THE PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENT ACADEMIC HONESTY
BY FACULTY AND STUDENTS IN A
SCHOOL OF NURSING

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
North Texas State University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

Pat W. Harnest
Denton, Texas
August, 1986
Harnest, Pat W., *The Perceptions of Student Academic Honesty by Faculty and Students in a School of Nursing*. Doctor of Philosophy (Higher Education), August, 1986, 87 pp., 10 tables, bibliography, 41 titles.

The purpose of this study was four-fold: the identification of behaviors perceived as academically honest by faculty and six levels of nursing students, to determine differences between faculty and students, to determine differences between graduate and undergraduate students, and to determine differences in consequences proposed by faculty and students.

The population of the study was thirty-seven faculty members and 381 students in the University of Texas at Arlington School of Nursing in October and November of 1985.

A survey instrument was developed to gather the data for this study. The instrument was judged by a panel of nurse educators who hold doctorates. They were asked to review the instrument for completeness, content validation, and clarity.

The final instrument was administered to students and faculty. A minimum return of sixty-five percent was required for continuing the study. The final return was sixty-nine percent of the faculty and 68.77 of the students. The data were tabulated and analyzed utilizing the Mann-Whitney U test for independence, the Kruskal-Wallis One Way
Analysis of Variance, medians, and percentages. A level of .05 was established to determine critical differences in responses.

An analysis of the findings led to the following conclusions:

1. There are significant differences between student behaviors perceived as honest and dishonest by faculty and students.

2. There was a significant difference between the perceptions of five groups of undergraduate nursing students and a group of graduate students on the honesty or dishonesty of student behaviors.

3. There were statistically significant differences between the consequences proposed by faculty and students for the listed behaviors. The consequences proposed by faculty were more severe than those recommended by the students for a majority of the behaviors listed.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Among faculty, students, and administrators in colleges and universities there is a growing concern regarding academic dishonesty. The concern is well founded, according to studies done over the past ten to twelve years. The Carnegie Council in 1979 included the growing incidence of cheating on its list of signs of deterioration in important parts of academic life. (3, p. 304). In a study done in 1974, forty-two percent of the undergraduate students at Amherst College and thirty percent of the undergraduates at Johns Hopkins reported that they had cheated on papers and examinations (3, pp. 13-14).

While many studies have been done on various aspects of academic dishonesty, a basic and important fact stands out as significant. Behaviors defined as academic dishonesty vary from institution to institution, and between students and faculty. For example, students at a midwestern university did not see the practice of scribining (copying a paper from fraternity files and submitting it as original) as dishonest (8, pp. 29-30).

In another questionnaire study of academic dishonesty, Wright and Kelly collected data on the types of behaviors that constituted cheating, as perceived by faculty and
students. Their study showed considerable differences between the perceptions of the two groups (12, p. 31). Further studies of behaviors perceived as dishonest by faculty and groups of students in institutions of higher education would serve to delineate the magnitude of the differences and highlight specific areas of difference. From these data, possible strategies for addressing dishonest student behaviors could be drawn. A clearly stated policy statement, with behaviors listed and defined, and possible consequences enumerated might be most helpful in beginning to alleviate academic dishonesty.

The problem of academic dishonesty is most important in professions which involve critical or life-maintaining decisions and actions. Nursing is a profession in which such decisions are made daily, and often hourly. Nursing, therefore, is an important area for study, as some dishonest behaviors which might go undetected can be vital, not only to the health of individuals, but to their lives as well.

Since there is a variation between institutions, as well as between students and faculty, as to which behaviors are perceived as honest and which are perceived as dishonest, perceptions of each involved individual become significant. If an individual views an action as honest in his or her own value system, no need to alter that behavior will be recognized.
Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study concerns perception student academic dishonesty held by faculty and stud a school of nursing.

Purpose of the Study

The purposes of this study are to:

1. Identify behaviors perceived as academically honest or dishonest by faculty and six levels of nursing students.

2. Determine differences between faculty and six levels of nursing students.

3. Determine differences between graduate and undergraduate nursing students.

4. Determine differences in consequences proposed by faculty and students.

Research Questions

In order to carry out the purpose of the study, the following research questions were formulated:

1. What behaviors are perceived as academically honest, and what behaviors are perceived as dishonest by nursing students and faculty?

2. Is there a significant difference between faculty and all students on behaviors perceived as academically honest or dishonest?

3. Is there a significant difference between the perceptions of five groups of undergraduate nursing students
and a group of graduate nursing students on the honesty or dishonesty of student behaviors?

4. Are there differences in consequences proposed by faculty and students for the listed student behaviors?

Background and Significance of the Study

In response to the growing concern of faculty, students, and administrators in colleges and universities, a number of studies of academic dishonesty have been conducted over the past ten to twelve years. Significant impetus was given to studies by the Carnegie Council's report on Policy Studies in Higher Education in 1979. This is the report which listed the "significant and apparently increasing amount of cheating by students in academic assignments" as first on its list of signs of deterioration in academic life (3, p. 304). The problem is not limited to higher education, certainly. A report in the Chronicle of Higher Education cites a finding that cheating is regarded by students in junior and senior high schools, as "a mere game of wits with their teachers. Everybody does it" (5, p. 25). It is with higher education, however, that this study is concerned.

In a 1979 study by Gene A. Budig, President of West Virginia University, the presidents of student bodies of twenty public universities with at least fifteen thousand students were surveyed. Eighteen of these presidents believed that cheating was on a decline as compared to four
years previously. Fifteen stated that they perceived academic standards to be somewhat lower and there seemed to be less pressure on students. Three stated that academic standards were too low, while most regarded academic standards as "fair" and "about right." Sixteen of the presidents said that cheating at their schools was not difficult and that penalties were not severe enough to be deterrents. This group encouraged professors to use greater vigilance while tests were being administered (2, p. 754).

Further findings in this survey showed that a majority of the respondents believed that there was less cheating in upper division courses, and that most occurred in large classes. More cheating occurred on minor quizzes, and fewer and fewer students are cheating on term papers due to the ease with which plagiarism can be detected and proved (2, p. 754).

The opinions of the presidents of student bodies regarding the decline of cheating are at variance with other studies. One study at the State University of New York at Stony Brook found that thirty-nine percent of 152 students cheated on tests given in the study (9, pp. 215-217). In another study, 45.6 percent of the students cheated when allowed to score their own tests with the teachers' backs turned (11, p. 427). The trend toward an increase in cheating is further supported by the findings of the Carnegie Council, which reported an increase of 1.3 percent
in the number of students who admit cheating on surveys, between 1969 and 1979, bringing the total to a level of 8.8 percent. During this same time frame, cheating was reported to have risen from 5.4 percent in 1969 to 9.8 percent in 1976 in research universities (3, p. 15).

Nor is the problem of cheating limited to undergraduate institutions. In a study of graduate students, forty percent reported cheating on at least one of three quizzes given as a part of the study (13, p. 157). Additional information on the gravity of the academic honesty issue is found in the report of a professor of psychology who was found guilty of plagiarism, and in reports of falsification of data in cancer research (1, p. 37). Since professors serve as role models for students, the statement made by the psychology professor's behavior is powerful, and the cancer data alteration can well have an impact on the health of patients and their very lives.

The implications of this problem are relevant to the whole of our society. Evidence of this was made abundantly clear in a study of four hundred medical students at two medical schools. In this study, eighty-eight percent reported having cheated at least one time during their undergraduate years and fifty-eight percent revealed having cheated at least once during medical school. The researchers reported a "highly significant correlation between cheating in medical school and falsifying
information from a laboratory examination, history, or physical examination and reporting a finding on a patient as normal without obtaining the information necessary to validate the opinion" (4, p. 64). The likelihood of cheating in medical school was greater if the students had cheated in undergraduate study, had transferred from another school, or had "cynical attitude toward cheating" (4, p. 64).

Physicians who falsify patient information can pose a significant threat to the life and well-being of their patients. Nurses, too, have opportunities to falsify patient information on medications given or not given, symptoms shown or not shown, treatments, and results. If nurses provide dishonest information, this poses a grave peril to patients, particularly since nurses are responsible for the care given to their patients for at least twenty-three and one-half hours a day during the stay in the acute care facilities/hospitals. For this reason, the question of academic dishonesty merits the attention of educators.

Academic honesty and dishonesty are often considered to be ethical issues. **Ethics** and **ethical** are terms drawn from the Greek word **ethos** meaning customs and usage, particularly as they were characteristics distinguishing one group from another. The word eventually evolved to mean disposition and/or character (6, p. 3). Similarly, the Latin word **mores** evolved to its current meaning **moral**. The ethical or moral
grew out of customs, which are ways of behaving which are approved by the society. Behaviors which the particular society disapproved of were prohibited and offenders were treated severely (6, p. 31).

Ethical behavior has two basic aspects, according to Dewey and Tufts. One is a psychological realm of "thought and feeling, ideals and motives, valuation and choice." The second is social and biological, incorporating the relationships of behavior to natural and societal factors. Ethics, then, must relate both aspects, and study both the internal process "as determined by the outer conditions or as changing these outer conditions, and the outward behavior or institution as determined by the inner purpose, or as affecting the inner life" (6, p. 4).

The behavior of individuals in a society is controlled largely by custom. Behavior is moral or ethical to the degree to which it conforms to the mores of the group. These customs are passed from one generation to another as "approved ways of acting, common to a group" (6, p. 45). They are passed down as habits which must be accepted with compliance. To some degree the continued well-being of the group is at stake. One generation carefully trains the next to comply, noting their importance with reverent ritual. There is great pressure for compliance and approval, and an implied peril in not following the custom (6, p. 45-48).
Customs are generally enforced through the use of "public opinion, taboos, ritual or ceremony, and physical force" (6, p. 48). Noncompliance is met with ridicule and loss of respect, forced compliance, expulsion from the group, and sometimes loss of freedom or death (6, pp. 49-50).

How people define a course of action as morally right is moral judgment (10, p. 310). The development of moral judgment has been studied extensively by Lawrence Wohlberg and Jean Piaget. Their findings, as reported by Duska, et al., support the development of moral judgment through stages which are identifiable and sequential (7, pp. 6-7). Wohlberg, probably the most influential psychologist in psychological moral development, identified six recognizable stages of moral development. Further, he found that significant differences in moral outlook become apparent when a person's reasons for their judgments and actions are studied (7, p. 42). Piaget's work covers more than forty years of study into the origins and development of cognitive structures and moral judgment in children, and this study supported his belief that, "all morality consists in a system of rules, and the essence of all morality is to be sought for in the respect which the individual acquires for those rules" (7, p. 8).

Ethical behaviors, then, are taught by each society to its members through enforcement and reward. Since academic
behavior, study is needed to identify what is considered honest and dishonest behavior so that it can be taught, enforced, and rewarded. In addition, it is important that educators be aware of the stages of development of moral and ethical judgment and behaviors so that these factors may be incorporated into the education process.

Limitation of the Study

This study is limited to one large school of nursing located in the southwest.

Basic Assumptions

It is assumed that faculty and students perceive certain student behaviors as academically honest or dishonest. As each individual progresses through the academic process, perceptions of behaviors are learned. Depending upon the ethical information passed on by the society, each person develops his or her own perception of behaviors as honest or dishonest.

Procedures for Collecting Data

After obtaining permission from the Dean of the School of Nursing at the University of Texas at Arlington, and the University Human Rights Committee, a questionnaire was devised and reviewed for content validity by a panel of nursing educators. Following validation, the questionnaire was administered to fifty-four faculty members and 545
students at the University of Texas at Arlington School of Nursing.

The completed questionnaires were scored and treated statistically by computers at the University of Texas at Arlington under the direction of statistician Jacqueline McFarlin. The data were analyzed for frequency by applying the Mann-Whitney U test, and the Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance, in order to compare the responses of the various groups.

Organization of the Study

This study is organized and presented in the following manner. Chapter I introduces the study with a statement of the problem, the purpose, the research questions, the background and significance of the study, and limitations of the study. Chapter II presents a review of related literature addressing issues of academic honesty, and cultural and governmental examples and influence related to ethical behavior. Chapter III includes the methods and procedures used to collect and analyze the data obtained for this study. Chapter IV presents the statistical analysis of the data, and Chapter V includes the summary of the findings, implications, conclusions, and recommendations for further study.
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CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Due to the importance of academic dishonesty to students, to institutions of higher education, and to society in general, there is a growing concern among students, educators, and administrators. While academic dishonesty is certainly not new, the incidence is apparently on the rise, according to a Carnegie Council (8, p. 230). Because of the rise in incidence, and a growing awareness among faculty and administrators, the body of literature is growing. A review of the literature on the topic of academic dishonesty is presented.

Definitions of Academic Dishonesty

Nuss (24, p. 140) and others (27, p. 64; 26, pp. 332-335) point out the lack of any clear definitions of academic dishonesty, not only between educational institutions, but within the institutions as well. Students and faculty do not agree as to what constitutes dishonest student behavior or cheating. Studies by Nuss (24, pp. 140-144), Wright and Kelly (32, p. 31), Barnett and Dalton (2, pp. 545-550), and Hardy (16, pp. 68-77) all support the confusion and the disagreement between faculty and students as to the honesty or dishonesty of a variety of student behaviors. These
authors all recommend the development and distribution of a clear definition of dishonest student behaviors, and that the consequences of these activities be meted out to the guilty, whether they be faculty or dishonest students.

One example of such a definition and set of consequences has been developed and adopted by Texas Christian University. Their Academic Conduct Policy statement is printed in the University Calendar. The statement encourages "faculty to remind students of this written statement of policies and procedures developed by the University in regard to cheating on examinations, plagiarism, collusion and other academic-related misconduct" (31).

The policy statement defines academic misconduct as follows:

A. Cheating shall be defined as:
1. Copying from another student's test paper, laboratory report, other report, or computer files and listings.
2. Using, during a test or laboratory experiment, material and/or devices not authorized by the person in charge of the test.
3. Collaborating with or seeking aid from another student during a test or laboratory without permission.
4. Knowingly using, buying, selling, stealing, transporting, or soliciting in its entirety or in part, the contents of a test or other assignment unauthorized for release.
5. Substituting for another student, or permitting another student to substitute for oneself, to take a test or other assignment or to make a presentation.

B. Plagiarism shall be defined as the appropriation, theft, purchase, or obtaining by any means another's work, and the unacknowledged submission or
incorporation of that work as one's own offered for credit. (Appropriation includes the quoting or paraphrasing of another's work without giving credit therefore.)

C. Collusion shall be defined as the unauthorized collaboration with another in preparing work offered for credit.

D. Abuse of resource materials shall be defined as mutilating, destroying, concealing, or stealing such materials (31, p. 42).

Dressel (13, pp. 276-277) defines cheating more simply, and gives examples of the methods used by students. He states,

Cheating is viewed as an attempt, using unfair or illegitimate means, to get a higher grade than that merited. Devices are numerous; copying or buying, stealing copies of exams, hidden notes, writing on one's hand, arm, or clothing, signaling responses for objective test questions to friends, obtaining and using a key (set of correct answers to an objective test).

Each of these authors suggest, directly or by implication, that academic institutions can begin to reduce the amount of student academic dishonesty by developing their own clear and specific definitions of student behaviors which are unacceptable. The definition and the proposed consequences can then be distributed to a faculty and students, discussed in classroom situations and student assemblies, and enforced.

Factors Influencing Student Academic Dishonesty

Many studies have been done to investigate the factors influencing student academic dishonesty. In its final summary report, the Carnegie Council cited as one factor the
competition growing out of an increasing drive toward vocationalism, which it defined as the acquiring of skills and training for an occupation (8, p. 230). In the fierce competitiveness of each student against all other students, a sense of desperation develops for many students. The enormous pressure for grades leads to cheating and other forms of academic dishonesty. The Carnegie Council's finding that pressure for grades leads to cheating is supported by the work of other authors. Farley, Oaks, Zastrow, Barnett and Dalton all report finding that pressure for grades is a major factor in the incidence of academically dishonest behaviors (2, 14, 25, 26, and 33). Zastrow adds other factors from his study. Being unprepared, having the opportunity to cheat available, desire to impress parents or peers, and the situation of having an unannounced test were also given as significant factors (33, pp. 157-160).

In another study, Oaks found that forty-five percent of his respondents gave as reasons for cheating having too many assignments and tests at the same time. Cheating being easier than studying for a test was the rationale given by thirty-eight percent. Teachers grading on the curve, and the game-like challenge of outsmarting the instructor were also listed. Another finding, possibly related to the competition for grades, was that twenty-five percent stated that others cheat, therefore one must cheat to survive (26,
Crowded conditions reduce the risk of detection, according to studies by Leming and Houston (21, p. 214; 19, p. 53). Test and exam situations which were set in large classroom areas made proctoring more difficult and identification of dishonest behaviors less likely.

Personal characteristics of students as factors in dishonest activities were studied by several authors. Borsellino (5), in a study of 1,009 students at North Texas State University, drew the following conclusions about his population:

1. The majority of the students engaged in dishonest behaviors at some time.

2. Ninety-eight percent of the students believed that academic dishonesty was commonplace among their peer group.

3. The majority of students would refuse to report peer dishonest behaviors, although fifty-six percent had observed these behaviors in their peers.

4. The earlier one began practicing dishonest behavior, the more frequently one would resort to being dishonest. Of the population studied, seventy-three percent stated that they had first been academically dishonest in elementary or high school.

5. Students considered the student accomplices equally guilty.

6. Students were lenient in attitudes toward punishment.
7. When the dishonest behaviors were not detected, the behaviors were reinforced.

8. Religious affiliation had no significant effect on academic dishonesty, but some religious variables did affect behavior and attitudes toward academic dishonesty (5, p. 147).

Forsyth, Pope, and McMillan (14) hypothesized that students who cheat will then externalize their responsibility for the behavior on such factors as test difficulty, poor techniques used in teaching, or bad luck. It was found that the cheaters in the study tended to insulate themselves from the esteem-damaging consequences of their behavior through externalization of causative factors.

This finding was supported by an example given by Morris in 1982, who reported confronting a student he had observed to be looking at another student's paper during a test. The student responded that the instructor had forced him to cheat by making the test too hard, and by not allowing the student to borrow a book to study. By blaming the instructor for the behavior, the student absolved himself of any responsibility for his behavior or its consequences (21, p. 40-41).

The issue of responsibility for dishonest behavior by students in academic pursuits is the subject of considerable attention in the academic community. "Cheating on Campus: Who's Really to Blame?" is Pavela's challenging title of
his article in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Pavela charges university faculty and administration with lethargy and confusion which are "major contributors to problems of academic dishonesty that were being blamed exclusively on the deficient moral standards of our students," in a 1980 incident at the University of Maryland (27, p. 64). He further charged faculty and administration with providing incentives for engaging in academic dishonesty. These incentives were: a basic lack of any precautions in preparing or proctoring examinations; policies and procedures for reporting cases were so vague and cumbersome that faculty were discouraged from taking action, and penalties for dishonesty were so lenient as to promote the belief that academic dishonesty was not regarded as a serious offense (27, p. 64).

Another indictment of administrators and faculty members was leveled by Biemiller in 1983. In a case at Florida State University, a history professor named Wynot turned in grades of A for forty-two of ninety-two varsity athletes. Six of this group of athletes received A's from other faculty. In addition, thirteen varsity athletes who were enrolled with Mr. Wynot for "directed individual study," a situation which is usually reserved for graduate students, received A's from Wynot. Other grades handed out by Mr. Wynot were fairly high, but within normal limits.
The Chairman of the History Department, Mr. Jones, informed Wynot that his grades seemed to be "seriously out of line and showed favoritism toward one group of students." Jones also informed the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences of his findings. Statistical evaluation of the grades showed that the pattern could not occur by chance. Later, apparently, Mr. Wynot distributed study guides for a test to all students except the athletes, who received a copy of the test. There appears to have been blatant faculty participation in academic dishonesty (3, pp. 20-24).

The problem of faculty involvement in the problem of academic dishonesty is expanded by Dressel (13, p. 276-277). The lack of responsibility assumed by faculty seems to be due in part to the antagonism of some faculty toward grading in general, and examinations in particular. Others would seem to view cheating as "a natural and inevitable part of the system" (13, p. 276). Still others avoid engaging in policing actions which could decrease or eliminate academic dishonesty.

The dishonest behaviors of faculty in academia also set strong examples for students. The psychology professor who was fond guilty of plagiarism, and the cancer researcher who published falsified data, both demonstrate a blatant disregard for their own integrity. They tarnish the reputations of the academic community and damage the credibility of scholarly pursuits (6, p. 37).
The behavior of Houston public-school teachers on a competency test resulted in national publicity in 1983 (23). Of the three thousand teachers taking the test, many cheated openly by passing their test booklets around, changing answers, and leaving and entering the room with their answer sheets. Although some may have engaged in the behaviors in protest against the required competency test, the activity provided a strong statement about academic honesty and its seriousness for students in the Houston schools, as well as other schools around the nation.

Bok, an ethics and decision-making teacher at Harvard Medical School, raises some serious questions for educational institutions to ask about themselves. They are as follows:

1. How scrupulously honest are they in setting an example?
2. How do they cope with cheating, with plagiarism, and with fraudulent research?
3. What pressures encourage such behavior?
4. To what extent, and in what disciplines, are deceptive techniques actually taught to students?
5. What can education bring to the training of students in order that they may be more discerning, better able to cope with various forms of duplicity that they will encounter in working life (4, p. 54)?

The precious resources of integrity and trust are "easily squandered, hard to regain" (4, p. 54). Bok advises colleges and universities to consider which standards can be expected and upheld. The respect for truth is the only healthy ground in which trust and integrity can flourish.
Nor is the academic community alone in teaching academic dishonesty by example. Most notably, perhaps, is the powerful lesson taught by the Watergate scandal, which brought then-President Nixon to resign, and many of his associates to stand trial, and some to spend time in prison. Subsequent exposes have been wide-spread in the media. The gross over-charging by suppliers for tools and equipment of the Department of Defense, the destruction of many individuals' income tax forms by the Internal Revenue Service personnel in 1985, computer fraud, Ralph Nader's investigations, CBS-TV's *Sixty Minutes*, and other examples of dishonest behavior do seem to give some support to the concern expressed by many over the decline of honesty, truth, and integrity in the United States (12, 20, 29).

In a study by Schab, over one thousand high school seniors were surveyed in a replication of a study done in the same area in 1969, ten years earlier. The students were partitioned into two groups, college-bound and non-college-bound. Cheating on tests had increased from 34 percent in 1969 to 56 percent in 1979. Plagiarism had increased significantly among the college-bound students, 63.5 percent in 1969 to 78.7 percent in 1979. In a section requiring reactions to selected general moral concepts in our culture, data from Schab's study shows a decrease in the belief that "honesty is the best policy." The statement, "Sometimes it is necessary to be dishonest," evoked positive responses
from 30.4 percent of the college bound and 39.4 percent of the others in 1969. The same statement in 1979 revealed that 62.4 percent of the college-bound group and 66.7 percent of the non-college-bound agreed. The study led the researcher to conclude, "It is obvious that a downturn has occurred in moral behavior and an increase in views of a decidedly pessimistic nature about our society in general" (29, pp. 379-380).

There are cultural differences in the way in which national groups view academic behaviors as honest or dishonest. Christian describes her experiences as a Peace Corps teacher in Turkey, and her experiences with classes. She estimates that at least fifty percent of the students cheated openly and that teachers in Turkey gave the observed cheaters a grade of zero, because that was all that could be done. Later in another part of Turkey, she observed that none of the students cheated.

In Asian countries, especially in China and Japan, copying has been considered a way of learning, not a dishonest behavior, according to Bunyan. She notes that the Samoan culture also does not share the American taboo on cheating. Their culture teaches that people are to help one another, and the emphasis is on communal work, not on individual effort (7, pp. 49-50).

In Saudi Arabian universities, however, another view is taken entirely. Teachers are assigned to "invigilate," a
practice that involves aggressive and relentless behavior on the part of the invigilators. Students are viewed as "experts at cheating," according to Ceasar. Teachers turn in tests two weeks prior to administering them, receiving them only minutes before the test is scheduled. The invigilator then takes the sealed envelope to the assigned room, passes out the tests, then patrols the room "like a predatory shark." As many as eight teachers may be assigned the invigilation. They scan the test booklets inches from students' faces, order some students to move their chairs, yell at students for the "slightest shift" of the student's eyes. In spite of the tenacity and ferocity of the invigilators, Ceasar notes that cheating still occurs. A possible reason for this was theorized to be an inevitable effort by people who are tyrannized to find a bit of freedom and self-determination (9, pp. 64).

There are many factors, then, which influence student academic dishonesty. The academic community, and indeed society as a whole, are confronted with a very complex problem in dealing with student academic dishonesty.

Possible Methods of Controlling Academic Dishonesty

A number of authors have addressed themselves to the problem of controlling academic dishonesty. As has already been mentioned in this study, and a major method mentioned by most authors, is the development and dissemination to
faculty and students of clear specific definitions of behaviors which constitute student dishonest behavior.

Dressel states that control depends upon faculty. Faculty must adopt attitudes against cheating and dishonesty of all sorts, for themselves and students. Faculty must also be willing to take action when incidents of dishonesty take place. Specific suggestions for control are made, including multiple test forms, careful and constant proctoring and care and security in preparing exams. The honor system, thought to be effective by some institutions, has been assailed by reports of incidents of cheating at various service academies.

Dressel also confronts the belief by some faculty and administrators that cheaters hurt only themselves. Since grades, awards, and honors are competitively based, those who cheat hurt the honest students. He states, "Thus the instructor who ignores cheating and thereby abets it injures all students and the reputation of the institution as well" (13, p. 276-277).

Faculty who assume the role of helper rather than adversary can help control dishonest behavior by reducing pressure on students and by not inviting students to "beat the system" (7, p. 49-50). Also recommended is that faculty work with students to help them to understand the reasons that cheating will not work.
The threat of detection works as a deterrent to some students (18, 21). Specific suggestions on ways of increasing the possibility of detection are made by several authors. The use of frequently changed topic lists for term papers may reduce the incidence of buying or copying papers, a rigid form which prescribes the precise formula for writing, and a strategy requiring a level of research quality which necessitates the generation of individual student evidence can also be useful.

Speaking from a background in law and education, Pavela suggests some ways in which academe can improve its control of academic dishonesty. In addition to strongly urging the development of a clear definition of dishonest behaviors, he advises the academic community to "reaffirm the importance of academic integrity," minimize the temptation to cheat, evaluate the disciplinary regulations and simplify them as much as possible, and to impose strict penalties for academic dishonesty (27, p. 64).

Hardy adds other possible control methods. Random seating by the instructor, essay questions, checking student identification cards, personally proctoring exams, the use of different question sequencing, different colors for examination papers, and stapling the answer sheets to the test booklet so that the answer sheets are covered most of the time, have all been found to be effective at the University of Missouri (16, p. 65).
Plagiarism is one form of academic dishonesty which may be particularly difficult to detect. There are ways in which this practice can be discouraged, however. In addition to the previously mentioned, frequently changing topic list, Hardy suggests the following:

1. Students turning in tentative bibliographies early, with library locations for sources cited.

2. Students turn in an early outline of their paper.

3. Do not allow students to change topics later as procrastinators are prone to plagiarize.

4. Keep all papers on file for at least five years. Students turn in original typed papers. They photocopy them before turning them in (16, pp. 7-12).

These procedures are admittedly laborious and take much time, but are needed in combatting plagiarism.

Strict penalties for academic dishonesty are suggested by Pavela (27, p. 64) and Hardy (16, pp. 12-13). These penalties should be set by the institution and publicized to faculty and students. One clear example of possible penalties for student academic dishonesty is the statement by Texas Christian University, published in its calendar, with the definitions of academic misconduct. It is as follows:

Possible Sanctions

Any one or more of the following actions listed below may be imposed on a student who has engaged in academic misconduct.

A. Action by the faculty member:
   1. Notify the dean that an incident has occurred and been dealt with.
2. Grant no credit for the examination or assignment in question (treated as a missed assignment).

3. Assign a grade of F (or a zero) for the examination or assignment in question.

4. Recommend to the dean that the student be dropped immediately from the course with a grade of F. This grade cannot be changed by student-initiated withdrawal.

5. In a case where the dean is not the dean of the college in which the student is enrolled, the dean shall recommend to the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs that one of the above specific actions be taken.

Procedures for handling cases of alleged academic misconduct have been carefully drawn to protect the rights of individual students to safeguard the University's commitment to academic integrity. Copies of these procedures are available in the offices of all academic deans and in the offices of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the Dean of Students (31, p. 52).

This document seems to present clearly all the elements recommended by the various authors reviewed.

**Academic Dishonesty and The Helping Professions**

As troubling as the impact of academic dishonesty is on the academic community and society, there is a perhaps more troubling aspect. That is the effect of dishonesty on the health and very lives of the public. A study of students at two medical schools made a strong statement. Almost eighty-eight percent of the medical students surveyed reported having cheated at least once in college, and fifty-eight percent reported cheating at least once in medical school. A further and more alarming element was found in that "highly
significant correlations between cheating in medical school and falsifying information about a patient from laboratory examination, history, or physical examination, and reporting a finding on a patient as normal without obtaining the information" were found (11, p. 17). This means that physicians who cheated in medical school were prone to misdiagnose patients and that patients would receive inadequate or incorrect care. The health, recuperation, and very lives of patients can be affected.

In nursing, too, academic dishonesty has been identified as correlated with unethical behaviors in the clinical setting. Hilbert studied a sample group of 101 senior baccalaureate nursing students just prior to graduation. It was found that, although 65 percent of the students considered taking hospital equipment, including scrub suits, home with them as being unethical, 59 percent reported doing it. Fifty-four percent reported discussing patients (breaking confidentiality) in public places or with nonmedical persons, in spite of the fact that 77 percent considered this unethical behavior. Nineteen percent reported that they had recorded that medications, treatments, or observations had been done when they were not, although 100 percent considered this unethical.

Among classroom behaviors, some of the most frequently engaged in unethical behaviors included copying material from a reference without citation (27 percent),
collaborating on an assignment when this was not allowed (19 percent), adding items to a bibliography that were not used in writing the paper (17 percent), turning in an assignment done, at least in part, by another person (10 percent), and getting exam or quiz questions from a student who had taken the test earlier (17, pp. 230-234).

In a current study, the American Association of Colleges of Nursing has distributed a working document to nursing educators for evaluation and feedback. In this document, the nurse is described as an educated person who should be able to, "understand the nature of human values and make ethical judgments in both personal and professional life" (1, p. 7). Furthermore, essential values, attitudes, and personal qualities are listed. Among these are the values of truth and justice, requiring personal qualities of integrity, moral behavior, authenticity, and honesty (1, p. 9). Nursing educators have as goals the education and preparation of practitioners who incorporate these virtues. The information from this review of the literature, and most especially the data found by Hilbert, indicate that nursing educators face some difficult challenges today and in the future.

Nursing ethics were investigated in areas of honesty, confidentiality, termination of life, and other decision in nursing, in a study done by Nursing '74 in 1974. The population consisted of 11,681 respondents on a 73-item
questionnaire in March of 1974. The data revealed the following findings:

1. Seventy percent of nurses take hospital supplies occasionally or frequently. These supplies range from aspirin and antacid tablets to surgical equipment and narcotics.

2. While the majority reported keeping accurate, honest records on patients' charts (legal documents), eleven percent reported erasing or altering information, and nine percent purposely omitted information which might reflect poorly on the nurse.

3. On the controversial issue of heroic resuscitation methods in a situation involving the unexpected cardiac arrest in a terminally ill patient when the physician has left no instructions, forty-six percent of the respondents reported that they would "call a code," (call for a resuscitation team). Fifty-four percent indicated that they would not call for heroic measures.

4. On the issue of a nurse refusing to give postoperative care to abortion patients, violating the nursing code of ethics, fifty-four percent stated that refusal to give postoperative care would be a violation of the ethical code of nurses. Forty-four percent did not believe that refusal to give care in such situations was unethical. In comments from respondents, the issue of
abortion was shown to be an area that might be a conflict between personal and professional ethical codes.

5. Responding to items based on a situation in which a former patient sent a letter of appreciation for care, including a check for $100, fifty-one percent of the respondents stated that they would return the money. Fourteen percent said that they would donate the money to a charity, five percent said they would share the money with other nurses, and thirty percent said that they would keep the money and write the former patient a thank you note. On this item, another interesting finding emerged. Nurses in different positions in the hierarchy of nursing responded differently. Thirty-eight percent of the administrators would keep the money, 34 percent of the supervisors would keep the money, 28 percent of the staff nurses would keep the money.

6. In order to evaluate the relationship of job satisfaction to ethics, an item asking, "How satisfied are you with your occupation?" was included. Sixty-one percent said that they were very satisfied, twenty-eight percent said that they were somewhat satisfied, ten percent stated that they were somewhat dissatisfied, and one percent said that they were very dissatisfied (24, pp. 56-66).

Overall, the profile of the *typical nurse*, developed from the responses to the questionnaire, indicates a person who is a highly confident professional, usually sure of
his/her own abilities, and very strict in his/her professional code. Relationships with physicians are overall satisfactory, with occasion irritations at physicians who expect the nurse to be subservient. Typically, the nurse would stand between a patient and an erring physician (one who orders too high a dosage of medication, or who is intoxicated). There is some uncertainty about legal liabilities, but the typical nurse would not withhold information from a patient in order to protect the hospital. The keeping of honest and accurate records is customary, and the maintenance of confidentiality is important (24, pp. 56–66).

Summary

The literature indicates that academic honesty is a growing concern for the academic community and for society. There are a number of studies which support that growing concern and some which demonstrate directions in which educational institutions can follow to reduce the incidence of academic dishonesty. Some of the major methods suggested are as follows:

1. Developing a clear definition of behaviors which are considered academically dishonest;

2. Developing simple and workable procedures for reporting and handling incidents of dishonest behaviors;

3. Developing a set of strict consequences for dishonesty;
4. Publicizing all of the above to faculty and students;

5. Encouraging the discussion of academic dishonesty by faculty with students on a regular basis;

6. Adopting procedures and practices which make academic dishonesty as difficult as possible;

7. Maintaining a philosophy of high regard for honesty, justice, truth, and integrity by the institution, faculty, and administrators.

The literature reviewed in this study also demonstrates the implications of academic dishonesty among health care professionals. Studies revealed the relationship between academic dishonesty and the practices of physicians and nurses. These findings showed that academic dishonesty can impact the health, well-being, and lives of patients in their care.
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CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present the methods and procedures used in obtaining and analyzing the data for this study. As outlined in Chapter I the purposes are to (1) identify behaviors perceived as academically honest or dishonest by faculty and six levels of nursing students; (2) to determine differences between faculty and six levels of nursing students; (3) to determine differences between graduate and undergraduate nursing students; and (4) to determine differences in consequences proposed by faculty and students.

Population

Students and faculty of the School of Nursing at the University of Texas at Arlington were the population for this study. Each of the fifty-five faculty members and each of the 554 students enrolled in the school were given the opportunity to participate. Thirty-seven faculty members and 381 students returned usable computer scan sheets. Thus, 67 percent of the faculty and 68.77 percent of the students enrolled were included in the study.

A questionnaire (See Appendix A) was developed by adapting portions of a questionnaire used in the Wright and
Kelly (1974) study. The first four items were related to demographic data, items five through nine related to classroom behaviors, items ten through twenty-seven related to out-of-class behaviors and items twenty-eight through forty related to clinical practice area behaviors. Participants were asked to respond to the items on computer scan sheets with number two pencils. After marking the appropriate circles on the scan sheet for the demographic items, respondents were asked to indicate their evaluation of each behavior as either (a) honest, or (b) dishonest. If they selected the (b) dishonest option, they were asked to choose one consequence which they believed best fit the dishonest behavior.

The questionnaire as a whole was then evaluated by a panel of nursing educators. These educators each have earned doctorates and have years of experience in nursing education and in nursing service. They were:

- Dr. Myrna Pickard, Dean, School of Nursing, University of Texas at Arlington
- Dr. Marlene Brewer, Staff Nurse, Veteran's Administration Hospital, Dallas, Texas
- Dr. Patricia Scearce, Dean, School of Nursing, Texas Christian University
- Dr. Mildred Hogstel, Professor, Texas Christian University
Dr. Virginia Smith, Assistant Professor, Texas Woman's University.

No major changes were advised by the panel. Most of the changes were editorial in nature, and a few additional items were suggested although individual items were not evaluated separately. These were incorporated into the questionnaire, and the revised questionnaire was printed.

Permission was obtained from the Human Rights Committee at the University of Texas at Arlington to use the questionnaire with students and faculty at the School of Nursing. The questionnaire was sent to each faculty member by the researcher following an announcement during a faculty meeting, explaining the purpose of the study and inviting participation by the faculty. Each faculty member received the questionnaire, a cover letter, and a computer response sheet through faculty mail in the School of Nursing.

The researcher, or her designate, then visited classes requesting students to participate in the study. The researcher visited one Junior I class, in which all students in Junior I were enrolled; two Junior II classes, enabling all Junior II students to participate; the Senior I group in one class, where all Senior I students were enrolled; Senior II students in two classes, in which each Senior II student enrolled could participate; two I.P.E. classes, in order to allow each I.P.E. student to be included in the study, and four graduate classes were surveyed, allowing each graduate
student enrolled to participate. Students were asked to omit their names from the response sheets and to place the completed computed scan sheets into a large manila envelope. The envelopes were marked only with group labels, i.e., I.P.E., Junior I, Junior II, Senior I, Senior II and Graduate.

Statistical Treatment of Data

Each response was given a weight for use in computing the statistical analyses. A response of (a) honest was assigned a value of 1. A response of (b) dishonest was valued at 2. The consequences were then valued as (e)=2.1, (f)=2.2, (g)=2.3, (h)=2.4, (i)=2.5, and (j)=2.6. The following statistical analyses were then conducted to address the research questions:

1. Research Question One was addressed by computing frequencies and distributions of responses to each of the items on the questionnaire. The findings were recorded and reported in percentages.

2. Research Question Two was addressed by computing Mann-Whitney U tests comparing the scores found for the group of faculty and the six groups of students. Mann-Whitney U was chosen because it is one of the most powerful nonparametric tests available for the ordinal data of this study (2, p. 116). Roscoe states that Mann-Whitney U "is a nonparametric alternative to the t-test for two independent samples. It is commonly used where the experimenter draws two samples from the same parent population. . . and compares
the two on a single criterion" (1, p. 175). Roscoe further states that "the measures from the two samples are combined in a single ordered series and ranked from one to N" (1, p. 175).

3. Research Question Three was addressed by computing Mann-Whitney U tests comparing the scores of five groups of undergraduate students with the group of graduate students. The findings were recorded and reported.

4. Research question four was addressed by applying the Kruskal-Wallis One Way Analysis of Variance by ranks to responses of the faculty group and a group of all the students. Kruskal-Wallis was chosen for its usefulness in determining whether the differences among samples denote true population differences or whether they represent chance variations which may be expected among random samples from the same population (2). A significance level of P .05 was chosen.

In addition, demographic data were analyzed for frequency and distribution. Gender, age, marital status, and cultural background/ethnicity were tabulated, recorded, and reported in percentages and raw numbers.

Summary

This chapter describes the procedures used for collecting and analyzing the data for this study. Faculty and students responded on computer scan sheets to a
questionnaire on the honesty or dishonesty of a list of thirty-six student behaviors and chose one of six possible consequences for each of the behaviors they perceived as dishonest. Four demographic items were also analyzed. The data were treated statistically, using percentages, Mann-Whitney U, and Kruskal-Wallis tests.
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CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSES OF DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present the findings resulting from an analysis of perceptions of student academic dishonesty, as held by faculty and students in a school of nursing. A questionnaire was developed and validated by a panel of nursing educators for content validity. The revised questionnaire was administered to the faculty and students enrolled in the University of Texas at Arlington School of Nursing. Fifty-four faculty members and 554 students were asked to answer the questionnaire on a computer scan sheet. Thirty-seven faculty members, 68.51 percent, and 381 students, 68.77 percent, returned usable computer scan sheets.

The data were analyzed in an effort to address research questions proposed in Chapter I. Research Question One was analyzed according to frequency distributions in percentages. Research Questions Two and Three were analyzed by the Mann-Whitney U test for independence utilizing a .05 statistical level of significance. Research Question Four was analyzed by the Kruskal-Wallis One Way Analysis of Variance utilizing a .05 statistical level of significance, and by distributions in percentages.
Description of the Population

Generic students are admitted to the program after having completed two years of prerequisites. Approximately forty to fifty percent take their prerequisites at the University of Texas at Arlington (UTA). The rest come from a wide variety of backgrounds. Some complete prerequisites at junior colleges, some at other four-year institutions in Texas or other states, and a few at institutions outside the United States. Although there is a part-time option, most of the generic students attend full-time. They spend three days a week in classroom settings and two days a week in clinical situations in groups of eight to twelve with a clinical instructor. This closeness of contact with each other and with instructors results in the development of camaraderie and esprit de corps, as well as the formation of a common socializing environment.

The Individualized Plan for Evaluation, known as I.P.E., is a one year program designed to prepare registered nurses who have diplomas or associate degrees in nursing to receive a baccalaureate degree in nursing. These students come from a wide variety of locales, backgrounds, age groups, and life experiences. Many are from the Metroplex area, but others commute from such Texas cities as Wichita Falls, Waco and Abilene. These students do their clinical practice components independently of each other, in agencies convenient to their work or their homes. They meet once a
week with an instructor for a clinical conference. Their
time together as a group is spent in lecture situations one
full day per week. They do not get to experience the
greater intensity of interaction and the longer duration of
time together that the generic students have.

The graduate students also come from a variety of age
groups, backgrounds, locales, and life experiences. The
majority attend on a part-time basis. Because of this and
because their individual clinical practice is done with only
occasional clinical conferences with an instructor, this
group is less cohesive and less intimate than the generic
students.

Analyses of Data

The demographic data presented in Table I show the
number and percentages of respondents as to items on gender,
marital status, age, and cultural background-ethnic
background. Of the respondents, 378 are females (90.4
percent) and 40 are males (9.5 percent). The majority are
Anglo females and the smallest minority is of Middle Eastern
descent.

The fact that 9.5 percent of the population is male
tends to support the belief that nursing remains a female-
dominated profession. It does show, however, that males are
beginning to enter the profession.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=418</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>90.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male*</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-45</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-50</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-55</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Background–Ethnicity:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>18*</td>
<td>4.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>86.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>14*</td>
<td>3.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>23*</td>
<td>5.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*indicates notable findings

The cultural background-ethnicity findings indicate that there are more Asian students in the group than those of either Hispanic or African descent. In Texas, it might be assumed that Hispanics and those of African descent would
outnumber Asians. While it might be assumed that the majority of the population of a school of nursing in Texas would be of Anglo descent, the finding that 86.6 percent of the respondents are Anglo indicates a somewhat different population.

The range of ages of the group indicates that the majority are under the age of thirty (60.4 percent). This age group probably formed its values during the period of Watergate, and Abscam, when misconduct of public officials was highly publicized.

**Research Question One**

Research Question One asks what behaviors are perceived as academically honest and what behaviors are perceived as dishonest by nursing students and faculty. The data presented in Table II indicate the frequency and percentages of responses of both groups to each item on the questionnaire. It is notable that 35.88 percent considered that submitting the same formal paper in more than one course without the instructor's knowledge to be honest behavior. Also related to the writing of papers was the inclusion of the work of others without citation, a behavior considered honest by 8.85 percent of the respondents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Honest</th>
<th>Dishonest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom Behaviors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Copying answers during an exam</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Giving answers during an exam</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Using prohibited notes in an exam</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Taking a test for another student</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Having a test taken by another</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Out of Class Behaviors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Submitting same paper, 2 courses</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>*35.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Using material without citation</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>*8.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Submitting paper by another</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Writing paper for another</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Buying a paper for submitting</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Selling a paper to another</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Studying banned previous tests</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Missing test when unprepared</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Using stolen test prior to test</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Studying same test before makeup</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>*11.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Buttering instructor for test</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>*9.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Adding unread items to biblio</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Cheating when others cheat</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Missing test, answers from others</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Giving answers to one absent</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>*12.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Cheating in required courses</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Remember items for &quot;file.&quot;</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>*17.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Remember items for self only</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>80.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clinical Practice Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Going to clinical unprepared</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>*34.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Completing charting early.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>*13.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Charting treatments not done</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Including false data in process</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Copying content from another</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>*16.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Charting vital signs falsely</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Charting medicines not given</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE II—Continued

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35. Having others do your work.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Not reporting error in care.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Trying to do procedures without knowing how, or getting help.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Using contaminated item(s).</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Not reporting lost or damaged patient property.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Avoiding instructor to avoid questions about patient care.</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>*21.70</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*indicates percentages above 8.80 considered behavior honest.

The items related to test-taking also present notable findings. Studying a copy of a test when taking a make-up of that test was considered honest by 11.72 percent of the respondents. In addition, developing a personal relationship with an instructor to obtain test information was considered honest by 9.80 percent of those responding. Further, 12.20 percent considered giving test information to someone who was absent from the test to be honest, and 17.46 percent believed that memorizing items to be included in a file for study by others was honest.

In the clinical practice area, there were other notable findings. Reporting to clinical practice without the assigned preparation—the care plan, reading about the diagnosis, medicine cards, and other preparations, was considered honest behavior by 34.21 percent. This means that students giving care to patients would be doing so without knowing about the nursing care, problems, normal findings, medications and procedures pertinent to their specific patients.
Completing charting on a patient three hours before the end of the shift was perceived as honest by 13.14 percent of the participants. This means that the student would be charting activities and happenings that were not observed. In other words, falsifying the record of the patient's care.

Borrowing content from another student's nursing process paper was perceived as honest by 16.02 percent. This means that portions of one student's paper about the nursing care of a patient could be used by another student. The act of consciously avoiding the instructor in order to prevent answering questions about patient care was seen as honest behavior by 21.70 percent of the population. Even though each student does the actual patient care, the clinical instructor works with all students to assure that the students are adequately prepared, that they carry out the prescribed treatments and activities as ordered, and that the care they give is safe. Individual students may, therefore, avoid supervision.

Research Question Two

Research Question Two asks if there is a significant difference between faculty and all students on behaviors perceived as academically honest or dishonest. The data presented in Table III show the medians and ranges obtained from the group scores. For each item marked as honest, a score of one was given. For each item marked as dishonest, a score of two was given. Medians are the measures of
central tendency used for comparison because medians are appropriate for use with ordinal data, and the data obtained from this study are ordinal in nature. The range is used to show the breadth from the highest score to the lowest in each group.

TABLE III

PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENT HONEST-DISHONEST BEHAVIORS BY STUDENTS AND FACULTY*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junior I</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior II</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior I</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior II</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.P.E.</td>
<td>80.35</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*based on scores of 1 for honest, 2 for dishonest.

It is notable that the medians of the Junior II group (80.4), and the I.P.E. group (80.35) are most alike. This indicates a similarity of scores from these two groups of widely varying experience and backgrounds. They also have the highest medians of the undergraduate students. This could indicate that they hold the highest ethical standards of the undergraduate students.
The data indicate that Junior I and Senior II are similar, Junior I having a median of 79.2 and Senior II having a median of 79. The ranges, however, differ by 12.5 points, with Junior I having a range of 45.7 and Senior II having a range of 33.2. This indicates that within the Junior I group, the opinions of whether the behaviors were honest or dishonest differed more widely than did the opinions of the Senior II group. The range of the scores of the Senior II group (33.2) is the narrowest of all student groups. This indicates that their opinions of honest and dishonest behavior are most nearly alike. The median for the Graduate group (81.2) is the highest of all the student groups. The range (33.6) is next to the narrowest of the student groups. These findings indicate that the Graduate group may be the most ethical of the student groups, and that they tend to be similar in their perceptions of the behaviors as honest or dishonest.

The Faculty group median (83.5) is the highest median of all the groups. The range for the Faculty group (27.9) is the narrowest. These findings indicate that Faculty perceived more of the behaviors to be dishonest than did the student groups, and that the faculty varied less in their perceptions than did the student groups.

The data presented in Table IV show faculty scores compared with all six levels of student scores utilizing Mann-Whitney U test with a statistical significance of .05.
A score of 1 was given for each response of honest and a score of 2 was given for each score of dishonest and these values were added together to arrive at the score for each participant. Then the scores were ranked in order of increasing size, and the Mann Whitney U test applied.

**TABLE IV**

**FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF HONEST/DISHONEST BEHAVIORS COMPARED WITH PERCEPTIONS OF ALL STUDENT GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>U value</th>
<th>Z score</th>
<th>Sig. Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>U=2182.5</td>
<td>3.294634</td>
<td>*P&lt;.0007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.P.E.</td>
<td>U=1954</td>
<td>3.962346</td>
<td>*P&lt;.00005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior II</td>
<td>U=1495</td>
<td>4.522488</td>
<td>*P&lt;.00003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior I</td>
<td>U=1686</td>
<td>3.504176</td>
<td>*P&lt;.00003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior II</td>
<td>U=1465</td>
<td>3.855296</td>
<td>*P&lt;.00007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior I</td>
<td>U=1592</td>
<td>4.67215</td>
<td>*P&lt;.00003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*indicates statistically significant finding.

These findings show that the faculty differs significantly from all groups of students in perceiving a list of student behaviors as honest or dishonest. The least difference is shown in the comparison of faculty scores with the graduate students (P<.0007). The highly statistically significant levels of difference support a strong statement that faculty and six levels of nursing students differ
significantly in their perceptions of the honesty or dishonesty of a list of student behaviors.

**Research Question Three**

Research Question Three asks if there is a significant difference between the perceptions of five groups of undergraduate nursing students and a group of graduate nursing students on the honesty or dishonesty of student behaviors. Table V presents the data obtained when the Mann-Whitney U test was utilized in analyzing the data.

**TABLE V**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>U Value</th>
<th>Z score</th>
<th>Sig. Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.P.E.</td>
<td>U=3675.5</td>
<td>1.410495</td>
<td>P&lt;.0778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior II</td>
<td>U=2937.5</td>
<td>2.577397</td>
<td>*P&lt;.0049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior I</td>
<td>U=3489</td>
<td>4.200444</td>
<td>*P&lt;.00003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior II</td>
<td>U=2707</td>
<td>1.190882</td>
<td>P&lt;.1151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior I</td>
<td>U=3080</td>
<td>2.524364</td>
<td>*P&lt;.0057</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*indicates statistically significant finding at .05 level.

When the graduate nursing student group scores are compared with the five levels of undergraduate students, the analysis shows that Senior II (.0049), Senior I (.00003), and Junior I (.0057) differ significantly from the graduate
student group. When compared with I.P.E. (.0778) and Junior II (.1151) groups, no significant difference is found. These findings indicate that the perceptions of honesty and dishonesty of student behaviors by the graduate students, the I.P.E. students, and the Junior II students were similar enough to have occurred by chance. The Senior I group perceptions differed most from those of the graduate group with a significance level of .00003.

Further analysis was done on the data from these groups. Table VI presents data obtained from comparing I.P.E. scores with the generic students.

**TABLE VI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>U-Value</th>
<th>Z score</th>
<th>Sig. Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior II</td>
<td>U=2235</td>
<td>1.339622</td>
<td>P&lt;.0901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior I</td>
<td>U=2672</td>
<td>2.820956</td>
<td>*P&lt;.0023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior II</td>
<td>U=2039.5</td>
<td>0.0214306</td>
<td>P&lt;.4880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior I</td>
<td>U=2326</td>
<td>1.1801</td>
<td>P&lt;.1170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*indicates statistically significant at the .05 level using Mann-Whitney U.

**is Individualized Plan for Evaluation, a program for R.N.s to receive baccalaureate degrees in nursing.

These data show that there is a significant difference between the I.P.E. group and the Senior I group (.0023).
The Senior II, Junior II, and Junior I groups all show no significant differences. These findings indicate that students enrolled in the I.P.E. program are more similar to the students in the Senior II, Junior I, and Junior II groups as to their perceptions of honest or dishonest student behavior than they are to the Senior I group.

In addition, the Senior II group scores were compared with the scores of the three remaining groups of generic students. The data concerning the perceptions of honest/dishonest behaviors between the Senior I, Junior II, and Junior I groups were analyzed by utilizing the Mann-Whitney U test at .05 level and the results are shown in Table VII.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>U value</th>
<th>Z score</th>
<th>Sig. Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior I</td>
<td>U=1734</td>
<td>1.515662</td>
<td>P&lt;.0643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior II</td>
<td>U=1742</td>
<td>1.748398</td>
<td>*P&lt;.0401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior I</td>
<td>U=1550.5</td>
<td>0.4031661</td>
<td>P&lt;.3446</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates statistical significance at .05 level, using Mann-Whitney U.

These data indicate that the Senior II group differs significantly from the Junior II group (.0401), and is not
statistically significantly different from the Senior I and Junior I groups. It is notable that the students in the Senior II group, who are at the end of their nursing curriculum, are similar in their perceptions of the honesty of student behaviors to the Junior I group, who are just beginning their nursing education.

The scores of the Senior I group were compared with the scores from the two Junior groups. The data from this comparison are presented in Table VIII.

**TABLE VIII**

SENIOR I PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENT BEHAVIORS COMPARED WITH PERCEPTIONS OF TWO JUNIOR GROUPS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>U value</th>
<th>Z score</th>
<th>Sig. Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junior II</td>
<td>U=2103</td>
<td>3.320586</td>
<td>P.&lt;0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior I</td>
<td>U=1869.5</td>
<td>1.754489</td>
<td>P.&lt;0392</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Using Mann-Whitney U at .05 significance level.

The data from these comparisons indicate that the scores of the Senior I group differ significantly from both of the Junior groups. The Junior II group (.0005) differs most from the Senior I group. The Junior I group (.0392) differs least from the Senior I group. These data indicate that the perceptions of the honesty of student behavior between the two is significantly different.
Of particular interest is the fact that the perceptions of the Senior I group differ significantly from all other groups in the study. While this study does not investigate the causes of differences, the question of what factors are involved in the differences expressed by the Senior I group is intriguing.

When the Junior II group scores were compared with the scores obtained from the Junior I group, no significant difference was found. This fact indicates that the perceptions of the honesty of student behaviors by both semesters of junior students were similar. This data are presented in Table IX.

TABLE IX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUNIOR II PERCEPTIONS HONEST/DISHONEST BEHAVIORS COMPARED WITH PERCEPTIONS OF JUNIOR I STUDENTS*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Using Mann-Whitney U at .05 significance level.

Research Question Four

Research question four asks if there are differences in consequences proposed by faculty and students for the listed student behaviors. The data were analyzed by comparing the scores of the faculty group with the scores of all the
student groups utilizing the Kruskal-Wallis One Way Analysis of Variance. The difference was found to be significant at the .001 level. Therefore, there is a statistically significant difference between the consequences proposed by the faculty and the total group of responding nursing students at the University of Texas at Arlington.

The data obtained from the analysis of the responses recommending specific consequences for student behaviors perceived as dishonest were further examined in order to determine where the differences occurred. The three most severe consequences were chosen for presentation.

When these data are used to compare the percentage of faculty recommending specific consequences for dishonest behavior with the percentage of students recommending the same specific consequences for the same behaviors, it is worthy of note that the classroom behaviors of taking a test for another student and having another take a test are the behaviors prompting responses of the most severe consequences. Of the faculty, fifty-four percent recommended suspension from school for taking a test for another student and 30.1 percent of the students agreed. For the act of "Having another take the test," 43.2 percent of the faculty and 29.9 percent of the students recommended suspension from school.
### TABLE X

**MOST SEVERE CONSEQUENCES FOR DISHONEST STUDENT BEHAVIORS AS RECOMMENDED BY FACULTY AND BY ALL STUDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Suspension Fac. Std. Percent</th>
<th>Failure Fac. Std. Percent</th>
<th>Zero Grade Fac. Std. Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classroom Behaviors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copying answers in exam.</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving answers in exam.</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using notes in exam.</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking test for another.</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having another take test.</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Out of Class Behaviors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using 1 paper, two courses.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use material, no citation.</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use paper by another.</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>45.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write paper for another.</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy paper for submitting.</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>*5.7</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling paper to another.</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studying banned old tests.</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing test, unprepared.</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>*4.7</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studying stolen test.</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use same test pre-make-up.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*1.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buttering inst. for test.</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unread items in biblio.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheating when others do.</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss test, ask others.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give answers to absent one.</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheat in required course.</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recall items for &quot;file.&quot;</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recall items for self only.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clinical Practice Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going when unprepared.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete chart early.</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charting undone treatment.</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False data in process.</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copying content of another.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*1.3</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chart false vital signs.</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chart medicines omitted.</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have others do your work.</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care error unreported.</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do procedure unprepared.</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table X--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use contaminated item(s)</th>
<th>5.4</th>
<th>4.7</th>
<th>24.3</th>
<th>14.4</th>
<th>27.0</th>
<th>12.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patient property abused</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>*5.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding instructor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates higher student

Another fact revealed in Table X is cause for considerable concern for the nurse-educator. When the severity of the consequence is viewed as indicative of the seriousness of the dishonest behavior, three items are perceived as more serious than any of the behaviors in the clinical practice area. Taking a test for another (54.0 percent of faculty) and having a test taken by another (43.2 percent of faculty), and item 15, selling a paper to another (32.4 percent of faculty), were the items considered more serious by faculty than any of the clinical practice behaviors. This matter is cause for concern in that the clinical behaviors can result in the increased morbidity of the patients, and could even result in the death of patients. Noting on the chart that medications were administered, when in fact they were not, could cause serious sequelae for patients in some instances. Physicians might increase the dosage of medications needlessly and in the case of some medications the omission might cause severe complications or death.

When treatments are charted as having been completed when they have not been done, a false picture is created.
For example, when an immobile patient is to be turned every two hours and this is not done, the patient may develop respiratory congestion, pneumonia, or bed sores. Each of the possible outcomes presents a threat to the patient's life, health, and comfort.

Other notable data are as follows:

1. For twenty-five of the listed behaviors, higher percentages of faculty members chose the most severe consequence. For eleven of the behaviors a higher percentage of students chose the most severe consequence, suspension from school. This indicates that a greater percentage of faculty may consider more of the behaviors to be more serious than do the group of students.

2. For thirty-one of the behaviors, greater percentages of faculty considered failure in the course to be advisable than did the student group. In only five behaviors the percentages of students recommending course failure exceeded the percentage of faculty recommending this consequence.

3. Greater percentages of faculty prescribed a grade of zero for twenty-two of the behaviors, and students recommended this consequence for fourteen of the behaviors.

4. Fifty-four percent of faculty and 30.1 percent of the students recommended suspension for taking a test for another student, while 43.2 percent of faculty and 29.9 percent of the students recommended suspension for having a
test taken by another. This indicates that taking a test for another may be perceived as more serious than having a test taken by another.

5. Buying a paper for submission as perceived as worthy of suspension by 5.4 percent of faculty and 5.7 percent of students, while selling a paper to another was seen as worthy of the same consequence by 32.4 percent of faculty and 9.7 percent of the students. This indicates that students and faculty may perceive selling a paper as more serious than buying one.

6. For cheating in courses where others cheat, 40.5 percent of faculty and 23.3 percent of students recommended a consequence of failure in the course, while for cheating in required courses, 54.0 percent of faculty and 44.6 percent of students recommended a failure in the course. This could indicate that it is more serious to cheat in required courses than in non-required course in which other students cheat.

7. A grade of zero was recommended for being absent from a test and getting test questions from someone who took the test by 45.9 percent of the faculty and 43.5 percent of the students, and giving test information to someone who was absent from the test received the same recommendation from 16.2 percent of the faculty and 22.5 percent of the students. This indicates that it may be more serious to get the illicit information than to give it.
8. A grade of zero was advised for looking at a stolen copy of test questions prior to a test by 56.7 percent of faculty and 45.4 percent of the students, while 62.1 percent of faculty and 49.6 percent of the students advised giving a grade of zero for "Studying a copy of a test when taking a make-up of that test." This suggests that using a stolen test to study before taking the test is perceived to be less serious an offense than studying a copy of a test before a make-up.

9. Charting treatments that were neither performed nor observed was seen as calling for a consequence of suspension by 21.6 percent of the faculty and 11.2 percent of the students. This may indicate that a majority of students consider this behavior less serious than the faculty.

10. The percentages of faculty were higher than the percentages of students advising all three consequences for charting vital signs not taken or not recalled exactly. This could indicate that students see this behavior as less serious than do the majority of the faculty.

11. The percentages of faculty that considered charting medications not given, nor seen prepared, and given, as meriting severe consequences were higher than the percentages of students on this item. Since accurate administration and documentation of medications can be vital, these data are cause for concern.
Summary of Data Findings

The following findings are derived from the analyses of data for this study:

**Research Question One**

There was a significant difference between student behaviors perceived as honest and dishonest by faculty and students at the University of Texas at Arlington School of Nursing. These were as follows:

1. Of the combined faculty and students population, 35.88 percent considered that submitting the same formal paper in more than one course without the instructor's knowledge was honest behavior.

2. Of the respondents, 8.85 percent considered inclusion of the work of others in papers, without citation to be honest.

3. Items related to test-taking also present notable findings.

4. Studying a copy of a test when taking a make-up of that test was considered honest by 11.72 percent of the combined group.

5. Developing a personal relationship with the instructor to obtain test information was considered honest by 9.80 percent.

6. Giving test information to someone who was absent from the test was considered to be honest by 12.28 percent.
7. Memorizing items to be included on a file for study by others was considered to be honest by 17.46 percent.

In the clinical practice area, there were other notable findings. These included the following:

1. Reporting to clinical practice without the assigned preparation was considered honest by 34.21 percent.

2. Completing charting on a patient three hours before the end of the shift was perceived as honest by 13.14 percent of the participants.

3. Borrowing content from another student's nursing process paper was seen as honest by 16.02 percent.

4. The act of consciously avoiding the instructor in order to prevent having to answer questions about patient care was perceived to be honest by 21.70 percent.

**Research Question Two**

There was a significant difference between the faculty and all six groups of students. The significance levels of these differences were as follows:

- Graduate students, P<.0007
- I.P.E., P<.00005
- Senior II, P<.00003
- Senior I, P<.00003
- Junior II, P<.00007
- Junior I, P<.0003
Research Question Three

There were significant differences between the perceptions of a group of graduate students and five levels of undergraduate students. Applying the Mann-Whitney U test, the significant differences were as follows:

Senior II P<.0049
Senior I P<.00003
Junior I P<.0057

Research Question Four

There were notable differences between the consequences proposed by faculty and students for the listed behaviors. Applying the Kruskal-Wallis One Way Analysis of Variance the difference was found to be significant at the .001 level. Faculty proposed the more severe consequences for twenty-five of the student behaviours, and students proposed the more severe consequences for eleven behaviors.

Some of the more notable differences were as follow:

1. Fifty-four percent of the faculty recommended suspension from school for taking a test for another student and 30.1 percent of the students agreed.

2. For the act of having another student take the test, 43.2 percent of the faculty and 29.9 percent of the students recommended suspension for school.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Introduction

This chapter summarizes the purposes, methods and procedures, analyses of the data, and the findings of this study. Conclusions and recommendations based upon the findings are also presented.

Summary

This study is concerned with the perceptions of students and faculty in a school of nursing on the honesty or dishonesty of student behaviors. The purposes of the study are to identify behaviors perceived as academically honest or dishonest by faculty and six levels of nursing students to determine differences between faculty and six levels of nursing students to determine differences between graduate and undergraduate nursing student, and to determine differences in consequences proposed by faculty and students.

Thirty-seven faculty members and 381 students were utilized in this study. Data were collected using a questionnaire developed by the researcher and reviewed for content validity by a panel of nursing educators.
Respondents completed computer scan sheets in answering the items on the questionnaire. The faculty received their questionnaires, a cover letter and a scan sheet by faculty mail, following an announcement in a faculty meeting requesting their participation. Classrooms were visited by the researcher or her designate during the last week of October and the first week of November, 1985. Students were asked to participate in the study by answering the items on the questionnaire on a computer scan sheet. They then placed their anonymous scan sheets into large manila envelopes labeled only with the title of the group (i.e., I.P.E., Senior, etc.).

Three major methods were used to treat the data obtained from students and faculty. The first four items, which asked for demographic information, and data responding to the first research question were treated as frequency distributions and percentages. The Mann-Whitney U test for independence was used to treat the data responding to research questions two and three. The Kruskal-Wallis One Way Analysis of Variance was used to treat the data responding to research question four.

Summary of Major Data Findings

Data collected to answer the research questions of this study produced the following major findings:
Research Question One

There was a significant difference between student behaviors perceived as honest and dishonest by faculty and students at the University of Texas at Arlington School of Nursing. These were as follows:

1. Of the combined faculty and student population 35.88 percent considered that submitting the same formal paper in more than one course without the instructor's knowledge was honest behavior.

2. Of the respondents 8.85 percent considered inclusion of the work of others in papers, without citation to be honest.

3. Items related to test-taking also present notable findings.

4. Studying a copy of a test when taking a make-up of that test was considered honest by 11.72 percent of the combined group.

5. Developing a personal relationship with the instructor to obtain test information was considered honest by 9.80 percent.

6. Giving test information to someone who was absent from the test was considered to be honest by 12.28 percent.

7. Memorizing items to be included on a file for study by others was considered to be honest by 17.46 percent.

In the clinical practice area, there were other notable findings. These included the following:
1. Reporting to clinical practice without the assigned preparation was considered honest by 34.21 percent.

2. Completing charting on a patient three hours before the end of the shift was perceived as honest by 13.14 percent of the participants.

3. Borrowing content from another student's nursing process paper was seen as honest by 16.02 percent.

4. The act of consciously avoiding the instructor in order to prevent having to answer questions about patient care was perceived to be honest by 21.70 percent.

**Research Question Two**

There was a significant difference between the faculty and all six groups of students. The significance levels of these differences were as follows:

- Graduate students, $P<.0007$
- I.P.E., $P<.00005$
- Senior II, $P<.00003$
- Senior I, $P<.00003$
- Junior II, $P<.00007$
- Junior I, $P<.00003$

**Research Question Three**

There were significant differences between the perceptions of a group of graduate students and five levels of undergraduate students. Applying the Mann-Whitney U test, the significant differences were as follows:
Research Question Four

There were notable differences between the consequences proposed by faculty and students for the listed behaviors. Applying the Kruskal-Wallis One Way Analysis of Variance the difference was found to be significant at the .001 level. Faculty proposed the more severe consequences for twenty-five of the student behaviors, and students proposed the more severe consequences for eleven behaviors.

Some of the more notable differences were as follow:

1. Fifty-four percent of the faculty recommended suspension from school for taking a test for another student and 30.1 percent of the students agreed.

2. For the act of having another student take the test, 43.2 percent of the faculty and 29.9 percent of the students recommended suspension for school.

Discussion of Findings

The literature refers to different causative factors of academic dishonesty in colleges and universities. One major cause cited is the lack of common definitions of academic dishonesty as held by college and university faculty, and administration, and the students enrolled in those institutions (1, pp. 545-550; 4, pp. 68-77; 5, pp. 140-144;
The students' lack of perception as to which behaviors constitute academic dishonesty, and the confusion of students as to the effects of academic dishonesty on the institution and on themselves especially as their future occupations are concerned, appear to be significant parts of the problem (1). The Wright and Kelly study also found students and faculty differed on behaviors that they classified as dishonest (5, p. 31). This study bears out their finding that there are statistically significant differences between faculty and student perceptions of behaviors which are considered dishonest.

One major suggestion for a method to address the problem of academic dishonesty on campuses is to develop a clear definition of academic dishonesty, identify the behaviors which are considered dishonest, and identify and develop consequences for acts of dishonesty (4). This study supports that a common definition of academic dishonesty, a common list of dishonest behaviors and a set of consequences for those behaviors are lacking at the University of Texas at Arlington School of Nursing.

Another reason for dishonesty as revealed in the literature is a laxity in faculty and administration to administer firm and strict consequences for the behaviors. The Carnegie Commission's report, *Fair Practices* (2), states that dishonesty is a significant problem in higher education, and that it is on the rise. Concern is expressed
that the "frantic search by colleges for scarce students in the 1980s and 1990s" will cause some colleges to be "even more reluctant to insist on ethical conduct by students and even more likely to engage in improper conduct themselves" (2, p. 261). This study shows a statistically significant difference between the consequences proposed for dishonest behavior by students and faculty members.

In a study cited by Connell (3), students were asked to rank in order of their seriousness fourteen types of dishonest behaviors. The behaviors considered most serious by the students surveyed were taking an exam for another student and having another student take your exam. These same two behaviors were the ones considered by most respondents (99.28 percent) to be dishonest.

The literature also refers to the practice of buying term papers to be turned in as the students' original work. This practice is apparently still occurring, in spite of legal judgments and penalties. There still are advertisements for catalogs by term paper mills (3, p. 19). In this study 5.98 percent of the respondents perceived buying a paper to submit as original work to be honest behavior.

Conclusions

Based on the findings of this study, the following conclusions appear to be warranted:
1. Students and faculty differ significantly on what behaviors are perceived as academically honest and dishonest.

2. Graduate students do differ significantly from undergraduate students on the honesty or dishonesty of selected student behaviors.

3. Faculty and students differ on the consequences proposed for the listed behaviors. Faculty tend to recommend more severe consequences than do the student group.

Recommendations for Further Study

The following recommendations are made for future research:

1. This study should be replicated in another school of nursing with a similar population to that of The University of Texas at Arlington School of Nursing in order to determine if the same or similar results occur.

2. A study should be conducted to determine the causes of academic dishonesty among students in schools of nursing.

3. A study should be conducted to determine the degree of the problem of academic dishonesty at a school of nursing.


5. Nuss, Elizabeth M., "Academic Integrity: Comparing Faculty and Student Attitudes," Improving College and University Teaching, 32 (Summer, 1984), 140-144.


Thank you for participating in this project. Your assistance is greatly appreciated.

Please DO NOT mark the answer sheet with your name or other identifying marks. Please fill in the appropriate circle on the answer sheet with your answer to the items.

1. Gender
   a. Female
   b. Male

2. Age
   a. Under 25
   b. 25 to 30
   c. 30 to 35
   d. 35 to 40
   e. 40 to 45
   f. 45 to 50
   g. 50 to 55
   h. 55 to 60
   i. Over 60

3. Marital Status
   a. single
   b. married
   c. divorced
   d. widowed

4. Cultural Background - Ethnicity
   a. Hispanic
   b. Anglo
   c. African
   d. Asian
   e. Middle Eastern

INSTRUCTIONS: First, please respond to each item. Read the item and indicate your evaluation of the behavior by marking the answer sheet with either:

   a. Honest
   b. Dishonest

Second, if you respond that the behavior is Dishonest (b), please choose ONE consequence you believe best fits the dishonest behavior and ON THE SAME ITEM LINE ON THE ANSWER SHEET, mark ONE of the following:

CONSEQUENCES:
   e. Suspension from school
   f. Failure in the course
   g. A grade of 0 on the assignment
   h. A conference with the dean or other administrator
   i. A conference with the instructor
   j. No consequence
Evaluation of Behavior:

a. Honest
b. Dishonest

Consequences:
e. Suspension from school
f. Failure in the course
g. A grade of 0 on the assignment
h. A conference with the dean or other administrator
i. A conference with the instructor
j. No consequence

EXAMPLE ITEM: 1. Using a computer to alter the university records of your grades.

CLASSROOM BEHAVIORS:

5. Copying answers from another student during an in-class or out-of-class exam.
6. Giving answers to another student during an in-class or out-of-class exam.
7. Using notes or books during an exam when this is prohibited by the instructor.
8. Taking a test for another student.
9. Having your test taken by another student in your name.

OUT OF CLASS BEHAVIORS:

10. Submitting the same formal paper in more than one course without the instructors' knowledge.
11. Copying or paraphrasing material in a paper without footnoting.
12. Submitting a paper written by another student.
13. Writing a paper for another student.
14. Buying a paper from another student or a paper writing service.
15. Selling a paper to another student.
16. Looking through previous copies of an instructor's tests without permission.
17. Avoiding taking a test on time when unprepared, making up an excuse like illness.
18. Looking at a stolen copy of test questions prior to a test.
19. Studying a copy of a test when taking a make-up of that test.
20. Developing a personal relationship with an instructor to obtain test information.
21. Adding items that were not read to a bibliography.
22. Cheating in courses where others cheat.
23. Being absent from a test and getting test questions from someone who took the test.
24. Giving test information to someone who was absent from the test.

PLEASE CONTINUE TO THE NEXT PAGE.
Evaluation of Behavior: Consequences:

a. Honest  e. Suspension from School
b. Dishonest  f. Failure in the course
g. A grade of 0 on the assignment
h. A conference with the dean or other administrator.
i. A conference with the instructor
j. No consequence

EXAMPLE:  A B C D E F G H I J

25. Cheating in required courses.
26. Consciously memorizing a block of items on a test to be included in a "file" for later use by others.
27. Consciously memorizing a block of items on an exam to use later for personal review only.

CLINICAL PRACTICE AREA:
28. Reporting to clinical practice without the assigned preparation, i.e., care plan, reading on diagnosis, medicine cards, etc.
29. Completing your charting on a patient three hours before the end of your shift.
30. Charting treatments that were neither performed nor observed.
31. Including content in a process recording that did not occur.
32. "Borrowing" content from another student's nursing process paper.
33. Charting vital signs not taken or not recalled exactly.
34. Charting medications not given nor seen prepared and given.
35. Getting others to perform your clinical assignments without the instructor's knowledge.
36. Avoiding reporting an error in patient care to the instructor.
37. Attempting to perform a procedure without adequate knowledge of how to do it, and without getting help.
38. Breaking sterile technique and neither reporting it nor replacing the contaminated item(s).
39. Losing, breaking, or damaging patients' property and not reporting it.
40. Avoiding the instructor in order to avoid answering questions about patient care.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP.
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