Yes depending on circumstances	Yes depending on circumstances
Student right to appeal	One appeal allowed (only on basis of process irregularities, not decision)	Several levels of adjudication and appeals. (See comments below)
Policies applied University-wide	No	Yes

Student Surveys - Preliminary Results

Table 3 presents summary results for the Student Survey aggregated over several, Distance Learning offerings of quantitative courses in Troy University’s business programs. The results are preliminary since the sample size is presently relatively small. The total enrollment for these classes was 221 and, of those, 45 students submitted responses to the completely voluntary and anonymous survey. The portion of the survey gathering demographic information is not displayed below. These results, though preliminary, suggest interesting trends in student attitudes:

- Students unanimously believe that copying other students’ work is cheating
- In contrast 5-10% do not believe using unapproved materials, including publisher test banks, is cheating. These results are consistent with the authors’ previous case study
- 4% believe using internet sources without acknowledgement (plagiarism) is not cheating
- 10-20% admit to cheating of some type. Typical reasons cited by these students include being “overwhelmed” or a necessity for “survival” since others are cheating
- 11% are aware of cheating among their peers. Most are unconcerned. A few believe such activity diminishes the value and meaningfulness of everyone’s degree
- Students believe cheating is significant in both the online and in-class environments, though the specific magnitude of their opinions differs widely (20-75%). Most believe it is more prevalent in distance learning courses

- 5-10% of students have not read the university’s standards of conduct or are not aware of the student honor code despite the fact they are well-published in the University catalog and Student Handbook and key excerpts are included in the course syllabus

Students have widely different views of what might deter them from cheating. These opinions range from “nothing” to strict policing and, in some cases, to a culture of honesty and pride. Again, these results are consistent with much of the published research. It will be interesting to compare these results to those for analogous questions posed to instructors and university officials now being collected through additional survey work. Students within Troy University’s eCampus program believe cheating is less of an issue for them because they are generally older and wiser than the typical on-campus undergraduate student.

Comparison of Approaches to Academic Integrity

As the authors conduct research to assess the shifting attitudes toward cheating for various the target populations, parallel research is being conducted to assess the approaches taken by different universities to mitigate such activity. This research has begun with the collection of data on the approaches taken by two universities; Troy University, Troy, Alabama and City University, Seattle, Washington. Both universities are in the midst of dramatic changes in their systems for monitoring violations of academic integrity and resolving the associated disputes.

Troy University is transitioning to a centralized system for adjudicating accusations and appeals of academic code violations incorporating state-of-the-art technology solutions to detect and support the verification of illicit behavior. With these changes, the university is keeping its more-traditional, non-technological methods for establishing an atmosphere of academic honesty shared by students and faculty alike.

In sharp contrast, the City University of Seattle has taken the opposite approach (Will, 2006). City University has taken a purely traditional, non-technology focused approach and is currently transitioning from a centralized Scholastic Honesty Board to a system that is decentralized to individual sites. Table 4 above compares the approaches taken by these two universities.

Table 5: Troy University Practices to Maintain Academic Integrity

	Prior to 2007	Post 2007
Academic Code		
- Definition of violations	Well published	Well published
- Penalties/consequences	Well published	Well published
- Procedures	Well published	Well published
Student Honor Code	Well published	Well published
Proctored Exams	Human Proctor	Remote Proctor TM
Addressing Common Problems		
- Student verification	Picture ID	Fingerprint scan
- Copying others work	Scrutiny by proctor	Remote Proctor TM
- Receiving assistance from others	Scrutiny by proctor	Remote Proctor TM
- Using unapproved materials such as copies of instructors past examinations	Scrutiny by proctor	Remote Proctor TM
- Using unapproved crib notes, electronic devices, storage media	Scrutiny by proctor	Remote Proctor TM
- Helping others commit illicit acts	Scrutiny by proctor	Remote Proctor TM
- Detecting suspicious behavior	Scrutiny by proctor	Remote Proctor TM
- Collusion	Post exam analysis	Post exam analysis
Course and Instruction Design	Discretion of the instructor based upon course and learning objectives established by committees of experts	Redesign by committee establishing standardized course templates to ensure uniformity across multiple course offerings
Controlling the examination environment	Proctored Exams Human Proctor (Currently optional)	Remote Proctor TM
Instructor Selectable Blackboard Options		
- Large test banks	Instructor discretion	Instructor discretion
- Randomized tests	Instructor discretion	Instructor discretion
- Force Exam completion	Instructor discretion	Instructor discretion
- Presentation of questions	Instructor discretion	Instructor discretion
- Multiple or single attempts	Instructor discretion	Instructor discretion
Detection tools/statistics		
- Record of student accesses	Provided by Blackboard	Provided by Blackboard
- Record of time spent	Provided by Blackboard	Provided by Blackboard
- Record of student postings to various components	Provided by Blackboard	Provided by Blackboard
- Record of communications via Digital Drop Box	Provided by Blackboard	Provided by Blackboard
Diagnosing/Detecting/Verifying Violations of Academic Integrity		
- Detection	Techniques determined by individual instructor	Suspicious activity files (SAF) generated by Remote Proctor TM
- Verification	Techniques determined by individual instructor	Analysis of SAF by instructor

Strengths of the City University approach

- Quality and consistency of decisions by utilizing experienced, committed Board members
- Balance of perspectives by having members from three different departments of the university (not just academics)

Weaknesses of this approach

- The majority of instructors never submitted allegations; most allegations tended to come from the same core group who believe in enforcing high standards

- Some students, when accused of scholastic dishonesty, were able to claim ignorance
- Not university-wide; one entire school was allowed to opt out of the process

Strengths of the Troy University approach

- Several levels of appeal are provided as means of checks and balances with respect to procedural issues, ensuring student's rights are maintained throughout the process
- Tribunals and committees are typically staffed with cross-

disciplinary members to promote balance perspectives

- Technology tools are applicable to all eCampus courses throughout all sites worldwide with decreased logistical requirements, e.g. elimination of human proctors

Weaknesses of this approach

- Since the first contact with the student is handled by the instructor rather than an administrative board or committee, students are quick to threaten lawyers and lawsuits
- Because of the time-consuming process many instructors are reluctant to pursue allegations of violations of the Academic Code
- Heavy dependence upon technology with increased burden on the instructor to police "suspicious activity files (SAF)" generated by the Remote Proctor™

Early in 2007 Troy University began implementing multi-faceted tools and procedures to ensure academic integrity for its eCampus online courses. The new system employs state-of-the-art hardware and software technologies (Remote Proctor™) in addition to its traditional, non-technology based approaches, such as strict Standards of Conduct, comprehensive Academic Code and Student Honor Code. These approaches are summarized in Table 5.

While this technology will not resolve all existing problems, it does address many of the issues currently controlled by the presence of a human proctor at the testing site and allows the real-time monitoring of exams throughout the eCampus global environment in a uniform and consistent manner. The Remote Proctor™ System (figure 1) will allow Troy faculty members to monitor online test takers and give students the flexibility to take exams anywhere and at any time. The hardware module will connect to a computer's USB port and will not contain the student's personal information, thereby allowing the sharing of the hardware. The target cost for the Remote Proctor™ system is in the order of \$100. A fingerprint sensor is built into the base of the unit and instructors can specify the time and frequency at which students must identify themselves before and during the examination. In the prototype system a small video camera with a 360-degree field of view and a microphone for real time audio are provided to detect unusual or unapproved activity. When such detections occur, alerts and "suspicious activity files" (SAF) are generated and suitable prompts may be sent to the instructor and recorded. The real time audio and video will be remotely recorded for viewing and processing at any time. The Remote Proctor™ will include software tools that filter material so that students taking exams cannot access any unauthorized material. This state-of-the-art system is currently completed its final test phases and began the first phase of deployment into eCampus courses in 2007.

Conclusions

The preliminary survey results are currently being analyzed to determine what improvements in the survey tools may be required to achieve more robust results. Thus far the much of the insight into student perceptions of cheating and academic

integrity, particularly from the comments sections of the surveys, appears to be consistent with other published research. To date the most interesting results seem to indicate that:

- Some students feel that they are free to use any sources of information they may have available to them, even those that are specifically designated as "unapproved" materials by the instructor. They see no wrongdoing in exploiting these resources for assignments and examinations alike
- Students believe that academic dishonesty is a fact of life leaving the decision to participate to their value systems and consciences
- Many believe that, given parental and societal pressures to succeed, such violations of academic integrity are necessary to survive in today's academic environment and subsequent entry into the business world
- Sadly, many feel that there is "nothing" that can be done to stop such acts
- Encouragingly many are comfortable with the application of strict rules and severe penalties to deter those who would cheat

Because of the small sample sizes to date much more work is required. More interesting results are expected by comparing the attitudes among the various populations (students, instructors, administrators, and employers) currently being surveyed. It is clear that academia must now do battle with would-be cheaters on a new technological and ethical front:

- Students who wish to obtain an unfair advantage over other students are now armed with new and interesting tools, resources and opportunities with which to obtain that unethical edge
- Beyond the often clever technologies used to defeat a University's attempts to maintain academic integrity, these students seem to be adopting a new ethic which may be reflective of an overly permissive society as a whole. Within this new ethic students have lost the sense of accountability and tend to place blame for their actions on everything and everyone other than themselves
- These new technologies and attitudes make the collective job of the University, instructors, course delivery system designers and publishers much more difficult
- In today's society students are more apt to wield a weapon they feel is omnipotent - the threat of lawyers and lawsuits, even in frivolous pursuits. They have been conditioned to believe that with such relentless threats the university will ultimately back down
- In the face of these difficulties much more thought, time and energy must be devoted to redesigning and refining DL courses to maintain academic integrity.

Future Research

While the challenge to protect Academic Integrity is common to course offerings in both the online and traditional (in-class) environments, courses presented in a purely Distance Learning (DL) environment offer special concerns for

will explore several aspects of these concerns identified in the previous case study:

- Are there differing views of academic integrity among the student, academia and working professional populations?
- Have student and society attitudes toward academic integrity changed? If so, at what point in a student's development and education does this change occur? What factors influence these changes in attitude?
- In today's ever expanding hi-tech environment is it possible to write a statement of the Standards of Conduct which is comprehensive and which will withstand the scrutiny of attorneys in a court of law? What are the bounds of "academic freedom"?
- What is the appropriate statement of the University's Standards of Conduct? How can such activity be controlled in the DL format? Will purely technology-based solutions be sufficient?
- How must these standards be communicated in a course syllabus? Obviously it is not possible or practical to include in a reasonable course syllabus an exhaustive list of possible means and mechanisms an unethical student may employ to circumvent the Academic Code. Do these omissions from a course syllabus constitute a legal loophole that allows students to behave in an unchecked manner?
- What are the legal implications? To what extent does enforcement of these standards put the University at risk for lawsuits? To what extent are instructors personally liable if his/her actions to enforce the Academic Code are taken are without malice, prejudice or bias and not conducted in an arbitrary or capricious manner?
- If a student has resources that give him/her an unfair advantage over other students, does this constitute unethical behavior, violations of the University's Standards of Conduct, or cheating? Is a student obligated to reveal the possession of such sources when queried by the instructor? How do these facts relate to the student's Honor Code?
- If a student obtains instructor materials, such as the authors' test banks for the course textbook, which give him/her prior knowledge of examination questions and therefore an unfair advantage over other students, does this constitute unethical behavior or cheating? If this material can be obtained from an open website does this change the fact that their possession is a clear violation of the University's Standards of Conduct?
- What degree of collusive activity in examinations, if any, is acceptable? To what level of certainty must an instructor prove that such unacceptable collusion did in fact occur? Upon whom does the "burden of proof" fall? Are the standards for burden of proof the same in academic cases as those in a civil court of law?
- What are the special implications of these issues on courses taught in the DL format? Are DL students more likely to commit actions in violation of the Academic Code? If so, what factors influence that disturbing trend, if any?

Many of these issues will be addressed using the new survey tools and corresponding statistical analyses. The results

of this research will be used to formulate recommendations for structuring effective Academic Codes and determining the appropriate mix of deterrent strategies and tools.

REFERENCES

- Argetsinger, A. 2003. **U-Maryland says students use phone to cheat - text messaging delivers test answers.** Washington Post online publication, accessed June 2007.
- Butterfield, K., McCabe, D., Trevino, L. 1999. Academic integrity in honor code and non-honor code environments: A qualitative investigation. **Journal of Higher Education**, 70: 211-234.
- Callahan, D. 2004. **The cheating culture: Why more Americans are doing wrong to get ahead.** Orlando: Harcourt Publishers.
- Conradson, S., & Hernández-Ramos, P. 2004. Computers, the internet, and cheating among secondary school students: Some implications for educators. **Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation**, 9: 9. Retrieved June 10, 2006 from <http://PAREonline.net/getvn.asp?v=9&n=9>.
- Diekhoff, G., LaBeff, E., Clark, R., Williams, L., Francis, B., & Haines, V. 1996. College cheating: Ten years later. **Research in Higher Education**, 37: 487-502.
- Harding, T., Carpenter, D., Montgomery, S., & Steneck, N. 2001. **The current state of research on academic dishonesty among engineering students.** 31st Annual Frontiers in Education Conference.
- Jordan, A. 2001. College student cheating: The role of motivation, perceived norms, attitudes, and knowledge of institutional policy. **Ethics and Behavior**, 11: 233-247.
- McCabe, D., Klebe-Trevino, L., Butterfield, K. 2001. Cheating in academic institutions: A decade of research. **Ethics and Behavior**, 11: 219-232.
- McCabe, D., & Klebe-Trevino, L. 1997. Individual and contextual influences on academic dishonesty: A multicampus investigation. **Research in Higher Education**, 38: 379-396.
- Read, B. 2004. Wired for cheating - some professors go beyond honor codes to stop misuse of electronic devices, **The Chronicle of Higher Education, Information Technology**, 50: A27.
- Ruegger, D., & King, E. 1992. A study on the effect of age and gender upon student business ethics. **Journal of Business Ethics**, 11: 179-186.
- Schreiner, J. 1999. Academic dishonesty at UNC: Students' perceptions. **Academic Dishonesty at UNC: A Collaborative Study - Part IX**, course report. Retrieved on February 20, 2008 from <http://www.unc.edu/~bmize/>

teaching/english_12/academic_dishonesty/schreiner.html.

Smale, P. 2004. Contemporary cheating. **Acadia University**, August 2004

Will, M. 2006. (Associate Dean and Director of the Graduate Programs retired, City University, Seattle, Washington). Personal e-mail communication with both authors.

Robert Kitahara is an assistant professor of business at Troy University - Southeast Region. He received his Ph.D. in electrical engineering from Purdue University. His current research interests include business/management, technology management, quantitative methods and distance learning.

Frederick Westfall is an associate professor of business at Troy University - Southeast Region. He received his Ph.D. in business administration/international business from the Ohio State University. His current research interests include business/management, technology management, information systems, and distance learning.

Appendix A: Sample Surveys

Dear Colleague:

I am conducting research into issues related to Academic Integrity. As part of my investigations I would like to collect a few statistics on the magnitude of the "cheating" problem on the Troy campus and eCampus. I appreciate your inputs and have included a short survey form below. If you do not have requested data, please indicate whom I should contact. Please feel free to add any information you consider relevant to this research in the comments section or on separate sheets. Thank you for your time.

Dr Robert Kitahara

Troy University - Florida Region (now Southeast Region)

Administration Survey (Best estimates)	Total Last Year	Total Last 5 Years	Total Last 10 Years
Cases of Cheating			
Number resolved without appeal			
Number brought to Academic Council			
Number brought to Student Council			
Number of repeat offenders			
If possible, delineate type of cheating experienced (indicate all that apply)			
• Copying another student's assignment (homework, project, report, etc.)			
• Using material (e.g. from internet) for assignments without acknowledging the source(s)			
• Copying another student's exam			
• Using unapproved materials on an exam			
• Using files on previous exams (which the instructor did not approve for distribution) on an exam			
• Using publishers' test banks on an exam			
• Receiving assistance from a friend on an exam			
• Providing assistance to a friend on an exam			
Resolution/Penalties/Consequences			
• Number given failing grades on specific assignments			
• Number given failing grades for the course			
• Number suspended + length of time			
• Number expelled			
Additional Comments			

Appendix A: Sample Surveys

Dear Colleague:

I am conducting research into issues related to Academic Integrity. As part of my investigations I would appreciate your inputs on the magnitude of the "cheating" problem on the Troy campus and eCampus. I have included a short survey form below. Please feel free to add any information you consider relevant to this research in the comments section or on separate sheets. All inputs will remain strictly anonymous. Thank you for your time.

Dr Robert Kitahara

Troy University – Florida Region (now Southeast Region)

Instructor Survey (Use your best estimates, if necessary)	If you do not know, answer "unknown"		
	Yes/No	Number	Comment
Which of the following do you consider to be cheating: (Indicate all that apply)			
• Copying another student's assignment (homework, project, report, etc.)		N/A	
• Using material (e.g. from internet) for assignments without acknowledging the source(s)		N/A	
• Copying another student's exam		N/A	
• Using unapproved materials on an exam		N/A	
• Using files on previous exams (which the instructor did not approve for distribution) on a current exam		N/A	
• Using publishers' test banks on an exam		N/A	
• Receiving assistance from a friend on an exam		N/A	
• Providing assistance to a friend on an exam		N/A	
Do you believe there is a cheating problem on campus?		N/A	
Do you believe there is a cheating problem in your courses?			
• Traditional Delivery (In-class)		N/A	
• eCampus Delivery (Online)		N/A	
• For which delivery format is cheating "worse"	N/A	N/A	
How many cases of cheating have you encountered?	N/A		
Have you ever ignored a cheating incident? Why?		N/A	
How many cases of cheating have you prosecuted?			
• In total	N/A		
• Typical number per year in-class	N/A		
• Typical number per year online	N/A		
Resolution of cases			
• Number failing grades on specific assignments	N/A		
• Number failing grades for the course	N/A		
• Number suspended + length of time	N/A		
• Number expelled	N/A		
• Other – please specify	N/A		
Do you feel the penalty/consequence generally matched the infraction?		N/A	
Personal cost to you			
• Number of man hours spent prosecuting case(s) (Rough estimate)	N/A		
• Threats of lawyer involvement		N/A	
• Threats of lawsuit by student		N/A	
• Harassment by student		N/A	
Rate the following on scale 1 (low) to 5 (high)			
• Support from administration	N/A		
• Pressure to "Let it be"	N/A		
• Personal cost to you	N/A		
Generally how did you detect the cheating?			
• Observed student cheating		N/A	
• Comparison with other student assignments		N/A	
• Detection tool (e.g. plagiarism detection software)		N/A	
• Proctored exam – irregularities in student responses		N/A	
• Comparison with other student exams		N/A	
Would you prosecute cases in the future? Why/Why Not?		N/A	
Personal Opinions			
• What do you feel is the most effective "tool" for detecting cheating?			
• What do you feel is the most effective strategy to deter cheating?			
General Comments			

Appendix A: Sample Surveys

Dear Student:

I am conducting research into various issues related to Academic Integrity. As part of my investigations I would appreciate your inputs on the magnitude of the "cheating" problem in Troy eCampus courses and have included a short survey form below. Please feel free to add any information you consider relevant to this research in the comments section or on separate sheets. All inputs will remain **strictly anonymous**. Thank you for your time.

Dr Robert Kitahara
Troy University - Florida Region (now Southeast Region)

Student Survey	Yes/No	Comment
General Information		
• Gender (enter M/F in comment column)		
• Troy main campus student? (if No which site?)		
• Currently member of fraternity/sorority		
• Currently on collegiate athletic team		
Which of the following do you consider to be cheating: (Indicate all that apply)		
• Copying another student's assignment (homework, project, report, etc.)		
• Using material (e.g. from internet) for assignments without acknowledging the source(s)		
• Copying another student's exam		
• Using unapproved materials (of any type) on an exam		
• Using files on previous exams (which the instructor did not approve for distribution) on an exam		
• Using materials provided by textbook publisher to instructor (not for student distribution) on an exam		
• Receiving assistance from a friend on an exam		
• Providing assistance to a friend on an exam		
Have you ever cheated? Why? (Indicate all that apply)		
• Homework		
• Project		
• Report		
• Quiz/Exam		
Are you aware of others cheating in your classes? (If yes, what percentage do you estimate cheat?)		
Have you read the University's Standards of Conduct?		
Are you aware of the University's Student Honor Code?		
What do you feel is the best deterrent to cheating?		
General Comments		

Appendix A: Sample Surveys

Dear Colleague:

I am conducting research into various issues related to Academic Integrity. As part of my investigations I would appreciate your inputs on industry's perception of the "cheating" problem in academia and how it may influence organizational behavior in the business world. Please feel free to add any information you consider relevant to this research in the comments section or on separate sheets. All inputs will remain strictly anonymous. Thank you for your time.

Dr Robert Kitahara
 Troy University - Florida Region (now Southeast Region)

Industry Survey	Yes/No	Comment
Which of the following do you consider to be cheating in academia? (Indicate all that apply)		
• Copying another student's assignment (homework, project, report, etc.)		
• Using material (e.g. from internet) for assignments without acknowledging the source(s)		
• Copying another student's exam		
• Using unapproved materials on an exam		
• Using files on previous exams (which the instructor did not approve for distribution) on an exam		
• Using publishers' test banks on an exam		
• Receiving assistance from a friend on an exam		
• Providing assistance to a friend on an exam		
Would your organization hire any graduate known to have cheated in college?		
Do you believe academic cheating translates into dishonest behavior on the job?		
Have you observed dishonest behavior on the job?		
What are the penalties/consequences for dishonest behavior on the job? (Indicate all that apply)		
• Reprimand/Notation in employee file		
• Suspension (for what time period?)		
• Firing		
• Other		
What is the best deterrent to dishonesty on the job?		
General Comments		

College of Business and Leadership
Fort Hays State University
600 Park Street
Hays, KS 67601
(785) 628-5339
www.fhsu.edu/cob/
ISSN: 1559-3355