

379
N81d
NO. 1986

A NOMOTHETIC EXAMINATION OF THE ROLE OF
RELIGIOUS IDEOLOGY IN RELATION TO
ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

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

Charles C. Borsellino, M.S.

Denton, Texas

May, 1983



Borsellino, Charles C., A Nomothetic Examination of the Role of Religious Ideology in Relation to Academic Dishonesty. Doctor of Philosophy (Higher Education), May, 1983, 178 pp., 49 tables, bibliography, 101 titles.

The purposes were (1) to determine student attitudes concerning the cause, frequency, method, and punishment of academically dishonest behavior, (2) to determine current behavioral patterns concerning the origin, method, frequency, and student reactions to academically dishonest behavior, and (3) to determine the role of denominational affiliation, religious participation, satisfaction with religious involvement, and importance of religious development in relationship to the practice of academic dishonesty.

The responses of 1,009 students were analyzed using percentages, means, medians, and standard deviations. The chi square statistical test was used to determine significant correlations and relationships for certain specific research questions.

The following conclusions of this study appear to be warranted.

1. The majority of college students have been academically dishonest at some time.

2. The earlier the first incidence of academic dishonesty (academic level), the more often the student will engage in deceptive practices.

3. The majority of students believe that academic dishonesty is commonplace among their peers.

4. The majority of students refuse to report the academic dishonesty of others.

5. Most students are academically dishonest in order to raise poor grades.

6. The student accomplice is considered equally guilty of academic dishonesty.

7. Standard proctoring of examinations is ineffective in identifying academic dishonesty.

8. Students are lenient in their attitudes toward punishment for academic dishonesty.

9. Academically dishonest students are rarely apprehended, which reinforces this behavior.

10. Although religious affiliation has no significant affect on the practice of academic dishonesty, the remaining religious variables do affect certain attitudes and behaviors toward academic dishonesty.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	v
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	
Purposes of the Study	
Research Questions	
Limitations of the Study	
Definition of Terms	
Background and Significance of the Study	
Outline of the Study	
Chapter Bibliography	
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	17
Introduction	
Degree of Incidence of Academic Dishonesty	
Motivations for Academic Dishonesty	
Morality, Religion, and Academic Dishonesty	
Chapter Bibliography	
III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES	44
Introduction	
The Survey Instrument	
Population of the Study	
Procedures for Collection of Data	
Procedures for the Analysis of Data	
Chapter Bibliography	
IV. PRESENTATION OF DATA	56
Introduction	
Demographic Data	
Religious Data and Attitudes	
Results of the Attitude and Behavior Statements Concerning the Practice of Academic Dishonesty	
Summary of Data Findings	

Chapter	Page
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, INFERENCES, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	139
Introduction	
Summary	
Summary of Data Findings	
Conclusions	
Inferences	
Recommendations for Further Research	
APPENDICES	159
BIBLIOGRAPHY	171

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Demographic Data of the Selected Student Population	57
II. Religious Data and Attitude Statements . . .	60
III. Students Who Have Witnessed Academic Dishonesty While at College	61
IV. Occurrence of Identified Academic Dishonesty	61
V. Students' Perceptions of Causes of Academic Dishonesty	62
VI. Student Reaction to Observed Academic Dishonesty	64
VII. Reasons Given by Students for Not Reporting Academically Dishonesty Behavior	66
VIII. Justification for Personal Academic Dishonesty Subsequent to Identifying Widespread Dishonest Behavior by Classmates	67
IX. Acceptance of Situationally Justified Dishonesty as a Result of Inappropriate Behavior by Professors or Students . . .	68
X. Student Opinions of the Occurrence of Academically Dishonest Behavior by Students	70
XI. Student Identification of Academic Dishonesty: 1981-1982	71
XII. Student Perceptions of Unobserved Academic Dishonesty: 1981-1982	72
XIII. Student Perceptions of Causes of Academic Dishonesty in Relation to Course Grades .	73

Table	Page
XIV. Student Perceptions of Extent of Unrelated Academically Dishonest Behavior	74
XV. Student Perceptions of the Present Occurrence of Dishonesty as Compared to First College Year	75
XVI. Per Cent of Responding Students Who Have Been Academically Dishonest While at College or University	76
XVII. School Level at Which Respondent's First Academically Dishonest Incident Occurred	76
XVIII. Percentage of Responding Students Who Have Been Apprehended as a Result of an Academically Dishonest Incident	77
XIX. Amount of Respondents' Participation in Academically Dishonest Activity: 1981-1982	78
XX. Methods of Academic Dishonesty Used by Respondents in College	78
XXI. Respondents' Most Commonly Used Method of Academic Deception	80
XXII. Respondents' Perceptions of Punishment for Dishonest Complicity	81
XXIII. Student-Recommended Punishment for Selected Methods of Academic Dishonesty	82
XXIV. Total Frequencies of Selected Methods of Academic Dishonesty in Relation to Recommended Punishments	83
XXV. Significant Chi Square Relationship for Academic Level of First Dishonest Incident and Frequency of Academic Dishonesty During 1981-1982 Academic Year	92
XXVI. Summary Table of Chi Square Relationships Concerning Religious Ideology	94

Table	Page
XXVII. Significant Chi Square Relationship for Religious Participation and Response Following the Discovery of an Academically Dishonest Incident	98
XXVIII. Significant Chi Square Relationship for Religious Importance and Response Following the Discovery of an Academically Dishonest Incident	99
XXIX. Significant Chi Square Relationship for Religious Satisfaction and Reason for Not Reporting an Academically Dishonest Incident Was Because Student Was a Friend	101
XXX. Significant Chi Square Relationship for Religious Importance and Reason for Not Reporting an Academically Dishonest Incident Was Because Student Was a Friend	103
XXXI. Significant Chi Square Relationship for Religious Satisfaction and Reason for Not Reporting an Academically Dishonest Incident Because of a Desire to Remain Uninvolved	104
XXXII. Significant Chi Square Relationship for Religious Participation and Personal Participation in Academic Dishonesty Subsequent to Identifying Widespread Dishonesty among Classmates During an Examination	106
XXXIII. Significant Chi Square Relationship for Religious Satisfaction and Personal Participation in Academic Dishonesty Subsequent to Identifying Widespread Dishonesty among Classmates During an Examination	107
XXXIV. Significant Chi Square Relationship for Religious Importance and Personal Participation in Academic Dishonesty Subsequent to Identifying Widespread Dishonesty among Classmates During an Examination	109

Table	Page
XXXV. Significant Chi Square Relationship for Religious Participation and the Practice of Situationally Justified Academic Dishonesty	110
XXXVI. Significant Chi Square Relationship for Religious Satisfaction and the Practice of Situationally Justified Academic Dishonesty	111
XXXVII. Significant Chi Square Relationship for Religious Importance and the Practice of Situationally Justified Academic Dishonesty	113
XXXVIII. Significant Chi Square Relationship for Religious Satisfaction and Participation in Dishonest Academic Activities	114
XXXIX. Significant Chi Square Relationship for Religious Importance and Participation in Dishonest Academic Activities	115
XL. Significant Chi Square Relationship for Religious Participation and Origin of First Academically Dishonest Incident	117
XLI. Significant Chi Square Relationship for Religious Satisfaction and Origin of First Academically Dishonest Incident	118
XLII. Significant Chi Square Relationship for Religious Participation and Degree of Expertise in Academically Dishonest Behavior	119
XLIII. Significant Chi Square Relationship for Religious Importance and Degree of Expertise in Academically Dishonest Behavior	120
XLIV. Significant Chi Square Relationship for Religious Satisfaction and Frequency of Academically Dishonest Behavior During the Past Academic Year (1981-1982)	121

Table	Page
XLV. Significant Chi Square Relationship for Religious Importance and Frequency of Academically Dishonest Behavior During the Past Academic Year (1981-1982) . . .	123
XLVI. Significant Chi Square Relationship for Religious Importance and Most Frequently Used Methods of Academic Dishonesty . . .	124
XLVII. Significant Chi Square Relationship for Religious Importance and Punishment for Those Who Aid or Support the Academically Dishonest Student	126
XLVIII. Significant Chi Square Relationship for Religious Satisfaction and Recommended Punishment for Those Who Turn in Work Completed by Others	128
XLIX. Significant Chi Square Relationship for Religious Importance and Recommended Punishment for Those Who Copied Answers During Test	129

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The subject of academic dishonesty continues to be of concern for students, faculty members, and administrators in higher education. Some instructors feel that they must resort to uncompromising measures in order to ensure that a test or term paper is representative of the true quality and quantity of a student's knowledge (6, p. 418).

Almost all institutions of higher education measure student achievement by a grading system, which proves to be a valuable source of information on students. Grades are an indication for pupils, parents, and professors of a student's progress in comparison to his peers. Because promotion, graduation, and career placement depend on one's grades, the practice of academic dishonesty among students has become commonplace in higher education; investigators indicate that high percentages of students (estimates range from 25 to 50 per cent) use some type of dishonest practice to aid their academic endeavors (10, 15). Bowers (3) shocked the academic community in 1964 by reporting that at least 50 per cent of all undergraduate students participate in some form of academic dishonesty. These and

other landmark studies will be discussed further in Chapter II.

The term academic dishonesty encompasses a multitude of subjective definitions. For the purposes of this study, this term signifies the use of a practice or a behavior that intentionally and deliberately misrepresents a student's true performance or level of achievement. Such behavior includes (but is not necessarily limited to) (a) the use of crib sheets or the unauthorized use of books, notes, or assistance during a test or examination, (b) turning in assignments that are produced in whole or part by other people, (c) knowingly furnishing the university with false information, and (d) plagiarism or copying assignments, tests, or reports.

What factors provoke a student's decision to participate in academically dishonest behavior? Munsinger (17) states that Piaget studied the practice of dishonest behavior and reports that academic dishonesty is a defensive reaction demanded by modern educational practices; Piaget believes that institutions of higher education isolate a student against their natural preferences for peer cooperation and, therefore, demand competition. It is possible that this could be one cause for the high incidence of academic dishonesty on our college and university campuses, but it also may be possible to identify other causes for this ever increasing student behavior.

Many publications address the frequency, methodology, and prevention of academic dishonesty (2, 3, 4, 10, 11, 14, 15, 17, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25). However, little attention has been paid to the role of religious ideology as a determining or influencing factor in the practice of academically dishonest behavior. Various theoretical positions concerning the behavior and personality of the religious participant have been presented by an array of noted psychologists. When Frankl (7) states that religious involvement initiates greater emotional stability, he contradicts Freud (8), who identifies a relationship between religious behavior and individual neurosis. Despite these conflicting positions, it is commonly observed that religious participation will influence and give direction to one's personality growth and behavior (18).

In the cases of those who resort to academic dishonesty, this study will attempt to determine if there are correlations among the various student demographic attributes and if denominational affiliation (religious participation, satisfaction, or importance) plays a role in such decision making. The answers to these questions are crucial to an understanding of student attitudes and behavioral patterns concerning academic dishonesty. Moreover, the answers to these questions may provide greater insight and understanding of today's college student.

Statement of the Problem

The problem with which this study is concerned is academic dishonesty.

Purposes of the Study

Following are the major purposes of this study:

1. To determine student attitudes concerning the cause, frequency, method, and punishment of academically dishonest behavior;
2. To determine current behavioral patterns concerning the origin, method, frequency, and student reactions to academically dishonest behavior;
3. To determine the role of denominational affiliation, religious participation, satisfaction with religious involvement, and importance of religious development as they refer to (a) the practice of academically dishonest behavior; and (b) attitudes toward those participating in academically dishonest behavior.

Research Questions

For the investigation of student attitudes and current behavioral practices in relation to academic dishonesty, the following research questions were formulated. The survey instrument question number(s), which relates to the answer to each research question, is listed in brackets. Research questions one through fourteen relate to the first purpose of the study.

1. How often have students witnessed academically dishonest behavior during the academic year [11, 12, 28]?
2. Why do most students participate in academically dishonest activities at institutions of higher education [13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18]?
3. What is the most common response of students subsequent to identifying or witnessing an academically dishonest incident [19]?
4. What reason is given by students for not reporting an observed incident of academic dishonesty [20, 21, 22, 23, 24]?
5. To what degree do students feel that widespread dishonest activities by fellow classmates justify their equally dishonest behavior [25]?
6. To what degree do students accept situationally justified dishonest activity [26]?
7. What percentage of college students believe that their peers participate in academically dishonest behavior while at college [27]?
8. What percentage of college students believe that their peers have participated in an unobserved form of academic dishonesty [29]?
9. Relative to course grades, why do most students engage in academically dishonest activities [30, 31, 32, 33]?

10. Will the practice of academic dishonesty continue regardless of classroom conditions or academic demands [34]?

11. Do college students believe that the incidence of collegiate academic dishonesty is increasing or decreasing [35]?

12. How successful has the academic faculty been in apprehending students who are involved in academically dishonest behavior [38]?

13. Should the student accomplice be punished for assisting the academically dishonest behavior of another student [42]?

14. What degree of punishment is recommended by students for those participating in (a) the use of crib sheets, (b) plagiarism, (c) submission of work completed by others, (d) answers copied during a test or examination, (e) use of unauthorized books or notes [43, 44, 45, 46, 47]?

Research questions fifteen through twenty relate to the second purpose of the study.

15. What is the occurrence rate of academically dishonest behavior among the surveyed students [36]?

16. Concerning those students who have participated in some form of academic dishonesty, at which school level did their first dishonest incident occur [37]?

17. How frequently do students participate in academically dishonest activities throughout the course of a school year [39]?

18. Is there a correlation between origin (first dishonest incident) and frequency of dishonest behavior at institutions of higher education [37 vs. 39]?

19. What methods of academic dishonesty have been personally used by the surveyed students [40]?

20. What are the most frequently used methods of academically dishonest behavior [41]?

Research question twenty-one relates to the third purpose of the study.

21. The following questions relate to the surveyed students who have common denominational affiliations, participation practices, religious satisfaction responses, and desires for religious development:

a. Will such students demonstrate similar attitudes and behavior by their responses to the academically dishonest behavior of others [9 vs. 19]?

b. Will such students demonstrate similar attitudes and behavior by their reasoning for not reporting an observed academically dishonest incident [9 vs. 20; 9 vs. 21; 9 vs. 22; 9 vs. 23; 9 vs. 24]?

c. Will such students demonstrate similar attitudes and behavior regarding the practice of situationally justified academic dishonesty [9 vs. 25; 9 vs. 26]?

d. Will such students demonstrate similar attitudes and behavior by their personal practices of academically dishonest activity in relation to

- (1) participation [9 vs. 36]?
- (2) origin [9 vs. 37]?
- (3) degree of expertise [9 vs. 38]?
- (4) frequency [9 vs. 39]?

e. Will such students demonstrate similar attitudes and behavior regarding punishment for those who aid or support the academically dishonest student [9 vs. 42]?

f. Will such students demonstrate similar attitudes and behavior regarding recommended punishments for those who are involved in an academically dishonest incident [9 vs. 43; 9 vs. 44; 9 vs. 45; 9 vs. 46; 9 vs. 47]?

Limitations of the Study

Following are the limitations of the study.

1. Since all data will be gathered from the self reports of the subjects, the concept to be measured (honesty) must be assumed and cannot be guaranteed. However, it is recognized that if the concepts of honesty and dishonesty are, in affect, personality characteristics that transcend situational variables, there may be reservations

about the likelihood that students will respond in an honest manner about their dishonest practices.

2. Since local institutional administrators or their subordinates will distribute and collect the questionnaires in uncontrolled circumstances, there is a possibility of unconventional influences that may affect survey results.

3. Since the selected population encompasses a sample drawn from three institutions of higher education, the population is limited by the voluntary return of the questionnaire.

4. Due to the nature of the student bodies at the selected institutions of higher education and the possibility of a disproportionate geographic makeup, a geographic bias may occur if the findings are generalized to a broader spectrum.

Definition of Terms

As they relate to the purposes of this study, the following definitions are provided:

Academic dishonesty is the conduct or practice that intentionally or deliberately deceives or misrepresents a student's true performance or level of achievement. This practice includes activities both inside and outside of the university classroom and encompasses (but is not necessarily limited to) the use of crib notes or the unauthorized use of books, notes, or assistance during a test or examination, knowingly furnishing false information to the university,

turning in assignments that are furnished in whole or part by other persons, copying tests, assignments, or reports, or being in unauthorized places (such as a professor's office or building) after closing without proper permission.

Denominational affiliation refers to selected religious persuasions or sects as recognized and defined by the Handbook of Denominations (16).

Religious participation refers to the willing attendance or involvement in recognized denominational services or organized gatherings for the purpose of worship or religious study and instruction (excluding funerals, weddings, socials, and private devotional activities).

High religious participation refers to the willing practice by individuals of attendance or participation in two-thirds of all recognized denominational services or organized gatherings for the purpose of worship or religious study or instruction (excluding funerals, weddings, socials, and private devotional activities).

Low religious participation refers to the willing practice by individuals of attendance or participation in one-third or less of all recognized denominational services or organized gatherings for the purpose of worship as weddings, socials, and private devotional activities.

Non-religious individuals are those who do not attend church [and who respond accordingly to question 9B of the survey instrument].

Background and Significance of the Study

From his examination of academic dishonesty, Brickman (4, p. 412) states that the existence of such behavior can be traced historically through thousands of years. In ancient China, for example, civil service examinations were given in individual cubicles to prevent examinees from looking at the test papers of others, examinees were searched for notes before they entered their cubicle, and the death penalty was mandated for both examinees and examiners if anyone were found guilty of cheating; yet the practice of deception continued. Brickman (4, p. 415) concludes that the practice of academic dishonesty continues to be a frequent behavior pattern in modern society.

During the last half century, the study of deceptive conduct in academia has repeatedly confirmed the 1928 findings of Hartshorne and May (11), who conclude that virtually every student who participated in their two-year study had been dishonest at some time, particularly in situations where the results of such dishonest behavior appeared self-beneficial, safe, and easy. More recently, Bowers (3) discovered that 50 per cent of the surveyed undergraduates either had cheated on an exam, plagiarized, or turned in a paper that was composed wholly or in part by another student; Zastro (25), provides evidence that 40 per cent of the surveyed graduate students participated in similar dishonest behavior.

From a review of the literature on academic dishonesty, it is apparent that the practice of academic deception has had a prolonged history and that it continues to flourish on the modern university campus. In response to this problem, a great deal of related research has been conducted in the fields of education and psychology. Numerous studies verify that student characteristics are a means of identifying the academic deceiver; the Russell B. Stearns Center (for research and dissemination in social values and behaviors of youth) has compiled an extensive bibliography of over 400 articles on this subject (22). Most of these studies deal with (a) the characteristics of the dishonest student, (b) the situational factors involved in a student's decision to be dishonest, and (c) the rationale for such conduct--the three areas that are vitally important to a determination of why this behavior continues. However, one important student attribute, which is not addressed adequately in the literature, is the role (if any) that is played by religious ideology in the practice of academic dishonesty.

Various theoretical positions have been presented by an array of psychologists concerning the behavior and personality of the religious participator. Such diverse theorists as Allport (1), Frankl (7), and Jung (13) suggest that religious involvement may have a positive effect on the psychological well-being of an individual through the formation of a basis of integration for the different

facets of life, which provides meaning and initiates greater emotional stability. An opposing position is taken by Freud (8), Jones (12), Oates (19), and Reik (20), who identify a relationship between religious behavior and neurosis, and who believe that religious participation, which is interpreted with an obsessive-compulsive paradigm, can be related to a delusional effort of wish-fulfillment. In the light of such contradictory theoretical positions, Gardner and Moriarity (9) note that an individual's religious affiliation and participation affects and may modify one's behavior and personality make-up.

Although the nature and degree of religious beliefs of college students has been the subject of a number of studies, Brown and Lowe (5) conclude there have been few systematic attempts to relate such beliefs to behavior patterns. They also state that such studies have been concerned with the relationships between religious beliefs and such variables as sex of the parent, years of college, and church affiliation.

The need exists to unite the efforts of those in the field of education and psychology. Valid research concerning the practice of academic dishonesty with reference to religious ideology could prove to be significant and useful to the disciplines of education, psychology, and religion. Professionals in the field of education could use such research in identifying and understanding this

deceptive behavior, while the field of psychology would benefit by a degree of insight and understanding of the college student. Finally, such research could provide the religious community with assistance in its attempts to evaluate the efforts of religious involvement and meet the needs of its congregations more effectively.

Outline of the Study

Chapter I introduces the problem, purposes, and research questions of the study; also included are relevant definitions, the limitations, and the background and significance of the study. Chapter II will present a review of relevant literature, and Chapter III will describe the methods and procedures for collection of the data. Chapter IV will present the data findings of the study, and Chapter V will include a summary, the conclusions and implications of the study, and recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Allport, G. W., The Individual and His Religion, New York, MacMillian, 1965.
2. Bonjean, C. M., and R. McGee, "Scholastic Dishonesty among Undergraduates in Differing Systems of Social Control," Sociology of Education, 38 (Winter, 1965), 127-137.
3. Bowers, W. J., Student Dishonesty and Its Control in College, New York, Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University Press, 1964.
4. Brickman, W. W., "Ethics, Examination, and Education," School and Society, 89 (December, 1961), 412-415.
5. Brown, Daniel G., and Warner L. Lowe, "Religious Beliefs and Personality Characteristics of College Students," Journal of Social Psychology, 33 (February, 1951), 103-129.
6. Drake, C. A., "Why Students Cheat," Journal of Higher Education, 12 (November, 1941), 418-420.
7. Frankl, V., Psychotherapy and Existentialism, New York, Washington Square Press, 1969.
8. Freud, S., Future of an Illusion, edited by James Strachey, New York, Liveright, 1953.
9. Gardner, Riley W., and Alice Moriarity, Personality Development and Preadolescence, Seattle, University of Washington Press, 1968.
10. Harp, J., and P. Taietz, "Academic Integrity and Social Structure: A Study of Cheating among College Students," Social Problems, 13, No. 4 (Spring, 1966), 365-373.
11. Hartshorne, H., and M. A. May, Studies in Deceit, New York, MacMillian, 1928.
12. Jones, E., Papers on Psychoanalysis, London, Bailliere, Tindall, and Cox, 1923.

13. Jung, C., Psychology and Religion, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1938.
14. Kanfer, Frederick H., and P. H. Duerfeldt, "Age, Class Standing, and Commitment as Determinates of Cheating in Children," Child Development, 39 (June, 1968), 547.
15. Leveque, Kenneth L., and Ronald E. Walker, "Correlates of High School Cheating Behavior," Psychology in the Schools, 7 (April, 1970), 159.
16. Mead, Frank S., Handbook of Denominations in the United States, New York, Abingdon Press, 1970.
17. Munsinger, H., Fundamentals of Child Development, 2nd ed., New York, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1975.
18. Nash, John, Developmental Psychology, Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, 1970.
19. Oates, W. E., "The Role of Religion on Psychosis," Readings in the Psychology of Religion, edited by O. Strunk, Jr., New York, Abingdon Press, 1959, pp. 235-244.
20. Reik, T., Dogma and Compulsion, Westport, Greenwood, 1951.
21. Schab, F., "Cheating in High Schools: Differences between the Sexes," Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, 33 (Winter, 1969), 39-42.
22. Shurtleff, R. F., Academic Dishonesty: A Bibliography, Boston, Northeastern University Press, 1966.
23. Vitro, F. T., "The Relationship of Classroom Dishonesty to Perceived Parental Discipline," Journal of College Student Personnel, 12 (November, 1971), 427-429.
24. White, W. F., A. W. Zielonka, and Eugene L. Gaier, "Personality Correlates of Cheating among College Women under Stress of Independent Opportunistic Behavior," Journal of Educational Research, 61 (October, 1967), 68-70.
25. Zastro, C. H., "Cheating among College Graduate Students," Journal of Higher Research, 64 (December, 1970), 157-160.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Considerable controversy continues to revolve around the question of just how much academically dishonest behavior takes place at institutions of higher education. Nelson, Grinder, and Mutterer (56) note that the measurement literature contains few statistical verifications of test cheating incidents. In response, Hynges, Givner, and Patil (36) developed a mathematical index for use with multiple-choice tests to determine the probability of academic dishonesty. Chaffin (11) points out that although this index may be appropriate for some cases, it should never be used to verify the suspected dishonesty of a single student, nor should it be used as a screening device to determine whether any academically dishonest activity has taken place. Chaffin concludes that the teacher is "no further ahead" concerning the statistical detection of academic dishonesty (11, p. 778).

Parr (58, p. 320) reports that while some college students contend that practically every member of their class has been dishonest during classroom examinations, many professors naively deny that any behavior of this

kind has ever taken place in their classrooms. While the occurrence rate for such behavior varies, so does the response to academic dishonesty. Drake (18, p. 418) believes that some professors find comfort in the rationalized response that dishonest students cheat only themselves, and these professors are not concerned with underlying motives. There are other professors, however, who view academic dishonesty as evidence of a basic character defect, and yet others who interpret such behavior as a direct affront to themselves. In the latter instance, such professors, who often are martinets during examinations, are constantly on the alert for signs of dishonesty; their behavior often multiplies the students' anxiety level, which has been found to increase the amount of academically dishonest behavior and decrease the true performance of the students (6, p. 128; 70, p. 641). Emphasizing the debilitating effects of the stressful test environment, it has been noted that students who experience high test anxiety may panic or be unable to concentrate and may resort to academic dishonesty because more constructive responses are not available to them at this time (70, p. 657).

A spokesman for the Educational Testing Service, which administers the college board tests, remarks that over the past four years the number of cases of suspected dishonesty has doubled (44, p. 174). A recent report notes that "officials wrestling with what they consider to be heavier-

than-usual outbreaks of collegiate dishonesty admit they are seeing only a fraction of the problem" (75, p. 39). A faculty committee at the University of California reported that cheating in examinations is "rampant" on that campus (52, p. 518), and the same condition is said to exist all over the country (16, p. 6; 55, p. 41). Recently, the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education reported a "significant and apparently increasing amount of cheating" at colleges throughout the nation (44, p. 174).

In response to the problem of academic dishonesty, a great deal of research has been conducted in the fields of education and psychology. In 1966, the Russell B. Sterns Center (for research and dissemination in social values and behaviors of youth) at Northeastern University published an extensive bibliography (66) of over 400 articles on this subject.

Degree of Incidence of Academic Dishonesty

During the last half century, studies of deceptive conduct in academia have repeatedly confirmed the findings of Hartshorne and May (31), who state that nearly everyone (depending on the situation) will practice some sort of dishonest behavior at some time. To combat what has become an academic custom, universities across the nation have formulated various codes of student conduct, and although the codes vary from institution to institution, the issue

of academic dishonesty is recognized and addressed in each code. Disciplinary penalties for such actions have been developed and published. In most cases, a judicial board under the direction of the dean of students has the delegated authority to administer a fair and just disciplinary penalty. Even so, the practice of academic dishonesty continues. A discipline coordinator for one Texas university points out that of approximately 21,000 students enrolled during the 1981 fall semester, only twelve cases of academic dishonesty were reported and pursued; numerically, this trend has remained steady since 1973 (68). Similarly, the Princeton University discipline committee hears only a dozen cases yearly of academic dishonesty, while the 44,000-student University of Texas at Austin reports fewer than 100 cases each year (64). The Texas University administrator observes that "there's probably not an institution in the world where academic dishonesty does not occur. The problem at hand is the question of just how much" (68).

Although many schools have stepped up their efforts to curb academic dishonesty (75, p. 42), cheating on the college campus appears to have achieved a new level of sophistication. Sheils and Fuller state that "cheating scandals frequently involve scores of cooperating students, outright criminal methods, and even fat profits for the masterminds behind the scenes" (65, p. 97). In recent

years, there has been an influx of well organized companies that sell professionally written term papers to college students; one such company is reported to employ 2,000 employees at fifty offices throughout the United States and Canada and to have earned \$1.2 million in gross income during the 1971-72 academic year (14, p. 89). According to an expose of the industry, one term-paper company produced and sold 4,000 original essays in less than seven months (73, p. 67) and has since grown into a nationwide, multimillion-dollar business (14, p. 76). Etzioni emphasizes that "students at every major university in the country have access to at least one commercial firm that offers a variety of writing and research services ranging from term papers on any subject for undergraduates to M.A. theses and Ph.D. dissertations" (20, p. 2). Rosenberg states that "no college community is complete without its term-paper company, and college newspaper who regularly carries ads for their services" (61, p. 134). Pendleton concludes that "dishonesty predominates . . . and honesty may be unrealistic" (59, p. 72).

The question of how often students participate in academically dishonest activities has been debated for many years and still remains undecided. As mentioned previously, in 1928 Hartshorne and May (31, p. 411) determined from testing 11,000 eight to sixteen year old students that nearly everyone will practice some form of dishonest

behavior. They conclude that neither dishonest behavior nor its opposite are unified character traits, but rather they are specific functions of life situations. The authors believe that no one is honest or dishonest by nature, but that one will act dishonestly in any given situation when conflict arises depending not upon one's code of ethics but solely upon the given situation (31, p. 412).

Since this inaugural study, many researchers have attempted to measure academically dishonest behavior at institutions of higher education. In 1936, Parr (58) investigated 409 college students over a two-year period and found that 42 per cent of his sample had participated in an academically dishonest incident during the period of that study. In 1941, Drake (18) reported his findings from an experiment that included 126 members of a private woman's college. Drake found that 24 per cent of his respondents had used some means to inflate their examination scores.

The literature of the last twenty years presents an array of findings. In 1964, Hetherington and Feldman (32) reported a 57 per cent rate of academic dishonesty as a result of their experiments, while in the same year an extensive study (which involved more than 5,000 students at ninety-nine colleges and universities) by Bowers (7) found, similarly, that 50 per cent of the sample either

cheated on an exam, plagiarized, or turned in a paper that was written wholly or in part by another student. The following year, Bonjean and McGee (6) reported on their undergraduate study, that compared two institutions which differed in their methods for controlling academic dishonesty. Whereas one university used an honor system (wherein students were expected to report themselves and each other for violations of student regulations), the other used the proctor system (wherein the student assumed no specific responsibility for the maintenance of appropriate behavior, which was the province of institutional personnel). Although the results indicate that 69 per cent of all students had participated in some form of academic dishonesty, Bowers notes that there were significantly fewer violators under the honor system; only 58 per cent of the honor-system students engaged in any of the dishonest possibilities stated in the experiment, whereas 81 per cent of the proctor-system students did so.

In an experiment reported by Ellenburg (19) in 1973, it was found that 81 per cent of an undergraduate student body had cheated at some time in their studies. In 1970, Zastro (82) found a 40 per cent incidence rate of academic deception among graduate students. Leveque and Walker state that "investigators have indicated that rather high percentages, usually from 25%-50% of grade school pupils,

high school students, college students, and even teachers in the role of students, cheated" (46, p. 159).

In recent years, the academic community has been shocked by what university administrators call this "epidemic" of academic dishonesty (13, p. 29; 72, p. 92). At Lehigh University, a telephone poll revealed that 47 per cent of the respondents made use of some method of academic dishonesty on at least one exam, while at the University of Southern California 40 per cent of its students admitted to plagiarism (13, p. 29). As many as 200 students at the University of Florida were discovered to have purchased final exams for as much as \$200 each (15, p. 73). In 1973, 162 students were given failing grades in a course and another 193 were given grade reductions at the University of Wisconsin in Madison after it was discovered that they had submitted purchased term-papers in the course (37, p. 36). The most damaging blow to academic integrity was uncovered in 1975 at West Point where 152 junior cadets were dismissed for cheating on an electrical engineering exam (4, p. 16). The 180 year old military academy, which relies on a strict honor code (22, p. 29), had been marred previously by student dishonesty; in 1951, 90 cadets were expelled for various violations of the honor code, while in 1973, 21 cadets were dismissed for academic dishonesty (37, p. 36). Although the Air Force and Naval Academies differ from West Point concerning their proctoring methods, the

records show that 109 Air Force cadets were dismissed in 1965; 46 cadets were expelled in 1967 for exchanging test questions; 39 cadets were forced to resign in 1972 after violations of the proctoring system were discovered; 7 naval midshipmen were dismissed in 1974 and 13 others put on probation for academic dishonesty; 6 United States Coast Guard students were dismissed and ordered to leave the Guard for academic violations (37, p. 36; 78, p. 29). Officials note that despite widespread changes in army discipline in recent years, West Point's honor system will continue to be rigorously enforced (77, p. 39). Ellensburg cites Trabue who states "that cheating definitely continues to make a significant contribution to the test scores of students at all educational levels . . ." (19, p. 427).

Although the practice of academic dishonesty is not limited to higher education, the incidence rate for high school students compared to college students is alarming. As cited by Martin (50, p. 621), Graham found that the number of students who knowingly participate in some form of academic dishonesty runs as high as 78 per cent at the upper-elementary level, 85 per cent at the secondary school level, and over 50 per cent at the college level. However, a 1966 American Council on Education survey of over 250,000 entering freshmen at 306 institutions reveals that only 20 per cent of the students admitted to having "cribbed on an examination" during the previous year (2, p. 28).

Student Characteristics that Affect Academic Dishonesty

Smith, Ryan, and Diggins (70) surveyed a number of undergraduate students in 1972 and discovered that 97 per cent of the men and 91 per cent of the women surveyed admitted having "cheated on an examination" while in college; in addition, 70 per cent of the males and 63 per cent of the females surveyed admitted that they had cheated on at least one exam in either the current or preceding semester.

Although it is interesting that sex is cited as an important and usually significant variable (7, 62, 70) with males showing a greater tendency to cheat than females, one must be cautious in accepting sex differences based on self-report. In a behavioral study of the effectiveness of an honor system, Canning (10) found that females lie more about their academically dishonest behavior than males. Jacobson, Breger, and Millham (38) report that, under temptation, female college students are more likely to be academically dishonest than males.

Numerous studies attempt to verify student characteristics as a means of identifying the academic deceiver. While controlling other variables, a number of researchers found that fraternity or sorority membership is the most common characteristic of academically dishonest students (6, 7, 18, 26, 29, 32, 58). After-the-fact explanations

invariably emphasize the anti-intellectual theme within the fraternity-sorority system (29, p. 365). The pervasive influence of fraternities on the total environment of the university is described by Bowers (7, pp. 109-110), who notes that the more closely students are associated with a fraternity or sorority, the more likely they are to cheat. Furthermore, Bowers discovered that this principle extends to institutions; the students who attend institutions of higher education that have no fraternities or sororities are less prone to cheat than students who do not belong, yet who attend schools that allow Greek organizations.

The literature also reveals a correlation between frequency of academic dishonesty and academic ability (9, 18, 31, 32, 34, 43, 58). To test this correlation, Bowers treated grades as an indicator of ability and found that "the proportion of cheating behavior steadily increased as academic standing decreased" (7, p. 73). As overwhelming as the evidence may be, Yepsen (81, p. 682), who conducted many experiments concerning this issue, correlated intelligence with academically dishonest behavior and found that of the 34 per cent of the students who had cheated, 67 per cent had intelligence test scores above the mean for the test group. Furthermore, Woods (80) was unable to demonstrate any significant relationship between academic achievement and academic dishonesty; a 1973 report (35,

p. 107) points out that academically high achieving students are as dishonest (if not more so) as low achieving students.

As reported by Kleiman (44, p. 196), some clarity is offered by Schab on this issue. Schab compared his experimental results with those from a study that he had conducted ten years previously; he found that although the rate of academic dishonesty has doubled among the best students, poor students were still more likely to cheat.

Taking into consideration intellectual ability and academic grades, Bowers (7) found that as time spent on studies decreases, academically dishonest behavior increases; the amount of study time, therefore, may be treated as an index of a student's commitment to academic pursuits. In addition, the researcher tested items concerning the degree of efficiency in study habits and found that these also affect cheating behavior. Bowers concludes that "the largest concentration of cheaters is to be found among those who treat their student role most lightly; those who study neither long nor efficiently" (7, p. 81).

Other studies identify other student characteristics in an attempt to identify the academically dishonest student. For example, in comparison to their non-deceptive peers, academically dishonest students tend to be more occupationally oriented and socially minded (7, 29), have low self-expectations (7), be more tense, irritable, and

anxious (79), be chronologically older (58), and attend a school that is not in their home state (58).

Bonjean and McGee (6, p. 134) profile the student who participates in academically dishonest behavior as a male upper-level classmember, whose home is in an urban area, and who had a grade-point-average below C. Hetherington and Feldman (32, pp. 214-215) cite research that identifies first born children (47), low achievers (31), neurotic and dependent students (9), those who display little conscious guilt (48), and those who exert little effort (3) as characteristics of the academic deceiver. Furthermore, the results of a study by Smith, Ryan, and Diggins (70, pp. 651-654) indicate that the college student who is most likely to cheat is a male who has weak achievement motivation, strong test anxiety, few moral scruples about academic dishonesty, is unprepared for exams, perceives other students as strongly competitive, and plans to go to graduate school.

In contrast, Johnson and Gormly (41) found that academic dishonesty may in fact be related to high achieving students. A test described as predictive of officer success was administered to advanced Navy Reserve Officer Training Corps students. Those students who planned to become career officers (who could have been assumed to place a higher value on the results of the test) were more academically dishonest than those students who did not have

officer aspirations. After further research and experimentation, the same authors (40) found locus of control, as a personality variable, to be correlated with academic dishonesty. Their findings suggest that those students who can be identified as having an external control (event outcomes are contingent upon forces beyond control, such as fate or chance) are much more academically dishonest than those students who have an internal control belief system (event outcomes are contingent upon one's ability or effort). Srull and Karabenick's (71) study produced similar findings; their findings indicate that students who display a consistent belief in an internal system of control are less likely to participate in academically dishonest activities.

Motivations for Academic Dishonesty

Although various motives may contribute to the students' decision to participate in academically dishonest behavior, Smith, Ryan, and Diggins (70, p. 641) believe that two particular achievement-related motives are usually aroused--the motive to achieve and the motive to avoid failure. Prior research yields noteworthy relationships between these motives and the practice of academic dishonesty. Mischel and Gilligan (53) found that the higher the students' level of achievement motivation, the more likely they are to become academically deceptive

if academically dishonest behavior is the only means to obtain their objective. In contrast, Schwartz and others (63, p. 54) state that academically dishonest behavior should deprive a student of a sense of personal accomplishment, and therefore, that students who have high personal motivation are less likely to cheat; however, their research results provide only weak support for this hypothesis.

With reference to the motive to avoid failure, Gulligan (27) states that as the fear of failure increases, test anxiety also increases, and test anxiety was found to be positively related to academic dishonesty. Shelton and Hill (66) found that there is a positive relationship between debilitating test anxiety and dishonest behavior, and the relationship is stronger when knowledge of peer reference group performance is available to students. Correspondingly, Smith, Ryan, and Diggins (70) found that as test anxiety increases, the amount of dishonest behavior also increases along with the amount of risk detection a student is willing to assume. Smith, Ryan, and Diggins (70, p. 653) contend that the most common motives for participating in academically dishonest behavior include improving low grades, competition among peers, and pressure for entrance to graduate school; deterrents include loss of self-esteem, violation of a personal moral code of ethics, and experiencing of long-term guilt feelings.

Morality, Religion, and Academic Dishonesty

Many studies have been initiated to determine the roles of situational factors and student characteristics as identifiers of individuals involved in academically dishonest behavior. While Hartshorne and May (31) argue that academic dishonesty is not a character trait that transcends situations, and that an individual's moral behavior cannot be predicted from another behavioral event unless identical elements exist in the situations, Kohlberg (45) contends that academically dishonest behavior is the result of immature moral development. Kohlberg refers to a study which indicates that yielding to temptation in an experimental cheating situation is associated with an individual of low moral insight. Harris, Mussen, and Rutherford (30), found a positive relationship between moral reasoning and academic honesty among students (even when intelligence was partialled out). Similarly, while studying college male freshmen, Schwartz and others (63) found that academically dishonest students tend to be lower in moral insight. Malinowski (49), found that subjects who are low in moral judgment are more likely to and do cheat more often than those who are high in moral judgment. These results are consistent with previous research in which inverse relationships are reported between Kohlberg's (45) measure of moral

reasoning and dishonesty, and they provide further support for Kohlberg's theory of morality.

This literature review reveals that most studies which have been conducted on academic dishonesty are of an experimental-psychological nature (33, 40, 66) and have dealt with such issues as student characteristics, environmental variables, social experiences, and the development of moral judgment. While the research is limited, some investigators have attempted to determine the behavioral correlates of religious ideology.

Various theoretical positions that concern the behavior and personality of the religious participator are taken by an array of psychologists. Such diverse theorists as Allport (1), Frankl (23), and Jung (42), suggest that religious involvement may have a positive effect on the psychological well-being of an individual by forming a basis of integration for the different facets of life, which provides meaning and initiates greater emotional stability. An opposing position is proposed by Freud (24), Jones (39), Oates (57), and Reik (60) who identify a relationship between religious behavior and neurosis, stating that religious participation (interpreted within an obsessive-compulsive paradigm) can be related to a delusional effort of wish fulfillment. Despite these conflicting positions, Nash (54, pp. 430-434) remarks that it is commonly observed that religious participation will influence and give

direction to one's personality growth and behavior, and Gardner and Moriarty (25, pp. 208-209) note that an individual's religious affiliation and participation affects, and may modify, one's behavior and personality make-up. In addition, McCandless and Evans report the influence of religious affiliation and moral behavior (51, p. 280) as well as the general association between religious development and behavior (51, pp. 37-38).

While the nature and degree of religious beliefs of college students has been the subject of a number of studies, Brown and Lowe (8) conclude that there have been few systematic attempts to relate such beliefs to behavior patterns; most studies have been concerned with the relationship between religious beliefs and such variables as sex, years of college, and church affiliation. There are, however, researchers who have investigated the specific attributes of the religiously active student. Barton and Vaughn (5), Eysenck (21), and Hamby (28) indicate that actively religious students tend to be conservative and have higher ethical standards, while their non-religious counterparts are more dominant, self-assertive, and suspicious in nature. Students who participate in religious activities have been found to be more emotional, tense, and insecure (8, 69); however, Wiebe (76) found that in comparison to their religious peers, the non-religious student is more flexible, self-reliant, innovative,

and free-thinking. Although Wiebe discovered that the religious participator has a greater concern for moral and ethical standards, his findings fail to demonstrate behavior that reflects this attribute. To further complicate the issue, Brown and Lowe (8), found that the religious participator is intellectually inferior, which, therefore, may increase the need for and possibility of academically dishonest behavior.

Following an extensive review of the literature, only three studies were discovered that deal specifically with academic dishonesty and religious ideology. The initial child study of Hartshorne and May (31) in 1928 revealed that of the three main religious groups, Catholics, Jews, and Protestants, there are no general differences which are not attributable to differences in intelligence or social level. These researchers also found that there is no relationship between church attendance and deception; they note that children who attend church regularly cheat about the same as those who rarely or never attend. Recent studies concerning college students are contradictory and inconclusive. Hetherington and Feldman (32) found that academic deceivers have a significantly higher frequency of church attendance, but Bonjean and McGee (6) found that religiously active students participate in academically dishonest behavior significantly less than students who are

inactive or moderately active in religious organizations, meetings, or activities.

In view of the inconsistent findings, the need exists to unite the efforts of those in the fields of education, psychology, and religion to determine the role of religious ideology in relation to the practice of academic dishonesty in higher education. Chandler (12) states that religious commitment, more than any other factor, has an overwhelming impact on nearly every major aspect of American life. The study, involving 3,780 people, goes on to note that a person's religious orientation is far more accurate as a predictor of attitudes and behavior than race, sex, age, income, education, occupation, or political persuasion. Due to this finding, valid research will prove to be significant and useful to each of these fields of study. Professionals in the field of education could use such research to help identify and understand deceptive behavior, while the field of psychology may benefit by gaining insight into its dealings with college students. Finally, such research could provide assistance to the religious community in its attempts to evaluate religious programs and meet the needs of its congregation more effectively.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Allport, G. W., The Individual and His Religion, New York, MacMillian, 1956.
2. Astin, A. W., R. J. Panos, and S. A. Creagor, National Norms for Entering College Freshmen, Fall 1966, research projects report, Washington, American Council on Education, 1967.
3. Atkins, B. E., and R. E. Atkins, "A Study of the Honesty of Prospective Teachers," Elementary School Journal, 36 (April, 1936), 595-603.
4. "A Barrage Hits West Point's Code," Time, 108 (December 27, 1976), 16.
5. Barton, K., and G. Vaughan, "Church Membership and Personality," Social Behavior and Personality, 4 (1976), 11-16.
6. Bonjean, C. M., and R. McGee, "Scholastic Dishonesty among Undergraduates in Different Systems of Social Control," Sociology of Education, 38 (Winter, 1965), 127-137.
7. Bowers, W. J., Student Dishonesty and Its Control in College, New York, Bureau of Applied Research, Columbia University Press, 1964.
8. Brown, D. G., and W. L. Lowe, "Religious Beliefs and Personality Characteristics of College Students," The Journal of Social Psychology, 33 (February, 1951), 103-129.
9. Campbell, W. G., "Measurement in Determining the Personality and Behavior of the College Cribber," Education, 53 (January, 1933), 403-408.
10. Canning, R. W., "Does an Honor System Reduce Classroom Cheating? An Experimental Answer," Journal of Experimental Education, 24 (June, 1956), 292-296.
11. Chaffin, W. W., "Dangers in Using the Z Index for Detection of Cheating on Tests," Psychological Reports, 45 (December, 1979), 776-778.

12. Chandler, Russell, "Survey Shows Impact of Religious Beliefs in America," Dallas Times Herald, May 9, 1981, F4.
13. "Cheating in Colleges," Time, 107 (June 7, 1976), 29-30.
14. "Cheating, Inc.," Newsweek, 79 (March 20, 1972), 89.
15. "Cheating in Florida," Time, 105 (March 10, 1975), 73.
16. "Cheating in Schools," New Statesman, 98 (July 6, 1979), 6.
17. "Crackdown on Fakes," Time, 99 (March 27, 1972), 76.
18. Drake, C. A., "Why Students Cheat," Journal of Higher Education, 12 (November, 1941), 418-420.
19. Ellenberg, F. C., "Cheating on Tests: Are High Achievers Greater Offenders than Low Achievers?" The Clearing House, March, 1973, 427-429.
20. Etzioni, A., "Paper Mills," Science, 192 (April 23, 1976), 2.
21. Eysenck, H. J., The Structure of Human Personality, London, Methuen, 1970.
22. Fraker, Susan, and Eric Gelman, "A Point of Honor," Newsweek, 87 (May 24, 1976), 29.
23. Frankl, S., Psychotherapy and Existentialism, New York, Washington Square Press, 1967.
24. Freud, S., Future of an Illusion, New York, Liveright, 1953.
25. Gardner, Riley W., and Alice Moriarity, Personality Development at Preadolescence, Seattle and London, University of Washington Press, 1968.
26. Goldsen, R. M. Rosenberg, R. Williams, and E. Suchman, What College Students Think, Princeton, D. Van Nostrand, 1960.
27. Gulligan, C. F., "Responses to Temptation: An Analysis of Motives," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, Boston, Massachusetts, 1963.

28. Hamby, J., "Some Personality Correlates of Religious Orientation," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee, 1973.
29. Harp, J., and P. Taietz, "Academic Integrity and Social Structure: A Study of Cheating among College Students," Social Problems, 13 (Spring, 1966), 365-373.
30. Harris, S., P. Mussen, and E. Rutherford, "Some Cognitive, Behavioral, and Personality Correlates of Maturity and Moral Judgement," The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 128 (March, 1976), 123-135.
31. Hartshorne, H., and M. A. May, Studies in Deceit, New York, MacMillian, 1928.
32. Hetherington, E. M., and S. E. Feldman, "College Cheating as a Function of Subject and Situational Variables," Journal of Educational Psychology, 55 (August, 1964), 212-218.
33. Hill, John, and Roy Kochendorfer, "Knowledge of Peer Success and Risk Detection as Determinants of Cheating," Developmental Psychology, 1 (May, 1969), 231-238.
34. Howells, T. H., "Factors Influencing Honesty," Journal of Social Psychology, 9 (February, 1938), 97-102.
35. Humes, I., "Cheating," Harper's, 247 (September, 1973), 107.
36. Hynes, K., N. Givner, and K. Patil, "Detection of Test Cheating Behavior," Psychological Reports, 42 (June, 1978), 1070.
37. "It's Not Only West Point that Has Cheating Problems," U. S. News and World Report, 80 (June 14, 1976), 35-36.
38. Jacobson, L. I., S. E. Berger, and J. Millham, "Individual Differences in Cheating during a Temptation Period when Confronting Failure," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 15 (May, 1970), 48-56.
39. Jones, E., Papers on Psychoanalysis, London, Bailliere, Tindell, and Cox, 1923.

40. Johnson, C. D., and J. Gormly, "Academic Cheating: The Contribution of Sex, Personality, and Situational Variables," Developmental Psychology, 6 (March, 1972), 320-325.
41. _____, "Achievement, Sociability, and Task Importance in Relation to Academic Cheating," Psychological Reports, 28 (February, 1971), 302.
42. Jung, Carl, Psychology and Religion, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1938.
43. Kanfer, F. H., and P. H. Duerfeldt, "Age, Class Standing, and Commitment as Determinates of Cheating in Children," Child Development, 39 (June, 1968), 547.
44. Kleiman, Dena, "Cheating," Seventeen, 40 (April, 1981), 174-175.
45. Kohlberg, L., "Moral Development and Identification," Child Psychology, edited by H. W. Severson, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1963, 212-218.
46. Leveque, K. L., and R. E. Walker, "Correlates of High School Cheating Behavior," Psychology in the Schools, 7 (April, 1970), 159.
47. Levy, D. M., Material Overprotection, New York, Columbia University Press, 1943.
48. MacKinnon, D. W., "Violation of Prohibitions," Explorations in Personality, edited by H. A. Murray, New York, Oxford University Press, 1938, pp. 491-501.
49. Malinowski, C. I., "Cheating as a Function of Moral Judgement and Selected Personality and Situational Factors," unpublished doctoral dissertation, City University of New York, New York, New York, 1979.
50. Martin, R. G., "Plagiarism and Originality: Some Remedies," English Journal, 60 (May, 1971), 621-625.
51. McCandless, Boyd R., and Ellis O. Evans, Children and Youth: Psychosocial Development, Hinsdale, The Dryden Press, 1973.
52. McCarthy, Abigail, "The Walker Makes the Road," Commonweal, 100 (September 27, 1974), 518.

53. Mischel, W., and C. Gilligan, "Delay of Gratification for the Prohibited Gratification and Responses to Temptation," Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 69 (October, 1964), 411-417.
54. Nash, John, Developmental Psychology, Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.
55. Nassivera, Joan, "The Race for Grades," Seventeen, 34 (May, 1975), 41.
56. Nelson, E. A., R. E. Grinder, and M. L. Mutterer, "Sources of Variance in Behavioral Measures of Honesty in Temptation Situations: Methodological Analyses," Developmental Psychology, 1 (May, 1969), 265-279.
57. Oates, W. E., "The Role of Religion on Psychosis," Readings in the Psychology of Religion, edited by O. Strunk, Jr., New York, Abingdon Press, 1959, pp. 235-244.
58. Parr, F. W., "The Problem of Student Honesty," Journal of Higher Education, 7 (June, 1936), 318-326.
59. Pendleton, James D., "Education for Honesty?" Today's Education, 64 (April, 1975), 72.
60. Reik, T., Dogma and Compulsion, Westport, Greenwood, 1951.
61. Rosenberg, Philip, "Why Johnny Can't Flunk," Esquire, 79 (April, 1973), 134-137.
62. Roskens, R. W., and H. F. Dizney, "A Study of Unethical Academic Behavior in High School and College," Journal of Educational Research, 59 (January, 1966), 231-234.
63. Schwartz, S. H., K. A. Feldman, M. E. Brown, and A. Heingartner, "Some Personality Correlates of Conduct in Two Situations of Moral Conflict," Journal of Personality, 37 (March, 1966), 41-57.
64. Sewall, G., S. Drake, and D. L. Elliott, "An Epidemic of Cheating," Newsweek, 95 (May 26, 1980), 63.
65. Sheils, M., and T. Fuller, "The Cheaters," Newsweek, 85 (April 21, 1975), 97.

66. Shelton, J., and J. P. Hill, "Effects of Cheating on Achievement, Anxiety, and Knowledge of Peer Performance," Developmental Psychology, 1 (September, 1969), 449-455.
67. Shurtleff, R. F., Academic Dishonesty: A Bibliography, Boston, Northeastern University Press, 1966.
68. Simmons, Don, "Punishment Varies for Cheaters," The Shorthorn, University of Texas at Arlington, April 29, 1982.
69. Slater, E., "Neurosis and Religious Affiliation," Journal of Mental Science, 93 (October, 1947), 392-398.
70. Smith, Charles, Edward Ryan, and Dean Diggins, "Moral Decision-Making: Cheating on Examinations," Journal of Personality, 40 (December, 1972), 640-660.
71. Srull, T. K., and S. A. Karabenick, "Effects of Personality, Situation, Locus of Control Congruence," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32 (October, 1975), 617-628.
72. Stone, Marvin, "The Crime of Cheating," U. S. News and World Report, 83 (September 19, 1977), 92.
73. "Term Paper Hustlers," Time, 97 (April 19, 1971), 67.
74. Vitro, F. T., "The Relationship of Classroom Dishonesty to Perceived Parental Discipline," Journal of College Student Personnel, 12 (November, 1971), 427-429.
75. Wellborn, Stanley N., "Cheating in College Becomes an Epidemic," U. S. News and World Report, 89 (October 20, 1980), 39.
76. Wiebe, K. F., "Personality Correlates of Intrinsic, Extrinsic, and Non-Religious Orientations," unpublished paper, meeting of the Western Psychological Association, San Diego, California, April, 1979.
77. "West Point's Tom Browns," The Economist, 259 (May 22, 1976), 39.
78. "What Price Honor," Time, 107 (June 7, 1976), 18-29.

79. White, W. F., A. W. Zielonka, and E. L. Gaier, "Personality Correlates of Cheating among College Women under Stress of Independent Opportunistic Behavior," Journal of Educational Research, 61 (October, 1967), 68-70.
80. Woods, R. C., "Factors Affecting Cheating and Their Control," Proceedings of the West Virginia Academy of Science, 29 (June, 1957), 79-82.
81. Yepsen, L. N., "An Experimental Study of Intellectual Honesty," School and Society, 29 (May 25, 1929), 681-682.
82. Zastro, C. H., "Cheating among College Graduate Students," Journal of Educational Research, 64 (December, 1970), 157-160.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

In order to fulfill the stated purposes of this study and to answer the related research questions that were presented in Chapter I, the dissemination of a survey instrument among the population of the study was determined to be the most effective data-gathering technique. A format for the survey instrument was developed with the advice and guidance of members of the research committee following an in-depth study of related professional literature and unpublished research.

The Survey Instrument

The Academic Dishonesty Attitude and Behavior Survey (see Appendices) is a forty-seven item instrument that was designed specifically for this study by the researcher. The items were worded so as to elicit the specific information that was required to answer the research questions.

The survey instrument is composed of two sections. Section I contains the following:

1. Seven multiple-choice questions (items 1 through 7) were included to gather demographic data on sex (gender), marital status, academic classification, present

grade point average, race, field of study, and fraternity or sorority membership;

2. Two general questions (items 8 and 10) deal with political and family attitudes. These survey items were included to disguise the problem under study and to avoid the possibility of survey sabotage. These data were not tabulated and are not included in either the presentation of data or summary sections of this study;

3. Four multiple choice questions (item 9) gather data concerning religious background and attitudes in the areas of religious denomination, religious participation (as measured by average church attendance), degree of religious satisfaction, and importance of religious or spiritual development. The stated religious denominations were selected because they numerically represent the largest denominational affiliations in Dallas, Denton, and Tarrant counties according to Churches and Church Membership in the United States (4). Other than selected demographic variables, these four questions constitute the independent variable (religious ideology) that is presumed to cause variations in the dependent variable (attitudes and behavioral patterns concerning academic dishonesty).

Section II of the survey instrument consists of thirty-seven multiple choice questions that are designed to gather student responses concerning academic dishonesty in regard

to frequency, cause, student response, origin, methodology, and punishment. Subjects were instructed to rate the attitude statements on a one-to-five point Likert-type scale in which SA = Strongly Agree (1), A = Agree (2), U = Uncertain (3), D = Disagree (4), and SD = Strongly Disagree (5). The Likert scale is designed to provide precise information about a subject's degree of concern or agreement with a particular item (1, 5). Oppenheim (5) believes that the Likert scale performs well when it pertains to a reliable, rough ordering of people with regard to a particular attitude statement.

To determine face validity, a pilot study was conducted in March, 1982, with twenty-four residence hall students at Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Texas. The pilot study was designed to provide information about the survey instrument in regard to appearance, clarity of instructions, format, legibility of the questions, appropriateness of questions or responses, and length of time required to complete the survey. The pilot subjects were asked to write their opinions on these areas on the back of the questionnaires. Seventeen of the twenty-four pilot questionnaires were returned for a 71 per cent response rate.

After examining the responses and suggestions made by the pilot subjects, it was determined that the survey required an average of eighteen minutes to complete. The respondents also provided valuable information that led to

clearer instructions concerning the return and collection of the survey instrument.

Population of the Study

The population for the study consists of a selection of students from North Texas State University, Denton, Texas, Texas Wesleyan College, Fort Worth, Texas, and the University of Texas at Arlington, Arlington, Texas. The selected sample includes students who attend both public and private institutions, inhabit both residence halls and campus apartment facilities, and are both members and non-members of panhellenic organizations. This sample appears to be representative of all students who occupy university-approved housing facilities.

The population of students who reside in institutionally recognized living environments was selected in the following manner:

At North Texas State University, a stratified random sample of students was generated by the housing department that consists of 25 per cent of each residence hall. Approximately 3,200 students inhabit 8 on-campus residence hall facilities; for each facility, the population ranges from 150 to 980 students.

At Texas Wesleyan College, due to the limited number of students who reside on campus, this sample consists of

all students who live in each of the 3 residence halls, where populations range from 83 to 122 students.

At the University of Texas at Arlington, a random selection of students was generated by the housing department that consists of 25 per cent of those students who reside in 4 residence halls, plus 25 per cent of those students who live in the 12 apartment units. In addition, the panhellenic office randomly selected 25 per cent of those students who are affiliated with or reside in fraternity or sorority living environments.

The total number of students who participated in this study is 1,540. Of this number, 1,009 students returned complete and usable surveys (on which the data analyses is based).

Procedures for the Collection of Data

The Academic Dishonesty Attitude and Behavior Survey was used to gather the data required to answer the research questions of the study. During the Spring Semester, 1982, the survey was delivered to the research coordinators and residence hall directors at each of the three institutions for distribution to the identified population. A 60 per cent return rate was established as the minimum limit for this study; 69 per cent of the questionnaires were returned.

The data were collected with the cooperation of the following institutional members:

1. Residence hall directors, who are individuals responsible for managing a residence hall, distributed the survey to their respective residence hall assistants;

2. Resident assistants, who are individuals responsible for managing a floor in a residence hall, distributed and collected the completed surveys from the selected residence hall students on their floors;

3. Research coordinators, who are the individuals responsible for managing and coordinating all fraternity and sorority functions, supervised the distribution and collection of the surveys by the research assistants;

4. Research assistants, who are fraternity or sorority officers or leaders, distributed and collected the completed surveys from each selected fraternity or sorority member.

Following is the sequential design that was used in the distribution and collection of data:

1. Initial contact was made with each of the appropriate institutional administrators to discuss the importance and need for such research. After explaining the procedures for student selection and survey distribution and collection, a date was set for presentation of this information to the individual research coordinators and residence hall directors;

2. A visit was made to each of the selected schools in the spring of 1982 to present the pertinent information

to the research coordinators and residence hall directors at selected staff and panhellenic council meetings; each was given a survey instrument;

3. During the same month, individual residence hall staff meetings and fraternity or sorority council meetings were attended in order to present the survey instrument to the individual research and resident assistants who would be responsible for the distribution and collection of the surveys. At this time, the housing offices at North Texas State University, the University of Texas at Arlington, and Texas Wesleyan College generated the sample populations by producing (a) a grand master list of the total sample population, (b) a student master list for each residence hall director, and (c) a student submaster list for each resident assistant; this allowed for documentation of number and percentage of surveys returned. Uniform procedures (see Appendices) for the distribution and collection of the surveys were distributed to each research and resident assistant;

4. The resident and research assistants were asked (a) to distribute the survey to each student (on their floors or in their Greek organizations) who had been selected to participate in this study and (b) to follow carefully the uniform procedures established for this study. The resident and research assistants were instructed to encourage the participating students to complete the survey

in privacy in an attempt to elicit honest responses to the questionnaire. [Although over- and under-reporting of true academically dishonest practices may occur, previous research suggests that the self-report method of gathering data is relatively efficient and usually an accurate recording of deviance (5)]. The resident and research assistants distributed, collected, and documented the returned survey instruments from their respective floors or panhellenic organizations within five days of the survey distribution. The completed surveys and documented sub-master student lists were returned either to the residence hall director or research coordinator;

5. The residence hall directors and research coordinators reported the number and percentage of surveys returned from their respective sample populations; these were collected by the researcher.

In order to achieve the minimum rate of return for survey instruments, two follow-up contacts were designed:

1. Each director of housing was contacted by phone one week following the initial distribution of the survey instruments. The director of housing was requested to contact all residence hall directors or research coordinators to ask them to contact their resident and research assistants and request their follow-up on students who had not completed or returned the questionnaire in an effort to increase the survey return rate;

2. The second follow-up, approximately two weeks after the first, was made by the researcher to those residence hall staffs or Greek organizations from which the survey return rate was below the required 60 per cent. Problems were discussed, additional surveys were made available, and the importance of the collection of the survey instruments was emphasized.

When all questionnaires had been collected, each was carefully examined; a questionnaire was judged unusable and discarded if it was evident that the directions for completing the questionnaire had not been followed, if more than one response was given to any item of the questionnaire (except question 40), or if the questionnaire was not completed. The overall usable return rate was 66 per cent. The questionnaire return rates for each of the selected institutions are presented in Table I, Chapter IV.

Procedures for the Analysis of Data

As usable questionnaires were received, the data were key punched on computer cards for automatic data processing. Percentages were determined to describe the sample population and to demonstrate the relationship of each item as a selected response to a particular question, attitude, or behavior statement. For the purposes of this study, four demographic variables concerning student religious attitudes were treated as the independent variables (seven

demographic variables were used to describe the population sample), while the thirty-seven attitude and behavior responses were treated as the dependent variables, as follows:

1. Survey items 1 through 7, which gathered selected demographic data, and survey items 9A, B, C, and D, which referred to selected religious data concerning the student sample, were subjected to statistical procedures that included (a) the frequency and percentage of responses were calculated for each item, (b) mean scores were calculated for each item, and (c) median scores were calculated for each item;

2. In order to obtain answers to the research questions that deal with the first purpose of the study (student attitudes concerning academic dishonesty), (a) the frequency and percentage of responses were calculated for each of the multiple choice items, (b) the mean and median scores were calculated for the multiple choice items, (c) the frequency and percentage of responses were calculated for the Likert-scaled items, (d) mean scores were calculated for the degree of agreement reported for the Likert-scaled items, and (3) standard deviation scores were calculated from the means for the Likert-scaled items;

3. In order to obtain answers to the research questions that deal with the second purpose of the study (current behavioral practices concerning academically

dishonest activities), the data were treated in the same statistical ways as for student attitudes toward academic dishonesty;

4. Answers were obtained to the research questions that pertain to the third purpose of the study (correlation of religious ideology with student attitudes and behavior in regard to academic dishonesty) by the application of chi square contingency coefficient with a .05 minimum level of significance. This statistical treatment was used because it is considered uniquely useful when at least one category of data is of nominal level, when no underlying continuity between categories of data is assumed, and when no assumptions about the shape of the population are made (2, 3, 6).

Statistical presentations of chi square relationships in Chapter IV are Tables XXV and XXVII through XLIX. One can determine the direction of this relationship by comparing each cell column percentage with the corresponding total row percentage, which will indicate cells of greater than expected cell frequencies. By highlighting each cell that displays a cell column percentage greater than the total row percentage, a direction of the relationship can be identified.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Anastasi, A., Psychological Testing, Toronto, MacMillian Co., 1970.
2. Garrett, H. E., Statistics in Psychology and Education, New York, David McKay Co., 1966.
3. Leonard, W. M., Basic Social Statistics, New York, West Publishing Co., 1976.
4. National Council of Churches, Churches and Church Membership in the United States, New York, National Council of Churches, 1970.
5. Oppenheim, A., Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement, New York, Basic Books, Inc., 1966.
6. Roscoe, John T., Fundamental Research Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences, New York, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1969.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF THE DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to survey and describe student attitudes and behavioral patterns concerning academic dishonesty. In addition, the survey was designed to demonstrate the role of religious ideology as a selected variable that may affect the practice of academic dishonesty. Data were gathered from survey instruments returned by 1,009 college and university students who were enrolled during the 1981-1982 Spring Semester.

Results were received from North Texas State University (N = 519 of 812), Texas Wesleyan College (N = 163 of 297), and the University of Texas at Arlington (N = 327 of 431). The percentage of usable surveys received was 65.5 per cent (N = 1,009 of 1,540). The presentation of data is organized by demographic data, religious data and attitude responses, results of each of the thirty-seven attitude and behavior items, and data findings in relation to the research questions.

Demographic Data

A demographic profile of the subjects is presented in Table I. The table is arranged according to sex,

TABLE I
DEMOGRAPHIC DATA OF THE SELECTED
STUDENT POPULATION

Demographic Item	Frequency	Percentage
Sex		
Male	411	40.7
Female	598	59.3
Total	1,009	100.0
<hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/>		
Marital Status		
Single	979	97.0
Married	21	2.1
Divorced	4	0.4
Widowed	0	0.0
Other	5	0.5
Total	1,009	100.0
<hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/>		
Classification		
Freshman	327	32.4
Sophomore	265	26.3
Junior	215	21.3
Senior	162	16.1
Graduate	40	3.9
Total*	1,009	100.0
<hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/>		
Grade Point Average		
1.5 or below	24	2.4
1.6 to 2.5	279	27.7
2.6 to 3.5	532	52.8
3.5 or above	173	17.1
Total**	1,008	100.0
<hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/>		
Race		
White American	776	76.9
Black American	98	9.7
Mexican American	31	3.1
American Indian	28	2.8
International	61	6.1
Other	14	1.4
Total	1,008	100.0

TABLE I--Continued.

Demographic Item	Frequency	Percentage
Major		
Business	342	34.0
Education	105	10.4
Fine Arts	149	14.8
Liberal Arts	120	11.9
Natural Sciences	187	18.6
Behavioral Sciences	36	3.6
Undecided	67	6.7
Total	1,006	100.0

Academic Institution		
N.T.S.U.	519	51.4
T.W.C.	163	16.2
U.T.A.	327	32.4
Total	1,009	100.0

Fraternity/Sorority Membership		
Member	237	23.5
Non-Member	770	76.5
Total	1,007	100.0

* \bar{X} = 2.33; median = 2.17.

** \bar{X} = 2.85; median = 2.88.

marital status, academic classification, grade-point average, race, major field of study, academic institution, and fraternity or sorority membership.

As Table I data show, the average student in this study is a single (97 per cent) white American (77 per cent) female (59 per cent) who attends North Texas State University (51 per cent). The majority of students are freshman (32 per cent) whose grade-point average is between

2.6 and 3.5 (53 per cent). Business is the most popular major (34 per cent), and 77 per cent of the student population do not belong to a fraternity or sorority.

Religious Data and Attitudes

Concerning religious affiliation (see Table II), the majority of students surveyed are either Baptist (23 per cent), Catholic (18 per cent), or Methodist (15 per cent). Although most students attend church (82 per cent), the greatest number of students (32 per cent) attend less than 33 per cent of all recognized church services. The majority of students are satisfied with their religious involvement (69 per cent), and 77 per cent of the student population responded that their religious or spiritual development is important.

Results of the Attitude and Behavior Statements Concerning the Practice of Academic Dishonesty

A summary of the ranking of the attitude and behavior statements and questions concerning academic dishonesty by the selected population is presented in Tables III to XXIII. For many of the items, a five-point scale was incorporated in the survey instrument to measure the intensity of the respondent's agreement or disagreement to the particular attitude statement. The possible degree of response ranges from one to five, whereby SA corresponds to

TABLE II
RELIGIOUS DATA AND ATTITUDE STATEMENTS

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Religious Affiliation		
Agnostic	28	2.8
Assembly of God	16	1.6
Atheist	27	2.7
Baptist	229	22.7
Catholic	184	18.2
Church of Christ	58	5.7
Disciples of Christ	29	2.9
Episcopal	34	3.4
Jewish	35	3.5
Lutheran	41	4.1
Methodist	147	14.6
Presbyterian	48	4.8
Non-Denominational	77	7.6
Other	55	5.4
Total	1,008	100.0
Religious Participation		
Do Not Attend	180	17.9
Less than 33% of All Services	323	32.0
Between 33% and 66% of All Services	206	20.4
Greater than 66% of All Services	299	29.7
Total*	1,008	100.0
Religious Satisfaction		
Greatly Satisfied	281	27.8
Somewhat Satisfied	414	41.0
Uncertain	141	14.0
Somewhat Unsatisfied	144	14.3
Greatly Unsatisfied	29	2.9
Total**	1,009	100.0
Religious Importance		
Extremely Important	442	41.8
Somewhat Important	355	35.2
Uncertain	109	10.8
Somewhat Important	88	8.7
Extremely Important	35	3.5
Total***	1,009	100.0

* \bar{X} = 2.62; median = 2.51
** \bar{X} = 2.23; median = 2.04
*** \bar{X} = 1.97; median = 1.73

the lowest value of one, and SD equals the highest value of five.

The results of the survey indicate (see Table III) that 84 per cent of the students have personally witnessed some form of academically dishonest behavior while at college.

TABLE III
STUDENTS WHO HAVE WITNESSED ACADEMIC
DISHONESTY WHILE AT COLLEGE

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	849	84.1
No	160	15.9
Total*	1,009	100.0

* \bar{X} = 1.16; median = 1.09; S.D. = 3.65.

Table IV data show that of the 85 per cent of students who observed some form of academically dishonest behavior, the majority (56 per cent) witnessed this activity between 1 to 5 times per semester.

TABLE IV
OCCURRENCE OF IDENTIFIED ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

Response	Frequency	Percentage
1 - 5 times per semester	560	55.5
6 - 10 times per semester	185	18.3
11 - 20 times per semester	74	7.3
Greater than 20 times per semester	39	3.9
Not applicable (have not witnessed academic dishonesty)	151	15.0
Total*	1,009	100.0

* \bar{X} = 2.04; median = 1.40; S.D. = 1.46.

TABLE V

STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF CAUSES OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

Cause	N Responses						Total
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree		
Not Adequately Prepared ¹							
Frequency	438	492	48	23	8	1,009	
Percentage	43.4	48.8	4.7	2.3	0.8	100.0	
Students Seldom Get Caught ²							
Frequency	150	487	223	127	22	1,009	
Percentage	14.9	48.3	22.1	12.6	2.1	100.0	
Overcrowded Classrooms and a Lack of Supervision ³							
Frequency	139	395	172	253	50	1,009	
Percentage	13.8	39.1	17.0	25.1	5.0	100.0	
Unreasonable ⁴ Demands from Professors							
Frequency	126	267	219	326	71	1,009	
Percentage	12.5	26.5	21.7	32.3	7.0	100.0	
Competition for Graduate School or Employment ⁵							
Frequency	144	289	285	235	56	1,009	
Percentage	14.3	28.6	28.2	23.3	5.6	100.0	

TABLE V--Continued.

Cause	N Responses					Total
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Lack of Interest and Applicability of Subject Matter ⁶						
Frequency	228	505	156	97	22	1,009
Percentage	22.6	50.1	15.5	9.6	2.2	100.0

$\bar{1}X = 1.68$; median = 1.64; S.D. = 0.738.

$\bar{2}X = 2.39$; median = 2.23; S.D. = 0.958.

$\bar{3}X = 2.68$; median = 2.43; S.D. = 1.14.

$\bar{4}X = 2.95$; median = 3.01; S.D. = 1.17.

$\bar{5}X = 2.77$; median = 2.75; S.D. = 1.12.

$\bar{6}X = 2.19$; median = 2.05; S.D. = 0.963.

Table V data reveal that the majority of students (92 per cent) believe that lack of adequate preparation is the leading cause of academic dishonesty. The second most frequent cause of academic dishonesty is perceived as a lack of interest or applicability in the subject matter.

Concerning student responses to academically dishonest behavior, Table VI data indicate that the most frequent student response (42 per cent) is to be disturbed but take no action. The second most frequent response (24 per cent) indicates that these students would not be disturbed and would take no action following an observation of academic dishonesty.

TABLE VI
STUDENT REACTION TO OBSERVED ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

Reaction	Frequency	Percentage
Not Be Disturbed and Do Nothing	244	24.2
Be Disturbed but Do Nothing	418	41.5
Be Disturbed but my Action Would Depend on Who the Student Was	179	17.8
Express my Concern to the Student Only	67	6.6
Express my Concern to the Professor (Using No Names)	67	6.6
Report the Student by Name to the Professor	15	1.5
Other	18	1.8
Total*	1,008	100.0

* \bar{X} = 2.42; median = 2.12; S.D. = 1.34.

Table VII data indicate that the most common reason given (75 per cent) for failing to report an academically dishonest incident is that the student does not feel comfortable reporting on a fellow student. Students responded that they did not want to become involved as their second reason (64 per cent).

Concerning a personal justification for academic dishonesty, the survey found that most students would not feel personally justified to participate in equally dishonest behavior upon the recognition of widespread deception by fellow classmates even when the possibility of being caught is eliminated. Table VIII data indicate that 53 per cent of the students surveyed either disagree or strongly disagree with the concept of personally justified academic dishonesty.

Table IX data present the degree of acceptance by students of situationally justified dishonesty. The mean score of 3.12 indicates the overall uncertainty about this concept by the surveyed students. While 35 per cent of the students either agree or strongly agree with the acceptance of situationally justified personal dishonesty, 38 per cent disagree or strongly disagree with this concept.

Table X data are related to student opinions regarding the occurrence rate of academic dishonesty. The data show that the responding students believe that 98 per cent of their peers have participated at some time in academically

TABLE VII
REASONS GIVEN BY STUDENTS FOR NOT REPORTING ACADEMICALLY DISHONEST BEHAVIOR

Reason	N Responses					Total
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
The Dishonest Student was a Friend ¹						
Frequency	134	435	159	207	73	1,008
Percentage	13.3	43.2	15.8	20.5	7.2	100.0
Did Not Want to Become Involved ²						
Frequency	144	495	150	169	49	1,007
Percentage	14.3	49.2	14.9	16.7	4.9	100.0
It Is the Faculty's Responsibility to Monitor Dishonesty (Not the Students) ³						
Frequency	178	384	174	209	63	1,008
Percentage	17.6	38.1	17.3	20.7	6.3	100.0
Academic Dishonesty Does Not Warrant Any Type of Punishment ⁴						
Frequency	17	73	201	450	267	1,008
Percentage	1.7	7.3	19.9	44.6	26.5	100.0
I Do Not Feel Comfortable Reporting on a Fellow Student ⁵						
Frequency	243	509	116	98	42	1,008
Percentage	24.1	50.5	11.5	9.7	4.2	100.0

¹ \bar{X} = 2.65; median = 2.35; S.D. = 1.16.

² \bar{X} = 2.49; median = 2.23; S.D. = 1.08.

³ \bar{X} = 2.60; median = 2.35; S.D. = 1.18.

⁴ \bar{X} = 3.87; median = 3.97; S.D. = 0.943.

⁵ \bar{X} = 2.19; median = 2.01; S.D. = 1.04.

TABLE VIII
 JUSTIFICATION FOR PERSONAL ACADEMIC DISHONESTY SUBSEQUENT TO IDENTIFYING
 WIDESPREAD DISHONEST BEHAVIOR BY CLASSMATES

Response	Personal Dishonesty Justified					Total
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Frequency	51	207	214	292	245	1,009
Percentage	5.1	20.5	21.2	28.9	24.3	100.0

\bar{X} = 3.47; median = 3.61; S.D. = 1.20.

TABLE IX
 ACCEPTANCE OF SITUATIONALLY JUSTIFIED DISHONESTY AS A RESULT OF
 INAPPROPRIATE BEHAVIOR BY PROFESSORS OR STUDENTS

Response	Dishonesty Justified					Total
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Frequency	53	298	275	242	141	1,009
Percentage	5.3	29.4	27.3	24.0	14.0	100.0

\bar{X} = 3.12; median = 3.06; S.D. = 1.14.

dishonest behavior. The majority of students (59 per cent) believe that either many (25 to 50 per cent) or most (50 to 75 per cent) of their classmates have been academically deceptive. Only 3 per cent of the surveyed students believe that none of their peers have participated in any form of academic deception.

As Table XI data indicate, the majority of students (53 per cent) have witnessed less than 15 per cent of their peers participating in academically dishonest activities. As the incidence rate increases, the percentage of students who witnessed such activities decreases. Only 3 per cent of the surveyed students identified more than 60 per cent of their classmates being academically dishonest during the 1981-1982 academic year.

Table XII data show that the surveyed students believe that there was much more academically dishonest activity than that which was observed during the 1981-1982 academic year. Only 28 per cent of the surveyed students believe that less than 15 per cent of their fellow students engaged in unobserved academically dishonest activities.

Table XIII summarizes the responses concerning the causes of academic dishonesty in relation to course grades. The data indicate that 91 per cent of the surveyed students believe that the primary reason students engage in academic deception is to raise poor grades (mean = 1.84). The

TABLE X
 STUDENT OPINIONS OF THE OCCURRENCE OF ACADEMICALLY DISHONEST BEHAVIOR BY CLASSMATES

Response	Occurrence of Dishonesty						Total
	None (0%)	Relatively Few (Below 25%)	Many (25%-50%)	Most (50%-75%)	Practically All (Above 75%)		
Frequency	25	172	297	295	220	1,009	
Percentage	2.5	17.0	29.4	29.3	21.8	100.0	

\bar{X} = 3.51; median = 3.54; S.D. = 1.09.

TABLE XI
STUDENT IDENTIFICATION OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY: 1981-1982

Response	Identified Dishonesty					Total
	Less than 15%	15-29%	30-44%	45-60%	Greater than 60%	
Frequency	532	250	139	56	32	1,009
Percentage	52.7	24.7	13.8	5.6	3.2	100.0

\bar{X} = 1.82; median = 1.45; S.D. = 1.07.

TABLE XII
 STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF UNOBSERVED ACADEMIC DISHONESTY: 1981-1982

Response	Unobserved Academic Dishonesty					Total
	Less than 15%	15-29%	30-44%	45-60%	Greater than 60%	
Frequency	280	302	229	128	68	1,007
Percentage	27.8	30.0	22.7	12.7	6.8	100.0

$\bar{X} = 2.41$; median = 2.24; S.D. = 1.21.

TABLE XIII
STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF CAUSES OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY IN RELATION TO COURSE GRADES

Cause	Responses					Total
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Maintain Poor Grades (from Getting Worse) ¹	204 20.2	518 51.3	108 10.7	141 14.0	38 3.8	1,009 100.0
Raise Poor Grades ²	305 30.2	608 60.3	58 5.7	30 3.0	8 0.8	1,009 100.0
Maintain Good Grades ³	168 16.6	489 48.5	163 16.1	167 16.6	22 2.2	1,009 100.0
Raise Good Grades ⁴	124 12.3	334 33.1	189 18.7	278 27.6	84 8.3	1,009 100.0

¹ \bar{X} = 2.30; median = 2.08; S.D. = 1.06.
² \bar{X} = 1.84; median = 1.83; S.D. = 0.724.
³ \bar{X} = 2.40; median = 2.19; S.D. = 1.02.
⁴ \bar{X} = 2.87; median = 2.75; S.D. = 1.19.

TABLE XIV

STUDENT PERCEPTIONS CONCERNING THE INEVITABILITY OF ACADEMICALLY DISHONEST BEHAVIOR

Response	Degree of Agreement					Total
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Frequency	231	536	154	70	9	1,009
Percentage	23.1	53.6	15.4	7.0	0.9	100.0

\bar{X} = 2.09; median = 2.00; S.D. = 0.86.

second most frequently perceived cause of academic deception is to keep poor grades from becoming worse (mean = 2.30).

Table XIV data show that 77 per cent of the surveyed students believe that a certain percentage of their peers will participate in academically dishonest activities regardless of classroom conditions or academic demands. Only 8 per cent of the respondents either disagree or strongly disagree with this statement.

Table XV data indicate that 53 per cent of the respondents believe the occurrence of academic dishonesty is unchanged compared to when they first entered college. Since the majority of the respondents are freshmen and sophomores, this finding may have little significance.

TABLE XV
STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF THE PRESENT OCCURRENCE OF
DISHONESTY AS COMPARED TO FIRST COLLEGE YEAR

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Definitely More Frequent	126	12.5
Slightly More Frequent	197	19.5
Unchanged	531	52.6
Slightly Less Frequent	107	10.6
Definitely Less Frequent	48	4.8
Total*	1,009	100.0

* \bar{X} = 2.76; median = 2.84; S.D. = 0.966.

The data presented in Table XVI indicate that 63 per cent of the respondents have participated in some form of academically dishonest behavior while at college or university. The remaining 37 per cent has used no means to misrepresent their true performance on any test or paper.

TABLE XVI
PER CENT OF RESPONDING STUDENTS WHO HAVE BEEN
ACADEMICALLY DISHONEST WHILE AT COLLEGE
OR UNIVERSITY

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Academically Honest	377	37.4
Academically Dishonest	632	62.6
Total*	1,009	100.0

* \bar{X} = 1.37; median = 1.30; S.D. = 0.484.

Table XVII data show that 73 per cent of the surveyed students used some form of academic dishonesty before entering college or university. Forty-one per cent of the

TABLE XVII
SCHOOL LEVEL AT WHICH RESPONDENT'S FIRST ACADEMICALLY
DISHONEST INCIDENT OCCURRED

Responses	School Level				Total
	Elementary School	High School	College or University	Not Applicable	
Frequency	322	418	108	161	1,009
Per Cent	31.9	41.4	10.7	16.0	100.9

\bar{X} = 2.11; median = 1.94; S.D. = 1.03.

respondents took part in their first dishonest incident during high school; the first incidence of academic dishonesty for 32 per cent of the respondents occurred in elementary school.

Of the 83 per cent of the respondents who have been academically dishonest, the data in Table XVIII indicate that only 29 per cent have been identified at any time by academic personnel. The remaining 71 per cent have never been caught participating in academically dishonest activities.

TABLE XVIII
PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDING STUDENTS WHO HAVE BEEN
APPREHENDED AS A RESULT OF AN ACADEMICALLY
DISHONEST INCIDENT

	Total Population		Academic Deceivers	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Apprehended	243	24.1	243	28.9
Not Apprehended	597	59.2	597	71.1
Not Applicable	169	16.7
Total	1,009	100.0	840	100.0

The data in Table XIX indicate that of those 53 per cent of the responding students who have been academically dishonest during the 1981-1982 academic year, 47 per cent have been involved in such activities between one and five times. Forty-seven per cent of the surveyed students responded that they had not been academically dishonest to any degree during the academic year.

TABLE XX--Continued.

	Frequency	Percentage
Turned in Work Completed by Others		
Used	147	14.6
Not Used	862	85.4
Total	1,009	100.0

Copied Answers from Classmate During Test		
Used	360	35.7
Not Used	649	64.3
Total	1,009	100.0

Used Unauthored Books or Notes		
Used	90	8.9
Not Used	919	91.9
Total	1,009	100.0

Knowingly Furnished the University with False Information		
Used	38	3.8
Not Used	971	96.2
Total	1,009	100.0

Other		
Used	98	9.7
Not Used	911	90.3
Total	1,009	100.0

None of the Above		
Used	331	32.8
Not Used	678	67.2
Total	1,009	100.0

As shown by Table XXI data, the respondents indicated that they most often copy answers from classmates during tests (27 per cent). Similar to the results shown in Table XX, the next most common method of academic deception

is the use of crib sheets (15 per cent), followed by plagiarism (9.4 per cent).

TABLE XXI
RESPONDENTS' MOST COMMONLY USED METHOD OF
ACADEMIC DECEPTION

Method	Frequency	Percentage
Crib Sheets	148	14.7
Plagiarized on Term Paper	95	9.4
Turned in Work Completed by Others	78	7.7
Copied Answers from Classmates During Test	270	26.7
Used Unauthorized Books or Notes	35	3.5
Knowingly Furnished the University with False Information	22	2.2
Other	157	15.6
None	204	20.0
Totals*	1,009	100.0

* \bar{X} = 4.60; median = 4.18; S.D. = 2.42.

An analysis of the data in Table XXII indicates that 50 per cent of the responding students either agree or strongly agree that the student who aids a dishonest peer should be punished for participating in academic dishonest activities. Although only 25 per cent do not agree that the dishonest accomplice should be punished, 25 per cent are also uncertain about punishment for complicity.

Data presented in Table XXIII indicate that of the five selected methods of academic dishonesty, students indicate that turning in work completed by others (with a mean score of 2.88) should be the most severely punished, followed closely by copying answers during a test or

TABLE XXII
 RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF PUNISHMENT FOR DISHONEST COMPLICITY

Response	Punishment for Dishonest Complicity					Total
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Frequency	145	360	250	187	65	1,008
Percentage	14.4	35.8	24.9	18.5	6.4	100.0

\bar{X} = 2.67; median = 2.50; S.D. = 1.13.

TABLE XXIII

STUDENT-RECOMMENDED PUNISHMENT FOR SELECTED METHODS OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

Method	Punishment							Total
	Should Not Be Punished	Warning	Failing Grade on the Test	Failing Grade in the Course	Dismissed or Expelled from School			
Use of Crib Sheets ¹	30 3.0	279 27.7	616 61.1	64 6.3	19 1.9		1,008 100.0	
Plagiarism ²	30 3.0	355 35.2	426 42.2	159 15.8	38 3.8		1,008 100.0	
Turned in Work Completed by Others ³	42 4.2	257 25.5	513 50.9	169 16.7	27 2.7		1,008 100.0	
Copied Answers During a Test or Examination ⁴	20 2.0	223 22.1	665 65.9	80 7.9	21 2.1		1,009 100.0	
Used Unauthorized Books or Notes ⁵	98 9.7	401 39.7	404 40.1	88 8.7	18 1.8		1,009 100.0	

¹X = 2.76; median = 2.82; S.D. = 0.698.

²X = 2.82; median = 2.78; S.D. = 0.869.

³X = 2.88; median = 2.89; S.D. = 0.831.

⁴X = 2.86; median = 2.89; S.D. = 0.666.

⁵X = 2.53; median = 2.51; S.D. = 0.852.

examination (mean = 2.86). In both cases, the majority of students believe that just punishment for these offenses should be a failing grade on the test or term paper. The data also show that plagiarism, use of crib sheets, and use of unauthorized books or notes follow (mean scores = 2.82, 2.76, and 2.53, respectively). Table XXIV data show that 52 per cent of the responding students believe that a failing grade on a test or term paper is the most appropriate form of punishment for all of the selected methods of academically dishonest behavior.

TABLE XXIV
TOTAL FREQUENCIES OF SELECTED METHODS OF ACADEMIC
DISHONESTY IN RELATION TO RECOMMENDED
PUNISHMENTS

Punishment	Frequency	Percentage
Should Not Be Punished	220	4.6
Warning	1,515	30.0
Failing Grade on Test	2,624	52.0
Failing Grade in Course	560	11.1
Dismissed or Expelled from School	123	2.3

\bar{X} = 2.79; median = 2.80; S.D. = 0.894.

Data Findings in Relation to the Research Questions

The following discussion and statistical tables present the data findings as they relate to each of the twenty-one research questions by percentages, mean scores, and chi squares. Only the chi square correlations that were found to be significant at the .05 level of significance are

discussed. Of the 77 relationships measured, 24 were found to be significant and will be discussed in this section.

Research Question One

Research question one asks, "how often have students witnessed academically dishonest behavior during the academic year?" The answer to this question is determined by incorporating the results from Tables III, IV and XI. Table III data show that 85 per cent of the respondents have personally witnessed some form of academically dishonest behavior. While Table IV data show that 56 per cent of the students have identified this activity 1 to 5 times per semester, 18 per cent rate the frequency between 6 to 10 times per semester. Furthermore, Table XI data show that while the majority of students (53 per cent) believe that less than 15 per cent of their classmates have participated in some form of academic dishonesty, 25 per cent believe that between 15 and 29 per cent of their peers have cheated during 1981-1982.

Research Question Two

This research question seeks information regarding why most students participate in academically dishonest activities at institutions of higher education. The findings indicate (Table V) that most students believe the cause of academic dishonesty is that most dishonest students are not adequately prepared for a test or examination (mean score =

1.64); 92 per cent of the responding students either agree or strongly agree with this motive.

Research Question Three

Research question three asks, "what response by students is most common subsequent to identifying or witnessing an academically dishonest incident?" Forty-two per cent of the respondents (Table VI) would "be disturbed but do nothing" after witnessing an academically dishonest incident. The next most frequent response (24 per cent) after identifying academic dishonesty would be to "not be disturbed and do nothing."

Research Question Four

The fourth research question asks, "what reason is given by students for not reporting an observed incident of academic dishonesty?" Table VII data indicate that most students do not report academically dishonest behavior because they "do not feel comfortable reporting on a fellow student" by a 2.19 mean score. The next most frequent reason is that students "did not want to become involved."

Research Question Five

The fifth research question asks, "to what degree do students feel that widespread dishonest activities by fellow classmates justify their equally dishonest behavior?" As

shown in Table VIII, 53 per cent of the students disagree or strongly disagree with the practice of justified academic dishonesty. The mean score for this survey question is 3.47.

Research Question Six

This research question seeks information regarding the degree to which students accept situationally justified dishonest activity. The findings of Table IX indicate, by a mean score of 3.11, that there is a general uncertainty on this issue. While 34.7 per cent of the students either agree or strongly agree, 38 per cent either disagreed or strongly disagreed with this principle.

Research Question Seven

Research question seven asks, "what percentages of college students believe that their peers participate in academically dishonest behavior while at college?" An analysis of Table X reveals that only 3 per cent of the surveyed students believe that their peers have not participated in any form of academic dishonesty while at college. The majority of students (59 per cent) believe that either many (25 to 50 per cent) or most (50 to 75 per cent) of their classmates are academically deceptive.

Research Question Eight

Research question eight asks, "what percentage of college students believe that their peers have participated in an unobserved form of academic dishonesty?" Table XII data indicate that only 28 per cent of the responding students believe that less than 15 per cent of their classmates have participated in some form of unobserved academic deception during the 1981-1982 academic year. The majority of students (72 per cent) believe that more than 15 per cent of their peers have been unobserved while being academically dishonest.

Research Question Nine

The ninth research question asks, "relative to course grades, why do most students engage in academically dishonest activities?" As shown by Table XIII data, most students are believed to be academically dishonest in order to raise poor grades (mean = 1.84).

Research Question Ten

Research question ten asks, "will the practice of academic dishonesty continue regardless of classroom conditions or academic demands?" The data results in Table XIV show that 77 per cent of the students surveyed either agree or strongly agree that a certain percentage of students will participate in academically dishonest activities

regardless of classroom conditions or academic demands. Only 8 per cent disagree with this prediction.

Research Question Eleven

Research question eleven asks, "do college students believe that the incidence of collegiate academic dishonesty is increasing or decreasing?" An examination of Table XV data shows that the majority of students (53 per cent) believe the frequency of academic dishonesty is unchanged compared to when they first entered college or university.

Research Question Twelve

The twelfth research question asks, "how successful has the academic faculty been in apprehending students who are involved in academically dishonest behavior?" Table XVIII data indicate that after partialing out those students who have never been academically dishonest, 71 per cent of the surveyed students who have been academically dishonest have not been apprehended at any time for their dishonest activities.

Research Question Thirteen

The thirteenth research question asks, "should the student accomplice be punished for assisting the academically dishonest behavior of another student?" As shown by Table XXII data, the mean score of 2.67 indicates an agreement with the concept of punishment for the student

accomplice. Fifty per cent of the students either agree or strongly agree that the student accomplice should be punished, versus only 25 per cent of the respondents who disagree or strongly disagree with this course of action.

Research Question Fourteen

Research question fourteen seeks information that will determine the degree of punishment that students recommend for those who use crib sheets, plagiarize, turn in work completed by others, copy answers during a test or examination, and use unauthorized books or notes. Of the five selected methods of academic dishonesty presented, the data in Table XXIII show that the severity of the punishment recommended by the students ranks as follows (from most to least severe punishment): "turned in work completed by others" by a mean score of 2.88, "copied answers on a test or examination" by a mean score of 2.86, "plagiarized" by a mean score of 2.82, "used crib sheets" by a mean score of 2.76, and "used unauthorized books or notes" by a mean score of 2.53. In each case, the majority of students believe the most appropriate punishment is a "failing grade on the test."

Research Question Fifteen

Research question fifteen asks, "what is the occurrence rate of academically dishonest behavior among the surveyed

students?" An examination of Table XVI data shows that 63 per cent of the surveyed students have used some means to misrepresent their true performance on an examination or term paper while at college or university.

Research Question Sixteen

The sixteenth research question asks, "concerning those students who have participated in some form of academic dishonesty, at which school level did their first dishonest incident occur?" Table XVII data indicate that 41 per cent of the surveyed students participated in their first academically dishonest incident in high school, and a further 32 per cent were academically deceptive as early as elementary school. Combined, 73 per cent of the surveyed students participated in some form of academic dishonesty before entering college or university.

Research Question Seventeen

The seventeenth research question asks, "how frequently do students participate in academically dishonest activity throughout the course of a school year?" As shown by Table XIX data, 47 per cent of those surveyed did not participate in any dishonest academic activity during the 1981-1982 academic year. The data also indicate, however, that an equal number (47 per cent) of students were dishonest between one and five times during the same academic period.

Research Question Eighteen

The eighteenth research question seeks information that will determine if there is a correlation between origin (first dishonest incident) and frequency of dishonest behavior at institutions of higher education. Table XXV data show that there is a significant relationship between the school level at which a student's first dishonest incident occurs and the frequency of academically dishonest behavior in college. The earlier the first dishonest incident, the more likely the student was to have been academically dishonest during the indicated school year.

Research Question Nineteen

Research question nineteen asks, "what methods of academic dishonesty have been personally used by the surveyed students?" Table XX data show that the respondents had used each of the seven selected methods of academic dishonesty. The most popular method of academic deceit is copying answers from a classmate during a test.

Research Question Twenty

The twentieth research question asks, "what are the most frequently used methods of academically dishonest behavior?" Of the seven listed methods of academic dishonesty, Table XXI data reveal that the most frequently

TABLE XXV

SIGNIFICANT CHI SQUARE RELATIONSHIP FOR ACADEMIC LEVEL OF
FIRST DISHONEST INCIDENT AND FREQUENCY OF ACADEMIC
DISHONESTY DURING 1981-1982 ACADEMIC YEAR

Academic Level of First Dishonest Incident	*	Frequency of Academic Dishonesty 1981-1982				Row Total
		Never	1-5 times	6-10 times	10+ times	
Elementary	F	133	160	17	12	322
	%	13.18	15.86	1.68	1.19	31.91
	R%	41.30	49.69	5.20	3.73	
	C%	27.88	33.97	42.50	57.14	
High School	F	169	226	16	7	418
	%	16.73	22.48	1.59	0.69	41.43
	R%	40.43	54.07	3.83	1.67	
	C%	35.43	47.98	40.00	33.33	
College	F	19	81	6	2	108
	%	1.88	8.03	8.59	9.20	10.70
	R%	17.59	75.00	5.56	1.85	
	C%	3.98	17.20	15.00	9.52	
Not applicable	F	156	4	1	0	161
	%	15.46	0.40	0.10	0.00	15.96
	R%	96.89	2.48	8.62	0.00	
	C%	32.70	0.85	2.50	0.00	
Column Totals	F	477	471	40	21	1,009
	%	47.27	46.68	3.96	2.08	100.0

*F = frequency; % = percent of total; R% = row percent;
C% = column percent.

Chi square = 216.535; probability = 0.0001; contingency
coefficient = 0.420.

used method (27 per cent) of the surveyed students is to copy
answers from a classmate during a test or examination.

Research Question Twenty-One

Research question twenty-one asks several questions
concerning the academic honesty of students who have common
denominational affiliations, participation practices,

religious satisfaction responses, and desires for religious development. In order to answer these questions, chi square relationships were tested. Table XXVI summarizes all of the chi square relationships and indicates all relationships found to be significant at the .05 level of significance.

As the data show, 23 chi square relationships were found to be significant. Concerning the religious variables, 5 significant chi square relationships are related to religious participation, 8 are related to religious satisfaction, and 10 chi square relationships are associated with religious importance. One religious variable, religious affiliation, demonstrated no significant chi square relationships. Each of the significant chi square relationships will be discussed in relation to the twenty-first research question. All tables describing chi square relationships will report all relevant statistics (cell frequencies and percentages, and row and column percentages).

Research question twenty-one a.--This research question asks if students who display common religious beliefs will also demonstrate similar attitude or behavior patterns in their responses to the academically dishonest behavior of others. When each of the four religious variables was correlated with student response to an academically dishonest incident (survey question 19), religious participation and religious importance produced significant

TABLE XXVI

SUMMARY TABLE OF CHI SQUARE RELATIONSHIPS CONCERNING RELIGIOUS IDEOLOGY

No.	Survey Question (condensed)	**	9A-Religious Affiliation	9B - Religious Participation	9C-Religious Satisfaction	9D-Religious Importance
19	Student responses subsequent to witnessing academically dishonest incident.	X ² = P = C =	106.6110 0.1750 0.3090	50.4710 0.0001* 0.2180	23.0380 0.5175 0.1490	64.3090 0.0001* 0.2450
20	Observed, unreported academically dishonest incident of student friend.	X ² = P = C =	57.5300 0.2779 0.2320	13.1690 0.3569 0.1140	26.7440 0.0444* 0.1610	36.8680 0.0022* 0.1880
21	Observed, unreported academically dishonest incident because of desire to remain uninvolved.	X ² = P = C =	53.7480 0.4072 0.2250	15.5560 0.2124 0.1230	27.3630 0.0376* 0.1630	23.8550 0.0927 0.1520
22	Observed, unreported academically dishonest incident because this is a faculty (not student) responsibility.	X ² = P = C =	53.4800 0.4172 0.2250	18.2210 0.1091 0.1330	23.7200 0.0958 0.1520	15.4340 0.4931 0.1230
23	Observed, unreported academically dishonest incident because such dishonesty warrants no punishment.	X ² = P = C =	50.0310 0.5517 0.2180	17.6130 0.1280 0.1310	17.4750 0.3555 0.1310	18.2560 0.3091 0.1330
24	Observed, unreported academically dishonest incident because of discomfort reporting on fellow student.	X ² = P = C =	51.0980 0.5093 0.2200	14.9940 0.2418 0.1210	25.9270 0.0551 0.1580	16.5670 0.4141 0.1270
25	Personal academic dishonesty subsequent to identifying widespread dishonesty among classmates during exam.	X ² = P = C =	61.8430 0.1649 0.2400	57.5250 0.0001* 0.2320	47.1780 0.0001* 0.2110	67.7510 0.0001* 0.2510
26	Situations as a result of inappropriate behavior by professor or students that justify academic dishonesty.	X ² = P = C =	55.4880 0.3447 0.2280	31.6460 0.0016* 0.1740	27.6190 0.0351* 0.1630	40.6110 0.0006* 0.1970

TABLE XXVI--Continued.

No.	Survey Question (condensed)	**	9A-Religious Affiliation	9B-Religious Participation	9C-Religious Satisfaction	9D-Religious Importance
36	Personal use of any means to misrepresent true performance on college test or term paper.	X ² =	21.1510	2.3050	24.0820	10.2160
		P =	0.0700	0.5115	0.0001*	0.0369*
		C =	0.1430	0.0480	0.1530	0.1000
37	School level at which first dishonest incident occurred.	X ² =	42.2760	19.2090	24.5400	20.3030
		P =	0.3314	0.0228*	0.0172*	0.0616
		C =	0.2010	0.1370	0.1540	0.1400
38	Following participation in any form of academic dishonesty, has respondent ever been caught?	X ² =	24.1720	15.1550	14.8070	25.7270
		P =	0.5661	0.0191*	0.0630	0.0012*
		C =	0.1530	0.1220	0.1200	0.1580
39	Frequency of academically dishonest behavior during past collegiate year.	X ² =	50.9520	5.7200	22.3120	22.8070
		P =	0.0952	0.7676	0.0342*	0.0294*
		C =	0.2190	0.0750	0.1470	0.1490
41	Most frequent-common method of academic dishonesty used by respondents.	X ² =	82.5450	20.4300	29.5010	47.2760
		P =	0.7249	0.4942	0.3874	0.0128*
		C =	0.2750	0.1410	0.1690	0.2120
42	Punishment for those who aid or support the academically dishonest student.	X ² =	49.8810	18.6420	16.4840	26.7310
		P =	0.5576	0.0975	0.4197	0.0446*
		C =	0.2170	0.1350	0.1270	0.1610
43	Punishment for those caught using crib sheets.	X ² =	61.6920	9.9670	21.0770	24.5320
		P =	0.1682	0.6188	0.1756	0.0785
		C =	0.2400	0.0990	0.1430	0.1540
44	Punishment for those caught plagiarizing.	X ² =	58.5240	6.8370	19.0840	19.9410
		P =	0.2484	0.8682	0.2644	0.2229
		C =	0.2340	0.0820	0.1360	0.1390
45	Punishment for those caught turning in work completed by others.	X ² =	67.1130	15.0910	30.5000	24.3460
		P =	0.0774	0.2365	0.0156*	0.0822
		C =	0.2500	0.1220	0.1710	0.1540

TABLE XXVI--Continued.

No.	Survey Question (condensed)	**	9A-Religious Affiliation	9B - Religious Participation	9C-Religious Satisfaction	9D-Religious Importance
46	Punishment for those caught copying answers during a test or examination.	X ² = P = C =	52.7370 0.4454 0.2230	19.9590 0.0679 0.1390	19.1820 0.2593 0.1370	46.8900 0.0001* 0.2110
47	Punishment for those caught using unauthorized books or notes.	X ² = P = C =	46.0700 0.7051 0.2090	17.0110 0.1492 0.1290	23.4320 0.1027 0.1510	18.2780 0.3079 0.1330

*Chi square relationships that are significant at .05 level.

**X² = chi square; P = probability; C = contingency coefficient.

relationships. Table XXVII shows the chi square relationship between religious participation and student response to an academically dishonest incident; as church attendance increases, the more disturbed the student becomes and the more likely the student will respond by taking some type of action, whereas students whose religious participation is low are more likely to take no action following an observed academically dishonest incident. Specifically, the religious students are more likely to be disturbed and express concern to either the dishonest student or the professor following a dishonest incident, while the non-religious students are more likely to be undisturbed and take no action in a similar situation.

Table XXVIII data show a significant chi square relationship between religious importance and student response following an academically dishonest incident. The higher the value placed by the student on his religious development, the more likely the student is to take some action following a dishonest incident. In addition, those students who rate their religious development as extremely important are more likely to select a more severe response, while those students who rate their religious development as extremely unimportant are more likely to be undisturbed and do nothing following an observed academically dishonest incident.

TABLE XXVII

SIGNIFICANT CHI SQUARE RELATIONSHIP FOR RELIGIOUS PARTICIPATION AND RESPONSE FOLLOWING THE DISCOVERY OF AN ACADEMICALLY DISHONEST INCIDENT

Religious Participation	*	Response to Discovery of an Academically Dishonest Incident							Row Total
		Not Be Disturbed and Do Nothing	Disturbed But Do Nothing	Disturbed but Action Depends on Student's Identity	Express Concern Only to Student	Express Concern to Prof Without Names	Report Student Name to Prof	Other	
Do Not Attend	F	67	61	19	9	14	4	6	180
	%	6.65	6.06	1.89	0.89	1.39	0.40	0.60	17.87
	R%	37.22	33.89	10.56	5.00	7.78	2.22	3.33	
	C%	27.46	14.59	10.61	13.64	20.90	26.67	33.33	
Attend Less than 33% of Services	F	83	143	49	18	16	6	7	322
	%	8.24	14.20	4.87	1.79	1.59	0.60	0.70	31.98
	R%	25.78	44.41	15.22	5.59	4.97	1.86	2.17	
	C%	34.02	34.21	27.37	27.27	23.88	40.00	38.89	
Attend Between 33% and 66% of Services	F	46	89	42	13	12	1	3	206
	%	4.57	8.84	4.17	1.29	1.19	0.10	0.30	20.46
	R%	22.33	43.20	20.39	6.31	5.83	0.49	1.46	
	C%	18.85	21.29	23.46	19.70	17.91	6.67	16.67	
Attend More than 66% of Services	F	48	125	69	26	25	4	2	299
	%	4.77	12.41	6.85	2.58	2.48	0.40	0.20	29.69
	R%	16.05	41.81	23.08	8.70	8.36	1.34	0.67	
	C%	19.67	29.90	38.55	39.39	37.31	26.67	11.11	
Column Total	F	244	418	179	66	67	15	18	1,007
	%	24.23	41.51	17.78	6.55	6.65	1.49	1.79	100.00

*F = frequency; % = percent of total; R% = row percent; C% = column percent.
Chi square = 50.471; probability = 0.0001; contingency coefficient = 0.218.

TABLE XXVIII

SIGNIFICANT CHI SQUARE RELATIONSHIP FOR RELIGIOUS IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSE FOLLOWING THE DISCOVERY OF AN ACADEMICALLY DISHONEST INCIDENT

Religious Importance	Response to Discovery of an Academically Dishonest Incident										Row Total	
	Not Be Disturbed and Do Nothing	Disturbed But Do Nothing	Disturbed But Action Depends on Student's Identity	Express Concern Only to Student	Express Concern to Prof Without Names	Report Student Name to Prof	Other					
Extremely Important	F 77 % 7.64 R% 18.25 C% 31.56	169 16.77 40.05 40.43	91 9.03 21.56 50.84	31 3.08 7.35 46.27	36 3.57 8.53 53.73	10 0.99 2.37 66.67	8 0.79 1.90 44.44					422 41.87
Somewhat Important	F 82 % 8.13 R% 23.10 C% 33.61	169 16.77 47.61 40.43	51 5.06 14.37 28.49	26 2.58 7.32 38.81	21 2.08 5.92 31.34	1 0.10 0.28 6.67	5 0.50 1.41 27.78					355 35.22
Uncertain	F 36 % 3.57 R% 33.33 C% 14.75	42 4.17 38.89 10.05	18 1.79 16.67 10.06	3 0.30 2.78 4.48	7 0.69 6.48 10.45	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	2 0.20 1.85 11.11					108 10.71
Somewhat Unimportant	F 31 % 3.08 R% 35.23 C% 12.70	28 2.78 31.82 6.70	14 1.39 15.91 7.82	7 0.69 7.95 10.45	3 0.30 3.41 4.48	2 0.20 2.27 13.33	3 0.30 3.41 16.67					88 8.73
Extremely Unimportant	F 18 % 1.79 R% 51.43 C% 7.38	10 0.99 28.57 2.39	5 0.50 14.29 2.79	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	2 0.20 5.71 13.33	0 0.00 0.00 0.00					35 3.47
Column Total	F 244 % 24.21	418 41.47	179 17.76	67 6.65	67 6.65	15 1.49	18 1.79					1,008 100.00

*F = frequency; % = percent of total; R% = row percent; C% = column percent.
Chi square = 64.309; probability = 0.0001; contingency coefficient = 0.245.

Research question twenty-one b.--This question asks, if students who have common denominational affiliations, participation practices, religious satisfaction responses, and desires for religious development, will demonstrate similar attitudes and behavior by their reasoning for not reporting an observed incident of academic dishonesty. To answer this research question, each of the four religious variables were correlated with survey questions 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24 producing twenty possible significant chi square associations. Summary Table XXVI data show that only significant relationships were religious satisfaction and religious importance with survey question 20, and religious satisfaction with survey question 21.

Table XXIX data indicate the significant relationship between religious satisfaction and failure to report an academically dishonest incident because the student was a friend. The religiously satisfied student is more likely to report an academically dishonest friend than the student who is religiously unsatisfied. In general, the greater the student's satisfaction with his religious involvement, the stronger the disagreement with this explanation for not reporting the dishonest incident.

Table XXX data show that there is a significant relationship between religious importance and failure to report an academically dishonest friend. A student whose

TABLE XXIX

SIGNIFICANT CHI SQUARE RELATIONSHIP FOR RELIGIOUS SATISFACTION AND REASON FOR NOT REPORTING AN ACADEMICALLY DISHONEST INCIDENT WAS BECAUSE STUDENT WAS A FRIEND

Religious Satisfaction	*	Did Not Report Incident Because Dishonest Student Was a Friend						Row Total
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree		
Greatly Satisfied	F	28	112	44	67	30	281	
	%	2.78	11.11	4.37	6.65	2.98	27.88	
	R%	9.96	39.86	15.66	23.84	10.68		
	C%	20.90	25.75	27.67	32.37	41.10		
Somewhat Satisfied	F	54	194	58	83	25	414	
	%	5.36	19.25	5.75	8.23	2.48	41.07	
	R%	13.04	46.86	14.01	20.05	6.04		
	C%	40.30	44.60	36.48	40.10	34.25		
Uncertain	F	24	63	30	18	6	141	
	%	2.38	6.25	2.98	1.79	0.60	13.99	
	R%	17.02	44.68	21.28	12.77	4.26		
	C%	17.91	14.48	18.87	8.70	8.22		
Somewhat Unsatisfied	F	24	55	24	30	10	143	
	%	2.38	5.46	2.38	2.98	0.99	14.19	
	R%	16.78	38.46	16.78	20.98	6.99		
	C%	17.91	12.64	15.09	14.49	13.70		
Greatly Unsatisfied	F	4	11	3	9	2	29	
	%	0.40	1.09	0.30	0.89	0.20	2.88	
	R%	13.79	37.93	10.34	31.03	6.90		
	C%	2.99	2.53	1.89	4.35	2.74		
Column Total	F	134	435	159	207	73	1,008	
	%	13.29	43.15	15.77	20.54	7.24	100.00	

*F = frequency; % = percent of total; R% = row percent; C% = column percent.
 Chi square = 26.744; probability = 0.0444; contingency coefficient = 0.161.

religious development is important would be more likely to report the dishonest act of a friend than a student whose spiritual development is reported to be unimportant.

Table XXXI presents a significant chi square relationship between religious satisfaction and failure to report an academically dishonest incident because of a desire to remain uninvolved. The more moderate the degree of the student's religious satisfaction, the more likely the student is to want to remain uninvolved in an observed academically dishonest incident. As students' religious satisfaction increases or decreases, so does the disagreement with the statement, displaying a greater willingness to become involved by reporting an academically dishonest incident.

Research question twenty-one c.--This research question asks, "will students who have common religious patterns demonstrate similar attitudes and behavior regarding the practice of situationally justified academic dishonesty?" In order to answer this research question, each religious variable (affiliation, participation, satisfaction, and importance) was correlated with the survey questions (25 and 26) on this practice. With the exception of religious affiliation, the religious variables were found to correlate significantly with situationally justified personal academic dishonesty and the concept of situationally justified

TABLE XXX

SIGNIFICANT CHI SQUARE RELATIONSHIP FOR RELIGIOUS IMPORTANCE AND REASON FOR NOT REPORTING
AN ACADEMICALLY DISHONEST INCIDENT WAS BECAUSE STUDENT WAS A FRIEND

Religious Importance	*	Did Not Report Incident Because Dishonest Student Was a Friend					Row Total
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Extremely Important	F	45	176	65	95	40	421
	%	4.46	17.46	6.45	9.42	3.97	3.97
	R%	10.69	41.81	15.44	22.57	9.50	41.77
	C%	33.58	40.46	40.88	45.89	54.79	
Somewhat Important	F	40	171	56	71	17	355
	%	3.97	16.96	5.56	7.04	1.69	1.69
	R%	11.27	48.17	15.77	20.00	4.79	35.22
	C%	29.85	39.31	35.22	34.30	23.29	
Uncertain	F	26	41	23	13	6	109
	%	2.58	4.07	2.28	1.29	0.60	0.60
	R%	23.85	37.61	21.10	11.93	5.50	10.81
	C%	19.40	9.43	14.47	6.28	8.22	
Somewhat Unimportant	F	17	35	12	19	5	88
	%	1.69	3.47	1.19	1.88	0.50	0.50
	R%	19.32	39.77	13.64	21.59	5.68	8.73
	C%	12.69	8.05	7.55	9.18	6.85	
Extremely Unimportant	F	6	12	3	9	5	35
	%	0.60	1.19	0.30	0.89	0.50	0.50
	R%	17.14	34.29	8.57	25.71	14.29	3.47
	C%	4.48	2.76	1.89	4.35	6.85	
Column Total	F	134	435	159	207	73	1,008
	%	13.29	43.15	15.77	20.54	7.24	100.00

*F = frequency; % = percent of total; R% = row percent; C% = column percent.
Chi square = 36.868; probability = 0.0022; contingency coefficient = 0.188.

TABLE XXXI

SIGNIFICANT CHI SQUARE RELATIONSHIP FOR RELIGIOUS SATISFACTION AND REASON FOR NOT REPORTING
AN ACADEMICALLY DISHONEST INCIDENT BECAUSE OF A DESIRE TO REMAIN UNINVOLVED

Religious Satisfaction	*	Did Not Report Incident Because Reporting Student Did Not Want to Become Involved						Total
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree		
Greatly Satisfied	F	37	122	49	55	18	281	
	%	3.67	12.12	4.87	5.46	1.79	27.90	
	R%	13.17	43.42	17.44	19.57	6.41		
	C%	25.69	24.65	32.67	32.54	36.73		
Somewhat Satisfied	F	59	220	63	52	19	413	
	%	5.86	21.85	6.26	5.16	1.89	41.01	
	R%	14.29	53.27	15.25	12.59	4.60		
	C%	40.97	44.44	42.00	30.77	38.78		
Uncertain	F	26	74	18	20	3	141	
	%	2.58	7.35	1.79	1.99	0.30	14.00	
	R%	18.44	52.48	12.77	14.18	2.13		
	C%	18.06	14.95	12.00	11.83	6.12		
Somewhat Unsatisfied	F	18	63	18	37	7	143	
	%	1.79	6.26	1.79	3.67	0.70	14.20	
	R%	12.59	44.06	12.59	25.87	4.50		
	C%	12.50	12.73	12.00	21.89	14.29		
Greatly Unsatisfied	F	4	16	2	5	2	29	
	%	0.40	1.59	0.20	0.50	0.20	2.88	
	R%	13.79	55.17	6.90	17.24	6.90		
	C%	2.78	3.23	1.33	2.96	4.08		
Column Total	F	144	495	150	169	49	1,007	
	%	14.30	49.16	14.90	16.78	4.87	100.00	

*F = frequency; % = percent of total; R% = row percent; C% = column percent.
Chi square = 27.363; probability = 0.0376; contingency coefficient = 0.163.

academic dishonesty. Tables XXXII through XXXVII present these correlations.

There is a significant relationship between religious participation and a personal justification of situational academic dishonesty (Table XXXII). The data indicate that the more frequently students attend church, the less likely they are to feel a personal justification to be academically dishonest in a situation in which their peers are engaging in widespread academic dishonesty on an examination. Non-church goers are more likely to justify their academic dishonesty in such a situation.

There is a significant relationship between religious satisfaction and a personal justification of situational academic dishonesty (Table XXXIII). The data indicate that the more uncertain students are about their religious satisfaction, the more likely they are to feel a personal justification to be academically dishonest in a situation in which their peers are engaging in widespread academic dishonesty on an examination.

There is a significant relationship between religious importance and a personal justification of situational academic dishonesty (Table XXXIV). The data indicate that as the importance of students' religious development increases, the less likely they are to feel a personal justification to be academically dishonest in a situation in

TABLE XXXII

SIGNIFICANT CHI SQUARE RELATIONSHIP FOR RELIGIOUS PARTICIPATION AND PERSONAL PARTICIPATION IN ACADEMIC DISHONESTY SUBSEQUENT TO IDENTIFYING WIDESPREAD DISHONESTY AMONG CLASSMATES DURING AN EXAMINATION

Religious Participation	*	Justification of Dishonest Behavior Subsequent to Identifying Widespread Academic Dishonesty						Row Total
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree		
Do Not Attend	F	12	46	42	37	43	180	
	%	1.19	4.56	4.17	3.67	4.27	17.86	
	R%	6.67	25.56	23.33	20.56	23.89		
	C%	23.53	22.22	19.72	12.67	17.55		
Attend Less than 33% of Services	F	14	85	71	102	51	323	
	%	1.39	8.43	7.04	10.12	5.06	32.04	
	R%	4.33	26.32	21.98	31.58	15.79		
	C%	27.45	41.06	33.33	34.93	20.82		
Attend Between 33% and 66% of Services	F	15	40	48	58	45	206	
	%	1.49	3.97	4.76	5.75	4.46	20.44	
	R%	7.28	19.42	23.30	28.16	21.84		
	C%	29.41	19.32	22.54	19.86	18.37		
Attend 66% or More of Services	F	10	36	52	95	106	299	
	%	0.99	3.57	5.16	9.42	10.52	29.66	
	R%	3.34	12.04	17.39	31.77	35.45		
	C%	19.61	17.39	24.41	32.53	43.27		
Column Total	F	51	207	213	292	245	1,008	
	%	5.06	20.54	21.13	28.97	24.31	100.00	

*F = frequency; % = percent of total; R% = row percent; C% = column percent.
 Chi square = 57.525; probability = 0.0001; contingency coefficient = 0.232.

TABLE XXXIII

SIGNIFICANT CHI SQUARE RELATIONSHIP FOR RELIGIOUS SATISFACTION AND PERSONAL PARTICIPATION IN ACADEMIC DISHONESTY SUBSEQUENT TO IDENTIFYING WIDESPREAD DISHONESTY AMONG CLASSMATES DURING AN EXAMINATION

Religious Satisfaction	*	Justification of Dishonest Behavior Subsequent to Identifying Widespread Academic Dishonesty						Row Total
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree		
Greatly Satisfied	F	14	40	45	88	94	281	
	%	1.39	3.96	4.46	8.72	9.32	9.32	
	R%	4.98	14.23	16.01	31.32	33.45	27.85	
	C%	27.45	19.32	21.03	30.14	38.37		
Somewhat Satisfied	F	18	93	92	119	92	414	
	%	1.78	9.22	9.12	11.79	9.12	41.03	
	R%	4.35	22.46	22.22	28.74	22.22		
	C%	35.29	44.93	42.99	40.75	37.55		
Uncertain	F	14	40	37	29	21	141	
	%	1.39	3.96	3.67	2.87	2.08	13.97	
	R%	9.93	28.37	26.24	20.57	14.89		
	C%	27.45	19.32	17.29	9.93	8.57		
Somewhat Unsatisfied	F	4	30	31	47	32	144	
	%	0.40	2.97	3.07	4.66	3.17	14.27	
	R%	2.78	20.83	21.53	32.64	22.22		
	C%	7.84	14.49	14.49	16.10	13.06		
Greatly Unsatisfied	F	1	4	9	9	6	29	
	%	0.10	0.40	0.89	0.89	0.59	2.87	
	R%	3.45	13.79	31.03	31.03	20.69		
	C%	1.96	1.93	4.21	3.08	2.45		
Column Total	F	51	207	214	292	245	1,009	
	%	5.05	20.52	21.21	28.94	24.28	100.00	

*F = frequency; % = percent of total; R% = row percent; C% = column percent.
Chi square = 47.178; probability = 0.0001; contingency coefficient = 0.211.

which their peers are engaging in widespread academic dishonesty on an examination. Students who report their religious development to be unimportant are more likely to justify equally dishonest behavior.

Although there is a significant relationship between religious participation and the concept of situationally justified academic dishonesty (Table XXXV), the data indicate that only those students whose average attendance at church services is greater than 66 per cent demonstrate a trend concerning this issue. These students exhibit a tendency to disagree with the principle of situationally justified dishonesty in contrast to the other participation groups for which no particular patterns can be determined.

There is a significant relationship between religious satisfaction and the concept of situationally justified dishonesty (Table XXXVI). The students who are most likely to agree with this concept are those who are uncertain about their religious satisfaction. Those students who feel either extreme of religious satisfaction (greatly satisfied or greatly dissatisfied) are more likely to disagree with the concept of situationally justified dishonesty.

A significant relationship exists between religious importance and the concept of situationally justified academic dishonesty (Table XXXVII). The data suggest that students who responded moderately (either somewhat important or uncertain) concerning their religious development

TABLE XXXIV

SIGNIFICANT CHI SQUARE RELATIONSHIP FOR RELIGIOUS IMPORTANCE AND PERSONAL PARTICIPATION IN ACADEMIC DISHONESTY SUBSEQUENT TO IDENTIFYING WIDESPREAD DISHONESTY AMONG CLASSMATES DURING AN EXAMINATION

Religious Importance	*	Justification of Dishonest Behavior Subsequent to Identifying Widespread Academic Dishonesty							Row Total
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Extremely Important	F	18	64	68	127	145	145	422	
	%	1.78	6.34	6.74	12.59	14.37	14.37	41.82	
	R%	4.27	15.17	16.11	30.09	34.36	34.36		
	C%	35.29	30.92	31.78	43.49	59.18	59.18		
Somewhat Important	F	14	89	87	101	64	64	355	
	%	1.39	8.82	8.62	10.01	6.34	6.34	35.18	
	R%	3.94	25.07	24.51	28.45	18.03	18.03		
	C%	27.45	43.00	40.65	34.59	26.12	26.12		
Uncertain	F	7	26	32	28	16	16	109	
	%	0.69	2.58	3.17	2.78	1.59	1.59	10.80	
	R%	6.42	23.85	29.36	25.69	14.68	14.68		
	C%	13.73	12.56	14.95	9.59	6.53	6.53		
Somewhat Unimportant	F	6	22	19	29	12	12	88	
	%	0.59	2.18	1.88	2.87	1.19	1.19	8.72	
	R%	6.82	25.00	21.59	32.95	13.64	13.64		
	C%	11.76	10.63	8.88	9.93	4.90	4.90		
Greatly Unimportant	F	6	6	8	7	8	8	35	
	%	0.59	0.59	0.79	0.69	0.79	0.79	3.47	
	R%	17.14	17.14	22.86	20.00	22.86	22.86		
	C%	11.76	2.90	3.74	2.40	3.27	3.27		
Column Total	F	51	207	214	292	245	245	1,009	
	%	5.05	20.52	21.21	28.94	24.28	24.28	100.00	

*F = frequently; % = percent of total; R% = row percent; C% = column percent.
Chi square = 67.751; probability = 0.0001; contingency coefficient = 0.251.

TABLE XXXV

SIGNIFICANT CHI SQUARE RELATIONSHIP FOR RELIGIOUS PARTICIPATION AND THE PRACTICE OF SITUATIONALLY JUSTIFIED ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

Religious Participation	*	Possibility of Situations Arising Whereby Academic Dishonesty is Situationally Justified					Row Total
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Do Not Attend	F	12	52	51	37	28	180
	%	1.19	5.16	5.06	3.67	2.78	17.86
	R%	6.67	28.89	28.33	20.56	15.56	
	C%	22.64	17.45	18.55	15.29	20.00	
Attend Less than 33% of Services	F	17	106	95	80	25	323
	%	1.69	10.52	9.42	7.94	2.48	32.04
	R%	5.26	32.82	29.41	24.77	7.74	
	C%	32.08	35.57	34.55	33.06	17.86	
Attend Between 33% and 66% of Services	F	12	69	55	46	24	206
	%	1.19	6.85	5.46	4.56	2.38	20.44
	R%	5.83	33.50	26.70	22.33	11.65	
	C%	22.64	23.15	20.00	19.01	17.14	
Attend 66% or More of Services	F	12	71	74	79	63	299
	%	1.19	7.04	7.34	7.84	6.25	29.66
	R%	4.01	23.75	24.75	26.42	21.07	
	C%	22.64	23.83	26.91	32.64	45.00	
Column Total	F	53	298	275	242	140	1,008
	%	5.26	29.56	27.28	24.01	13.89	100.00

*F = frequency; % = percent of total; R% = row percent; C% = column percent.
 Chi square = 31.646; probability = 0.0016; contingency coefficient = 0.174.

TABLE XXXVI

SIGNIFICANT CHI SQUARE RELATIONSHIP FOR RELIGIOUS SATISFACTION AND THE PRACTICE OF SITUATIONALLY JUSTIFIED ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

Religious Satisfaction	*	Possibility of Situation Arising Whereby Academic Dishonesty is Situationally Justified					Row Total
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Greatly Satisfied	F %	17 1.68	71 7.04	77 7.63	64 6.34	52 5.15	281
	R%	6.05	25.27	27.40	22.78	18.51	27.85
	C%	32.08	23.83	28.00	26.45	36.88	
Somewhat Satisfied	F %	20 1.98	132 13.08	102 10.11	108 10.70	52 5.15	414
	R%	4.83	31.88	24.64	26.09	12.56	41.03
	C%	37.74	44.30	37.09	44.63	36.88	
Uncertain	F %	5 0.50	54 5.35	44 4.36	27 2.68	11 1.09	141
	R%	3.55	38.30	31.21	19.15	7.80	13.97
	C%	9.43	18.12	16.00	11.16	7.80	
Somewhat Unsatisfied	F %	9 0.89	35 3.47	47 4.66	33 3.27	20 1.98	144
	R%	6.25	24.31	32.64	22.92	13.89	14.27
	C%	16.98	11.74	17.09	13.64	14.18	
Greatly Unsatisfied	F %	2 0.20	6 0.59	5 0.50	10 0.99	6 0.59	29
	R%	6.90	20.69	17.24	34.48	20.69	2.87
	C%	3.77	2.01	1.82	4.13	4.26	
Column Total	F %	53 5.25	298 29.53	275 27.25	242 23.98	141 13.97	1,009
	%						100.00

*F = frequency; % = percent of total; R% = row percent; C% = column percent.
Chi square = 27.619; probability = 0.0351; contingency coefficient = 0.163.

are more likely to accept the concept of situationally justified academic dishonesty. The students who indicate either extreme of religious development (important or unimportant) are most likely to reject the concept of situationally justified academic dishonesty.

Research question twenty-one d.--This research question seeks to determine if students who have common religious patterns will demonstrate similar behavior patterns concerning their personal practices of academically dishonest activity in relation to participation, origin, degree of expertise, frequency, and methodology. In order to answer this question, each of the religious variables was correlated with survey questions 36, 37, 38, 39, and 41. Summary Table XXVI indicates that of the 20 chi square tests, 9 are statistically significant.

In regard to student participation in academically dishonest activities and the religious variables, religious satisfaction and religious importance are statistically significant. Table XXXVIII data reveal that those students who are greatly satisfied with their religious involvement are far less likely to participate in academic dishonesty than those who are less satisfied with their religious involvement.

Also in regard to the issue of participation in academically dishonest behavior, Table XXXIX data revealed

TABLE XXXVII

SIGNIFICANT CHI SQUARE RELATIONSHIP FOR RELIGIOUS IMPORTANCE AND THE PRACTICE OF SITUATIONALLY JUSTIFIED ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

Religious Importance	*	Possibility of Situation Arising Whereby Academic Dishonesty is Situationally Justified						Row Total
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree		
Extremely Important	F	19	97	116	106	84	422	
	%	1.88	9.61	11.50	10.51	8.33		
	R%	4.50	22.99	27.49	25.12	19.91	41.82	
	C%	35.85	32.55	42.18	43.80	59.57		
Somewhat Important	F	20	130	91	82	32	355	
	%	1.98	12.88	9.02	8.13	3.17		
	R%	5.63	36.62	25.63	23.10	9.01	35.18	
	C%	37.74	43.62	33.09	33.88	22.70		
Uncertain	F	6	35	29	29	10	109	
	%	0.59	3.47	2.87	2.87	0.99		
	R%	5.50	32.11	26.61	26.61	9.17	10.80	
	C%	11.32	11.74	10.55	11.98	7.09		
Somewhat Unimportant	F	4	28	30	18	8	88	
	%	0.40	2.78	2.97	1.78	0.79		
	R%	4.55	31.82	34.09	20.45	9.09	8.72	
	C%	7.55	9.40	10.91	7.44	5.67		
Extremely Unimportant	F	4	8	9	7	7	35	
	%	0.40	0.79	0.89	0.69	0.69		
	R%	11.43	22.86	25.71	20.00	20.00	3.47	
	C%	7.55	2.68	3.27	2.89	4.96		
Column Total	F	53	298	275	242	141	1,009	
	%	5.25	29.53	27.25	23.98	13.97	100.00	

*F = frequency; % = percent of total; R% = row percent; C% = column percent.
 Chi square = 40.611; probability = 0.0006; contingency coefficient = 0.197.

TABLE XXXVIII
SIGNIFICANT CHI SQUARE RELATIONSHIP FOR RELIGIOUS
SATISFACTION AND PARTICIPATION IN
DISHONEST ACADEMIC ACTIVITIES

Religious Satisfaction	*	Participated in Academic Dishonesty		Row Total
		Yes	No	
Greatly Satisfied	F	145	136	281
	%	14.37	13.48	27.85
	R%	51.60	48.40	
	C%	22.94	36.07	
Somewhat Satisfied	F	273	141	414
	%	26.06	13.97	41.03
	R%	65.94	34.06	
	C%	43.20	37.40	
Uncertain	F	89	52	141
	%	8.82	5.15	13.97
	R%	63.12	36.88	
	C%	14.08	13.79	
Somewhat Satisfied	F	106	38	144
	%	10.51	3.77	14.27
	R%	73.61	26.39	
	C%	16.77	10.08	
Greatly Unsatisfied	F	19	10	29
	%	1.88	0.99	2.87
	R%	65.52	34.48	
	C%	3.01	2.65	
Column Total	F	632	377	1,009
	%	62.64	37.36	100.00

*F = frequency; % = percent of total; R% = row percent; C% = column percent.

Chi square = 24.082; probability = 0.0001; contingency coefficient = 0.153.

a significant relationship with religious importance. Similar to the previous findings, those students who feel that their religious development is extremely important are less likely to participate in academically dishonest behavior; those students whose religious development is less important are more likely to participate in academically dishonest behavior.

TABLE XXXIX

SIGNIFICANT CHI SQUARE RELATIONSHIP FOR RELIGIOUS
IMPORTANCE AND PARTICIPATION IN
DISHONEST ACADEMIC ACTIVITIES

Religious Importance	*	Participated in Academic Dishonesty		Row Total
		Yes	No	
Extremely Important	F	246	176	422
	%	24.38	17.44	41.82
	R%	58.29	41.71	
	C%	38.92	46.68	
Somewhat Important	F	234	121	355
	%	23.19	11.99	35.18
	R%	65.92	34.08	
	C%	37.03	32.10	
Uncertain	F	71	38	109
	%	7.04	3.77	10.80
	R%	65.14	34.86	
	C%	11.23	10.08	
Somewhat Unimportant	F	63	25	88
	%	6.24	2.48	8.72
	R%	71.59	28.41	
	C%	9.97	6.63	
Extremely Unimportant	F	18	17	35
	%	1.78	1.68	3.47
	R%	51.43	48.57	
	C%	2.85	4.51	
Column Total	F	632	377	1,009
	%	62.64	37.36	100.00

*F = frequency; % = percent of total; R% = row percent; C% = column percent.

Chi square = 10.216; probability = 0.0369; contingency coefficient = 0.100.

Concerning the origin of the first dishonest incident, Summary Table XXVI data show that this variable is significantly related to both religious participation and religious satisfaction. Table XL data reveal that the more often students attend church, the greater the likelihood that their first dishonest activity occurred later in their

academic life (college), while those who attend church less frequently are more likely to have participated in academically dishonest behavior at an earlier academic level (elementary or high school).

Furthermore, Table XLI data show that there is a significant relationship between origin of first dishonest incident and religious satisfaction. Although no particular overall pattern of relationships emerges, there appears to be a tendency for those students who are greatly satisfied with their religious involvement. All academic levels are below the expected frequencies of first dishonest incident for those students who are greatly satisfied with their religious involvement.

Religious participation and religious importance were found to be significantly related to the degree of expertise students have achieved in dishonest behavior (Summary Table XXVI). This characteristic was measured from student responses concerning whether or not they have been caught participating in an academically dishonest activity. Table XLII data show that as students' church attendance increases, the chances decrease of being caught in an academically dishonest incident. These data indicate that students whose religious participation is high are more likely to be successful in their academically dishonest activities.

TABLE XI

SIGNIFICANT CHI SQUARE RELATIONSHIP FOR RELIGIOUS PARTICIPATION AND ORIGIN OF FIRST ACADEMICALLY DISHONEST INCIDENT

Religious Participation	*	Origin of First Dishonest Incident				Row Total
		Elementary School	High School	College	Not Applicable	
Do Not Attend	F	55	71	21	33	180
	%	5.46	7.04	2.08	3.27	17.86
	R%	30.56	39.44	11.67	18.33	
	C%	17.08	17.03	19.44	20.50	
Attend Less than 33% of Services	F	105	145	23	50	323
	%	10.42	14.38	2.28	4.96	32.04
	R%	32.51	44.89	7.12	15.48	
	C%	32.61	34.77	21.30	31.06	
Attend Between 33% and 66% of Services	F	59	99	25	23	206
	%	5.85	9.82	2.48	2.28	20.44
	R%	28.64	48.06	12.14	11.17	
	C%	18.32	23.74	23.15	14.29	
Attend 66% or More of Services	F	103	102	39	55	299
	%	10.22	10.12	3.87	5.46	29.66
	R%	34.45	34.11	13.04	18.39	
	C%	31.99	24.46	36.11	34.16	
Column Total	F	322	417	108	161	1,008
	%	31.94	41.37	10.71	15.97	100.00

*F = frequency; % = percent of total; R% = row percent; C% = column percent.
 Chi square = 19.298; probability = 0.0228; contingency coefficient = 0.137.

TABLE XLI

SIGNIFICANT CHI SQUARE RELATIONSHIP FOR RELIGIOUS SATISFACTION AND ORIGIN OF FIRST ACADEMICALLY DISHONEST INCIDENT

Religious Satisfaction	*	Origin of First Dishonest Incident						Row Total
		Elementary School	High School	College	Applicable	Not Applicable	Total	
Greatly Satisfied	F	87	109	23	62		281	
	%	8.62	10.80	2.28	6.14		27.85	
	R%	30.96	38.79	8.19	22.06			
	C%	27.02	26.08	21.30	38.51			
Somewhat Satisfied	F	124	187	48	55		414	
	%	12.29	18.53	4.76	5.45		41.03	
	R%	29.95	45.17	11.59	13.29			
	C%	38.51	44.74	44.44	34.16			
Uncertain	F	54	50	16	21		141	
	%	5.35	4.96	1.59	2.08		13.97	
	R%	38.30	35.46	11.35	14.89			
	C%	16.77	11.96	14.81	13.04			
Somewhat Unsatisfied	F	46	66	16	16		144	
	%	4.56	6.54	1.59	1.59		14.27	
	R%	31.94	45.83	11.11	11.11			
	C%	14.29	15.79	14.81	9.94			
Greatly Unsatisfied	F	11	6	5	7		29	
	%	1.09	0.59	0.50	0.69		2.87	
	R%	37.93	20.69	17.24	24.14			
	C%	3.42	1.44	4.63	4.35			
Column Total	F	322	418	108	161		1,009	
	%	31.91	41.43	10.70	15.96		100.00	

*F = frequency; % = percent of total; R% = row percent; C% = column percent.
 Chi square = 24.540; probability = 0.0172; contingency coefficient = 0.154.

TABLE XLII

SIGNIFICANT CHI SQUARE RELATIONSHIP FOR RELIGIOUS
PARTICIPATION AND DEGREE OF EXPERTISE
IN ACADEMICALLY DISHONEST BEHAVIOR

Religious Participation	*	Caught Being Academically Dishonest			Row Total
		Yes	No	not Applicable	
Do Not Attend	F	48	95	37	180
	%	4.76	9.42	3.67	17.86
	R%	26.67	52.78	20.56	
	C%	19.75	15.94	21.89	
Attend Less than 33% of Services	F	93	180	50	323
	%	9.23	17.86	4.96	32.04
	R%	28.79	55.73	15.48	
	C%	38.27	30.20	29.59	
Attend Between 33% and 66% of Services	F	47	132	27	206
	%	4.66	13.10	2.68	20.44
	R%	22.82	64.08	13.11	
	C%	19.34	22.15	15.98	
Attend 66% or More of Services	F	55	189	55	299
	%	5.46	18.75	5.46	29.66
	R%	18.39	63.21	18.39	
	C%	22.63	31.71	32.54	
Column Total	F	243	596	169	1,008
	%	24.11	59.13	16.77	100.00

*F = frequency; % = percent of total; R% = row percent; C% = column percent.

Chi square = 15.155; probability = 0.0191; contingency coefficient = 0.1222.

Table XLIII data reveal that students who consider their religious development to be more important are less likely to be caught participating in an academically dishonest incident. In addition, students who consider their religious development to be unimportant are more likely to be caught in an academically dishonest incident.

Two religious variables were found to be significantly related to recent frequency of academically dishonest

TABLE XLIII

SIGNIFICANT CHI SQUARE RELATIONSHIP FOR RELIGIOUS
IMPORTANCE AND DEGREE OF EXPERTISE IN
ACADEMICALLY DISHONEST BEHAVIOR

Religious Importance	*	Caught Being Academically Dishonest			Row Total
		Yes	No	Not Applicable	
Extremely Important	F	81	264	77	422
	%	8.03	26.16	7.63	41.82
	R%	19.19	62.56	18.25	
-----	C%	33.33	44.22	45.56	
	F	88	218	49	355
	%	8.72	21.61	4.86	35.18
Somewhat Important	R%	24.79	61.41	13.80	
	C%	36.21	36.52	28.99	
	F	33	56	20	109
Uncertain	%	3.27	5.55	1.98	10.80
	R%	30.28	51.38	18.35	
	C%	13.58	9.38	11.83	
Somewhat Unimportant	F	25	49	14	88
	%	2.48	4.86	1.39	8.72
	R%	28.41	55.68	15.91	
-----	C%	10.29	8.21	8.28	
	F	16	10	9	35
	%	1.59	0.99	0.89	3.47
Extremely Unimportant	R%	45.71	28.57	25.71	
	C%	6.58	1.68	5.33	
	F	243	597	169	1,009
Column Total	%	24.08	59.17	16.75	100.00

*F = frequency; % = percent of total; R% = row percent;
C% = column percent.

Chi square = 25.727; probability = 0.0012; contingency
coefficient = 0.158.

behavior. Summary Table XXVI data show that these variables are religious satisfaction and religious importance. Table XLIV data show that as students' satisfaction concerning their religious involvement increases, the recent frequency of academic dishonesty decreases (for the 1981-1982 academic year). Those who are either satisfied or greatly satisfied

TABLE XLIV

SIGNIFICANT CHI SQUARE RELATIONSHIP FOR RELIGIOUS SATISFACTION AND FREQUENCY OF ACADEMICALLY
DISHONEST BEHAVIOR DURING THE PAST ACADEMIC YEAR (1981-1982)

Religious Satisfaction	*	Frequency of Dishonesty During Past Academic Year (1981-1982)					Row Total
		Never	1-5 Times	6-10 Times	10+ Times		
Greatly Satisfied	F	158	109	8	6	281	
	%	15.66	10.80	0.79	0.59	27.85	
	R%	56.23	38.79	2.85	2.14		
	C%	33.12	23.14	20.00	28.57		
Somewhat Satisfied	F	184	206	17	7	414	
	%	18.24	20.42	1.68	0.69	41.03	
	R%	44.44	49.76	4.11	1.69		
	C%	38.57	43.74	42.50	33.33		
Uncertain	F	67	64	5	5	141	
	%	6.64	6.34	0.50	0.50	13.97	
	R%	47.52	45.39	3.55	3.55		
	C%	14.05	13.59	12.50	23.81		
Somewhat Unsatisfied	F	54	77	10	3	144	
	%	5.35	7.63	0.99	0.30	14.27	
	R%	37.50	53.47	6.94	2.08		
	C%	11.32	16.35	25.00	14.29		
Greatly Unsatisfied	F	14	15	0	0	29	
	%	1.39	1.49	0	0	2.87	
	R%	48.28	51.72	0	0		
	C%	2.94	3.18	0	0		
Column Total	F	477	471	40	21	1,009	
	%	47.27	46.68	3.96	2.08	100.00	

*F = frequency; % = percent of total; R% = row percent; C% = column percent.
Chi square = 22.312; probability = 0.0342; contingency coefficient = 0.147.

with their religious involvement are less likely to have been academically dishonest at college during the 1981-1982 academic year.

A similar finding is presented in Table XLV; these data show that as importance of religious development increases, the frequency of recent academically dishonest activities decreases. Students who consider their religious development to be important are less likely to have participated in recent academically dishonest activities than those who view their religious development to be unimportant.

The only religious variable found to be significantly related to the selected methods of academic dishonesty is religious importance (see Summary Table XXVI). Table XLVI data show that although no particular overall pattern of relationship can be determined (because methods of academic dishonesty are not continuous variables), individual trends do emerge. Those who believe their spiritual development to be extremely important are more likely to give the school false information and least likely to plagiarize; those who consider their spiritual development to be somewhat important are more likely to plagiarize and least likely to furnish the school with false information; those who believe their spiritual development to be either somewhat or extremely unimportant are more likely to use unauthorized books or notes to further their academic cause.

TABLE XLV
 SIGNIFICANT CHI SQUARE RELATIONSHIP FOR RELIGIOUS IMPORTANCE AND FREQUENCY OF ACADEMICALLY
 DISHONEST BEHAVIOR DURING THE PAST ACADEMIC YEAR (1981-1982)

Religious Importance	*	Frequency of Dishonesty During Past Academic Year (1981-1982)					Row Total
		Never	1-5 Times	6-10 Times	10+ Times		
Extremely Important	F	224	182	9	7	422	
	%	22.20	18.04	0.89	0.69	41.82	
	R%	53.08	43.13	2.13	1.66		
	C%	46.96	38.64	22.50	33.33		
Somewhat Important	F	150	181	17	7	355	
	%	14.87	17.94	1.68	0.69	35.18	
	R%	42.25	50.99	4.79	1.97		
	C%	31.45	38.43	42.50	33.33		
Uncertain	F	46	55	4	4	109	
	%	4.56	5.45	0.40	0.40	10.80	
	R%	42.20	50.46	3.67	3.67		
	C%	9.64	11.68	10.00	19.05		
Somewhat Unimportant	F	37	42	7	2	88	
	%	3.67	4.16	0.69	0.20	8.72	
	R%	42.05	47.73	7.95	2.27		
	C%	7.76	8.92	17.50	9.52		
Extremely Unimportant	F	20	11	3	1	35	
	%	1.98	1.09	0.30	0.10	3.47	
	R%	57.14	31.43	8.57	2.86		
	C%	4.19	2.34	7.50	4.76		
Column Total	F	477	471	40	21	1,009	
	%	47.27	46.68	3.96	2.08	100.00	

*F = frequency; % = percent of total; R% = row percent; C% = column percent.
 Chi square = 22.807; probability = 0.0294; contingency coefficient = 0.149.

TABLE XLVI

SIGNIFICANT CHI SQUARE RELATIONSHIP FOR RELIGIOUS IMPORTANCE AND MOST FREQUENTLY USED METHODS OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

Religious Importance	*	Methods of Academic Dishonesty										Row Total
		Crib Notes	Plagiarize	Turned in Others' Work	Copied Test Answers	Used Unauthorized Books - Notes	Gave False Information to School	None	Other			
Extremely Important	F	53	27	30	104	17	12	98	81	422		
	%	5.25	2.68	2.97	10.31	1.68	1.19	9.71	8.03	41.82		
	R%	12.56	6.40	7.11	24.64	4.03	2.84	23.22	19.19			
	C%	35.81	28.42	38.46	38.52	48.57	54.55	48.04	51.59			
Somewhat Important	F	51	46	31	100	8	4	61	54	355		
	%	5.05	4.56	3.07	9.91	0.79	0.40	6.05	5.35	35.18		
	R%	14.37	12.96	8.73	28.17	2.25	1.13	17.18	15.21			
	C%	34.46	48.42	39.74	37.04	22.86	18.18	29.90	34.39			
Uncertain	F	23	9	11	28	3	3	21	11	109		
	%	2.28	0.89	1.09	2.78	0.30	0.30	2.08	1.09	10.80		
	R%	21.10	8.26	10.09	25.69	2.75	2.75	19.27	10.09			
	C%	15.54	9.47	14.10	10.37	8.57	13.64	10.29	7.01			
Somewhat Unimportant	F	18	9	3	27	5	2	13	11	88		
	%	1.78	0.89	0.30	2.68	0.50	0.20	1.29	1.09	9.72		
	R%	20.45	10.23	3.41	30.68	5.68	2.27	14.77	12.50			
	C%	12.16	9.47	3.85	10.00	14.29	9.09	6.37	7.01			
Extremely Unimportant	F	3	4	3	11	2	1	11	0	35		
	%	0.30	0.40	0.30	1.09	0.20	0.10	1.09	0	3.47		
	R%	8.57	11.43	8.57	31.43	5.71	2.86	31.43	0			
	C%	2.03	4.21	3.85	4.07	5.71	4.55	5.39	0			
Column Total	F	148	95	78	270	35	22	204	157	1,009		
	%	14.67	9.42	7.73	26.76	3.47	2.18	20.22	15.56	100.00		

*F = frequency; % = percent of total; R% = row percent; C% = column percent.
 Chi square = 47.276; probability = 0.0128; contingency coefficient = 0.212.

Research question twenty-one e.--This research question seeks to find out if those students who express common religious patterns will demonstrate similar attitudes regarding punishment for those who aid or support the academically dishonest student. Summary Table XXVII data show that religious importance is the only statistically significant religious variable. Table XLVII data indicate that as the importance for spiritual development increases, so also does the likelihood for agreement to punish both the academic deceiver and the student accomplice. In general, those students who are unconcerned about their spiritual development are more likely to be lenient concerning punishment for those who aid the student deceiver than those whose spiritual development is more important.

Research question twenty-one f.--This research question seeks to determine if students with common religious patterns will demonstrate similar attitudes regarding punishments for those involved in certain academically dishonest incidents. In order to answer this question, each of the religious variables was correlated with survey questions 43 to 47, which were the selected methods of academic dishonesty. Although twenty chi square correlations were tested, as Summary Table XXVI data indicate, only two correlations are statistically significant.

TABLE XLVII

SIGNIFICANT CHI SQUARE RELATIONSHIP FOR RELIGIOUS IMPORTANCE AND PUNISHMENT FOR THOSE WHO AID
OR SUPPORT THE ACADEMICALLY DISHONEST STUDENT

Religious Importance	*	Both Dishonest Student and Accomplice Should Be Punished for Academic Dishonesty						Total
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree		
Extremely Important	F	74	156	97	64	30	421	
	%	7.37	15.48	9.62	6.35	2.98		
	R%	17.58	37.05	23.04	15.20	7.13	41.77	
	C%	51.03	43.33	38.65	34.22	46.15		
Somewhat Important	F	41	130	94	69	21	355	
	%	4.07	12.90	9.33	6.85	2.08		
	R%	11.55	36.62	26.48	19.44	5.92	35.22	
	C%	28.28	36.11	37.45	36.90	32.31		
Uncertain	F	14	28	37	24	6	109	
	%	1.39	2.78	3.67	2.38	0.60		
	R%	12.84	25.69	33.94	22.02	5.50	10.81	
	C%	9.66	7.78	14.74	12.83	9.23		
Somewhat Unimportant	F	10	36	13	24	5	88	
	%	0.99	3.57	1.29	2.38	0.50		
	R%	11.36	40.91	14.77	27.27	5.68	8.73	
	C%	6.90	10.00	5.18	12.83	7.69		
Extremely Unimportant	F	6	10	10	6	3	35	
	%	0.60	0.99	0.99	0.60	0.30		
	R%	17.14	28.57	28.57	17.14	8.57	3.47	
	C%	4.14	2.78	3.98	3.21	4.62		
Column Total	F	145	360	251	187	65	1,008	
	%	14.38	35.71	24.90	18.55	6.45	100.00	

*F = frequency; % = percent of total; R% = row percent; C% = column percent.
Chi square = 26.731; probability = 0.0446; contingency coefficient = 0.161.

Table XLVIII data show that there is a significant relationship between religious satisfaction and recommended punishments for those who are caught turning in work completed by others. Those students who indicated either extreme of religious satisfaction (extremely satisfied or extremely unsatisfied) are more likely to recommend a severe punishment (fail course or expel from school). In comparison, those most likely to recommend a lenient punishment (no punishment or a warning) for turning in work completed by others are the moderately religious students. In general, the moderates tend to be lenient concerning punishment, while those who have strong feelings concerning their religious involvement (either satisfied or unsatisfied) are inclined to endorse a more severe punishment for those who turn in work completed by others.

Table XLIX data show that there is a significant relationship between religious importance and recommended punishments for copying answers during a test or examination. As importance of religious development increases, the severity of recommended punishment decreases for those who copy answers during exams. Overall, there is a tendency for those whose religious development is important to be more lenient concerning punishment; however, those students for whom their religious development is extremely unimportant recommend no punishment for those who copy answers during a test or examination.

TABLE XLVIII

SIGNIFICANT CHI SQUARE RELATIONSHIP FOR RELIGIOUS SATISFACTION AND RECOMMENDED PUNISHMENT FOR THOSE WHO TURN IN WORK COMPLETED BY OTHERS

Religious Satisfaction	*	Recommended Punishment for Those Who Turn In Work Completed by Others							Row Total
		No Punishment	Warning	Fail Test	Fail Course	Expelled	Row Total		
Greatly Satisfied	F	10	67	144	46	13	280		
	%	0.99	6.65	14.29	4.56	1.29	27.78		
	R%	3.57	23.93	51.43	16.43	4.64			
	C%	23.81	26.07	28.07	27.22	48.15			
Somewhat Satisfied	F	21	115	192	77	9	414		
	%	2.08	11.41	19.05	7.64	0.89	41.07		
	R%	5.07	27.78	46.38	18.60	2.17			
	C%	50.00	44.75	37.43	45.56	33.33			
Uncertain	F	7	34	75	23	2	141		
	%	0.69	3.37	7.44	2.28	0.20	13.99		
	R%	4.96	24.11	53.19	16.31	1.42			
	C%	16.67	13.23	14.62	13.61	7.41			
Somewhat Unsatisfied	F	2	40	86	14	2	144		
	%	0.20	3.97	8.53	1.39	0.20	14.29		
	R%	1.39	27.78	59.72	9.72	1.39			
	C%	4.76	15.56	16.76	8.28	7.41			
Greatly Unsatisfied	F	2	1	16	9	1	29		
	%	0.20	0.10	1.59	0.89	0.10	2.88		
	R%	6.90	3.45	55.17	31.03	3.45			
	C%	4.76	0.39	3.12	5.33	3.70			
Column Total	F	42	257	513	169	27	1,008		
	%	4.17	25.50	50.89	16.77	2.68	100.00		

*F = frequency; % = percent of total; R% = row percent; C% = column percent.
 Chi square = 30.500; probability = 0.0156; contingency coefficient = 0.171.

TABLE XLIX
 SIGNIFICANT CHI SQUARE RELATIONSHIP FOR RELIGIOUS IMPORTANCE AND RECOMMENDED PUNISHMENT FOR
 THOSE WHO COPIED ANSWERS DURING TEST

Religious Importance	*	Recommended Punishment for Those Who Copied						Row Total
		No Punishment	Warning	Fail Test	Fail Course	Expelled	Total	
Extremely Important	F	11	73	297	33	8	422	
	%	1.09	7.23	29.44	3.27	0.79	41.82	
	R%	2.61	17.30	70.38	7.82	1.90		
	C%	55.00	32.74	44.66	41.25	38.10		
Somewhat Important	F	5	104	220	19	7	355	
	%	0.50	10.31	21.80	1.88	0.69	35.18	
	R%	1.41	29.30	61.97	5.35	1.97		
	C%	25.00	46.64	33.08	23.75	33.33		
Uncertain	F	1	27	64	13	4	109	
	%	0.10	2.68	6.34	1.29	0.40	10.80	
	R%	0.92	24.77	58.72	11.93	3.67		
	C%	5.00	12.11	9.62	16.25	19.05		
Somewhat Unimportant	F	0	11	66	11	0	88	
	%	0	1.09	6.54	1.09	0	8.72	
	R%	0	12.50	75.00	12.50	0		
	C%	0	4.93	9.92	13.75	0		
Extremely Unimportant	F	3	8	18	4	2	35	
	%	0.30	0.79	1.78	0.40	0.20	3.47	
	R%	8.57	22.86	51.43	11.43	5.71		
	C%	15.00	3.59	2.71	5.00	9.52		
Column Total	F	20	223	665	80	21	1,009	
	%	1.98	22.10	65.91	7.93	2.08	100.00	

*F = frequency; % = percent of total; R% = row percent; C% = column percent.
 Chi square = 46.890; probability = 0.0001; contingency coefficient = 0.211.

Summary of Data Findings

This summary of data findings is presented according to demographic and religious background findings, and attitude and behavior findings and their relationships with the four religious variables.

Demographic and Religious Background Findings

The following findings are related to the demographic data and religious background data of the student population:

1. Of the 1,009 students who participated in this study, 59 per cent were female, 77 per cent were white Americans, 97 per cent were unmarried, 59 per cent were freshmen and sophomores, 53 per cent had a GPA between 2.6 and 3.5, 34 per cent were business majors, and 77 per cent had no panhellenic affiliation;
2. Although no one religious denomination predominated, 56 per cent of the respondents were either Baptist (23 per cent), Roman Catholic (18 per cent), or Methodist (15 per cent); only 6 per cent of the population responded that they were agnostics or atheists;
3. Although 82 per cent of the student respondents attend church, only 30 per cent attend two-thirds or more of their church's services;
4. Only 28 per cent of the student respondents are greatly satisfied with their present religious involvement,

although 41 per cent are somewhat satisfied; 28 per cent are either uncertain or somewhat dissatisfied with their present religious involvement, and only 3 per cent are greatly unsatisfied;

5. Seventy-seven per cent of the student population responded that their religious (spiritual) development is either extremely important (42 per cent) or somewhat important (35 per cent).

Attitude and Behavior Findings

The following findings are concerned with the attitudes and behavior of the student population in regard to academic dishonesty and the influence of the religious variables on such attitudes and behavior:

6. Actual frequency of academic dishonesty among student respondents.--The majority of the students (63 per cent) have been academically dishonest while in college. Although 53 per cent were academically dishonest during the 1981-1982 academic year (47 per cent between 1 and 5 times), 47 per cent were not academically dishonest during this period. The majority of the students (73 per cent) also admit that they were academically dishonest for the first time in elementary (32 per cent) and high school (41 per cent); 10 per cent of the students were academically dishonest for the first time in college.

7. The affect of religious affiliation, participation, satisfaction, or importance on academic dishonesty.--Chi square values indicate that the students who are presently satisfied with their religious involvement and who acknowledge the importance of their religious development are much less likely to have been academically dishonest. As religious satisfaction and importance increase among the students, the incidence of recent academic dishonesty (for 1981-1982) decreases. The more often students attend church (participation) and the more satisfied they are with their religious involvement, the longer (later in their academic careers) they appear to be able to resist being academically dishonest.

8. Respondents' observations of academic dishonesty.--Eighty-five per cent of the students have witnessed some form of academic dishonesty in college; 56 per cent have observed forms of academic dishonesty between 1 and 5 times. During the 1981-1982 academic year, 53 per cent of the respondents have witnessed less than 15 per cent of their peers participating in some form of academic dishonesty.

9. Perceptions of respondents regarding incidence of academic dishonesty.--Ninety-eight per cent of the respondents believe that their peers have been academically dishonest at some point in their academic careers. The majority of the respondents (72 per cent) also believe

that more than 15 per cent of their classmates have engaged in unobserved academically dishonest activities during the 1981-1982 academic year, while 77 per cent believe that a certain percentage of their peers will be academically dishonest regardless of class conditions or academic demands. Only 15 per cent of the respondents believe that the frequency of academic dishonesty is declining compared to when they first entered college.

10. Students' reactions to observed incidents of academic dishonesty.--Forty-two per cent of the respondents would be disturbed but take no action following an observed academically dishonest incident; 24 per cent would not be disturbed and would take no action; 18 per cent would be disturbed, but any action taken would depend on their knowledge of and feelings toward the dishonest student.

11. The affect of religious affiliation, participation, satisfaction, or importance on students' reaction to observed incident of academic dishonesty.--Chi square values indicate that as students' participation in church services and importance of religious development increases, the greater the likelihood that they will report the incident; students who are unconcerned about these religious variables would not be disturbed and take no action.

12. Respondents' reasons for not reporting observed academically dishonest incident.--Mean responses indicate

that students would not report an observed incident because (1) they would be uncomfortable reporting on a fellow student, (2) they do not want to be involved, and (3) they feel that such matters are the faculty's responsibility, not theirs.

13. The affect of religious affiliation, participation, satisfaction, or importance on students' reasons for not reporting observed academically dishonest incident.--Chi square values indicate that as satisfaction with religious involvement and importance of religious development increase, so does the likelihood that the student will report the academic dishonesty of a friend. Students who have strong feelings (either high or low) regarding religious satisfaction are more likely to become involved following observed academic dishonesty.

14. Respondents' perceptions of the reasons for academic dishonesty.--Mean responses indicate that the reasons for academic dishonesty are (1) inadequate preparation by the student, (2) student's lack of interest in and applicability of the subject matter, and (3) students feel that those who are academically dishonest seldom get caught. As mentioned previously, students also feel that a certain percentage of students will be academically dishonest regardless of class conditions and academic demands.

15. Respondents' perceptions of causes of academic dishonesty in relation to course grades.--Ninety-one per

cent of the respondents believe that students are academically dishonest because they want to raise their poor grades in the course. The second most probable reason (72 per cent) is to keep a poor grade in the course from getting worse.

16. Respondents' perception of the concept of situationally justified academic dishonesty.--The mean score indicates that the respondents are undecided concerning an occasion or situation that would justify academic dishonesty.

17. The affect of religious affiliation, participation, satisfaction, or importance on students' perception of the concept of situationally justified academic dishonesty. Chi square values indicate that those students who attend greater than 66 per cent of their churches' services tend to disagree with this concept. Students who are greatly satisfied or greatly dissatisfied with their present religious involvement also tend to disagree with this concept; the moderately satisfied students tend to agree with this concept. As the importance of students' religious development increased, the greater the likelihood that students will disagree with this concept.

18. Respondents' reaction to situationally justified personal academic dishonesty.--When the respondents were presented with a situation in which they recognized widespread dishonesty activities by their peers on an examination, and if they knew they would not be caught, 53 per

cent of the students would not feel justified in being equally dishonest although 26 per cent would feel justified in responding with equally dishonest behavior.

19. The affect of religious affiliation, participation, satisfaction, or importance on situationally justified personal academic dishonesty.--Chi square values indicate that the more frequently students attend church (participation), the more satisfied they are with their religious involvement, and the more importance they ascribe to their religious development, the less likely they are to feel personally justified to participate in widespread academic dishonesty.

20. Respondents' perceptions and use of methods for collegiate academic deception.--Mean responses indicate that the most commonly perceived and personally used methods of collegiate academic deception are (1) copying answers during test or examination, (2) using crib notes, (3) plagiarising, and (4) turning in work completed by others. No particular patterns emerged in the chi square correlations of these variables with the religious variables.

21. Respondents' recommended punishments for selected methods of academic deception.--The most frequently recommended punishment for all methods of academic dishonesty is a failing grade on the test or examination, followed by the issuance of a warning to the student deceiver by the professor.

22. The affect of religious affiliation, participation, satisfaction, or importance on recommended punishments for academic dishonesty.--Chi square values indicate that those students who are either greatly satisfied or greatly dissatisfied with their religious involvement recommend the more severe punishments for incidents of academic dishonesty.

23. Respondents' recommended punishment for the student accomplice in academic dishonesty.--Fifty per cent of the respondents agree that the student accomplice also should be punished; however, 25 per cent of the respondents disagree, and 25 per cent are uncertain about punishment for the student accomplice.

24. The affect of religious affiliation, participation, satisfaction, or importance on recommended punishment for the student accomplice.--Chi square values indicate that the more importance that students attach to their religious development, the more likely they are to recommend a more severe form of punishment for the student accomplice.

25. The incidence rate for student apprehension as the result of an academically dishonest incident.--Of the 83 per cent of the respondents who have been academically dishonest (on all school levels), 71 per cent have never been apprehended; in other words, only 29 per cent of the students who have been academically dishonest have been caught at any time.

26. The affect of religious affiliation, participation, satisfaction, or importance on student apprehension for academic dishonesty.--Chi square values indicate that as church attendance (participation) and importance of religious development increases, the likelihood decreases of students being caught participating in an academically dishonest activity.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, INFERENCES, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Introduction

In this chapter, the problem, purposes, methods, analyses of data, and principle data findings are summarized, followed by the conclusions which were formulated and based upon the results of the study. Also presented are inferences drawn from the conclusions, which are compared to research findings in the literature. Finally, recommendations for further research are suggested.

Summary

The problem with which this research is concerned was to study and determine the role of academic dishonesty among selected institutions of higher education. The purposes of this research were (1) to determine student attitudes concerning the cause, frequency, method, and punishment of academically dishonest behavior, (2) to determine current behavioral patterns concerning the origin, method, frequency, and student reactions to academically dishonest behavior, and (3) to determine the

role of denominational affiliation, religious participation, satisfaction with religious involvement, and importance of religious development in relationship to the practice of academically dishonest behavior.

Following an investigation of the related literature and discussions with research committee members, a survey instrument was developed. Prior to distribution to the study population, the survey instrument was used in a pilot study at an institution of higher education selected for this purpose. Following the recommendations of the research committee and pilot-study subjects, the survey instrument was revised and refined.

The survey instrument was distributed and collected by residence hall staff and panhellenic officers; 1,540 randomly selected students from three institutions of higher education were surveyed, of which 1,009 returned complete and usable surveys. This represents a 65.5 per cent return rate.

Following the collection of the data, the subjects' responses were analyzed in order to answer each of the 21 research questions. Answering research questions 1 through 17, 19, and 20 required the use of percentages, means, medians, and standard deviations. The chi-square statistical test was used to determine significant differences or correlations for research questions 18 and 21. Seventy-seven individual correlations were tested for significant

associations at the .05 level of significance, producing 24 statistically significant relationships. Summary data were presented for the research questions, although only the statistically significant correlations were individually presented and discussed.

Summary of Data Findings

This summary of data findings is presented according to demographic and religious background findings, and attitude and behavior findings and their relationships with the four religious variables.

Demographic and Religious Background Findings

The following findings are related to the demographic data and religious background data of the student population:

1. Of the 1,009 students who participated in this study, 59 per cent were female, 77 per cent were white Americans, 97 per cent were unmarried; 59 per cent were freshmen and sophomores, 53 per cent had a GPA between 2.6 and 3.5, 34 per cent were business majors, and 77 per cent had no panhellenic affiliation;

2. Although no one religious denomination predominated, 56 per cent of the respondents were either Baptist (23 per cent), Roman Catholic (18 per cent), or Methodist (15 per cent); only 6 per cent of the population responded that they were agnostics or atheists;

3. Although 82 per cent of the student respondents attend church, only 30 per cent attend two-thirds or more of their church's services;

4. Only 28 per cent of the student respondents are greatly satisfied with their present religious involvement, although 41 per cent are somewhat satisfied; 28 per cent are either uncertain or somewhat dissatisfied with their present religious involvement, and only 3 per cent are greatly unsatisfied;

5. Seventy-seven per cent of the student population responded that their religious (spiritual) development is either extremely important (42 per cent) or somewhat important (35 per cent).

Attitude and Behavior Findings

The following findings are concerned with the attitudes and behavior of the student population in regard to academic dishonesty and the influence of the religious variables on such attitudes and behavior:

6. Actual frequency of academic dishonesty among student respondents.--The majority of the students (63 per cent) have been academically dishonest while in college. Although 53 per cent were academically dishonest during the 1981-1982 academic year (47 per cent between 1 and 5 times), 47 per cent were not academically dishonest during this period. The majority of the students (73 per cent) also

admit that they were academically dishonest for the first time in elementary (32 per cent) and high school (41 per cent); 10 per cent of the students were academically dishonest for the first time in college.

7. The affect of religious affiliation, participation, satisfaction, or importance on academic dishonesty.--Chi square values indicate that the students who are presently satisfied with their religious involvement and who acknowledge the importance of their religious development are much less likely to have been academically dishonest. As religious satisfaction and importance increase among the students, the incidence of recent academic dishonesty (for 1981-1982) decreases. The more often students attend church (participation) and the more satisfied they are with their religious involvement, the longer (later in their academic careers) they appear to be able to resist being academically dishonest.

8. Respondents' observations of academic dishonesty.--Eighty-five per cent of the students have witnessed some form of academic dishonesty in college; 56 per cent have observed forms of academic dishonesty between 1 and 5 times. During the 1981-1982 academic year, 53 per cent of the respondents have witnessed less than 15 per cent of their peers participating in some form of academic dishonesty.

9. Perceptions of respondents regarding incidence of academic dishonesty.--Ninety-eight per cent of the respondents believe that their peers have been academically dishonest at some point in their academic careers. The majority of the respondents (72 per cent) also believe that more than 15 per cent of their classmates have engaged in unobserved academically dishonest activities during the 1981-1982 academic year, while 77 per cent believe that a certain percentage of their peers will be academically dishonest regardless of class conditions or academic demands. Only 15 per cent of the respondents believe that the frequency of academic dishonesty is declining compared to when they first entered college.

10. Students' reactions to observed incidents of academic dishonesty.--Forty-two per cent of the respondents would be disturbed but take no action following an observed academically dishonest incident; 24 per cent would not be disturbed and would take no action; 18 per cent would be disturbed, but any action taken would depend on their knowledge of and feelings toward the dishonest student.

11. The affect of religious affiliation, participation, satisfaction, or importance on students' reaction to observed incident of academic dishonesty.--Chi square values indicate that as students' participation in church services and importance of religious development increases, the greater the likelihood that they will

report the incident; students who are unconcerned about these religious variables would not be disturbed and take no action.

12. Respondents' reasons for not reporting observed academically dishonest incident.--Mean responses indicate that students would not report an observed incident because (1) they would be uncomfortable reporting on a fellow student, (2) they do not want to be involved, and (3) they feel that such matters are the faculty's responsibility, not theirs.

13. The affect of religious affiliation, participation, satisfaction, or importance on students' reasons for not reporting observed academically dishonest incident.--Chi square values indicate that as satisfaction with religious involvement and importance of religious development increase, so does the likelihood that the student will report the academic dishonesty of a friend. Students who have strong feelings (either high or low) regarding religious satisfaction are more likely to become involved following observed academic dishonesty.

14. Respondents' perceptions of the reasons for academic dishonesty.--Mean responses indicate that the reasons for academic dishonesty are (1) inadequate preparation by the student, (2) student's lack of interest in and applicability of the subject matter, and (3) students feel that those who are academically dishonest seldom get caught.

As mentioned previously, students also feel that a certain percentage of students will be academically dishonest regardless of class conditions and academic demands.

15. Respondents' perceptions of causes of academic dishonesty in relation to course grades.--Ninety-one per cent of the respondents believe that students are academically dishonest because they want to raise their poor grades in the course. The second most probable reason (72 per cent) is to keep a poor grade in the course from getting worse.

16. Respondents' perception of the concept of situationally justified academic dishonesty.--The mean score indicates that the respondents are undecided concerning an occasion or situation that would justify academic dishonesty.

17. The affect of religious affiliation, participation, satisfaction, or importance on students' perception of the concept of situationally justified academic dishonesty.--Chi square values indicate that those students who attend greater than 66 per cent of their churches' services tend to disagree with this concept. Students who are greatly satisfied or greatly dissatisfied with their present religious involvement also tend to disagree with this concept; the moderately satisfied students tend to agree with this concept. As the importance of students' religious development increased, the greater the likelihood that students will disagree with this concept.

18. Respondents' reaction to situationally justified personal academic dishonesty.--When the respondents were presented with a situation in which they recognized widespread dishonest activities by their peers on an examination, and if they knew they would not be caught, 53 per cent of the students would not feel justified in being equally dishonest although 26 per cent would feel justified in responding with equally dishonest behavior.

19. The affect of religious affiliation, participation, satisfaction, or importance on situationally justified personal academic dishonesty.--Chi square values indicate that the more frequently students attend church (participation), the more satisfied they are with their religious involvement, the more importance they ascribe to their religious development, the less likely they are to feel personally justified to participate in widespread academic dishonesty.

20. Respondents' perceptions and use of methods for collegiate academic deception.--Mean responses indicate that the most commonly perceived and personally used methods of collegiate academic deception are (1) copying answers during test or examination, (2) using crib notes, (3) plagiarising, and (4) turning in work completed by others. No particular patterns emerged in the chi square correlations of these variables with the religious variables.

21. Respondents' recommended punishments for selected methods of academic deception.--The most frequently recommended punishment for all methods of academic dishonesty is a failing grade on the test or examination, followed by the issuance of a warning to the student deceiver by the professor.

22. The affect of religious affiliation, participation, satisfaction, or importance on recommended punishments for academic dishonesty.--Chi square values indicate that those students who are either greatly satisfied or greatly dissatisfied with their religious involvement recommend the more severe punishments for incidents of academic dishonesty.

23. Respondents' recommended punishment for the student accomplice in academic dishonesty.--Fifty per cent of the respondents agree that the student accomplice also should be punished; however, 25 per cent of the respondents disagree, and 25 per cent are uncertain about punishment for the student accomplice.

24. The affect of religious affiliation, participation, satisfaction, or importance on recommended punishment for the student accomplice.--Chi square values indicate that the more importance that students attach to their religious development, the more likely they are to recommend a more severe form of punishment for the student accomplice.

25. The incidence rate for student apprehension as the result of an academically dishonest incident.--Of the 83 per cent of the respondents who have been academically dishonest (on all school levels), 71 per cent have never been apprehended; in other words, only 29 per cent of the students who have been academically dishonest have been caught at any time.

26. The affect of religious affiliation, participation, satisfaction, or importance on student apprehension for academic dishonesty.--Chi square values indicate that as church attendance (participation) and importance of religious development increases, the likelihood decreases of students being caught participating in an academically dishonest activity.

Conclusions

As a result of the data findings, the following conclusions appear to be warranted:

1. The majority of college students have been--at some time in their academic careers--academically dishonest, and it appears that the earlier the first incidence of academic dishonesty, the more often students will engage in academically deceptive practices throughout the school year;

2. Although religious affiliation has no significant affect on the practice of academic dishonesty, it appears

that students who participate frequently in the activities of their church, who are satisfied with their present religious involvement, and who acknowledge the importance of their religious development are less likely to have begun dishonest academic activities at an early age or to continue such activities;

3. College students have no illusions about the academic honesty of their peers; they appear to accept the fact that nearly everyone has been, is, or will be academically dishonest;

4. Although the majority of students are disturbed by witnessing any form of academic dishonesty, most students appear to feel that the punishment of academic dishonesty is not their responsibility. The student who is religiously active and satisfied would be more likely to report an incident of academic dishonesty;

5. For whatever reason, the student who does not study or who is disinterested in the course is more likely to be academically dishonest; it also appears that the student who has a poor grade in a course is more likely to be academically dishonest in that class;

6. Since the most popular and obviously productive method of academic dishonesty is copying answers on a test or examination, it appears that there is both active and passive academic dishonesty; the passive accomplice is considered equally guilty; it also may be concluded that

the proctoring system for examinations is, to all effective purposes, nonexistent;

7. Students appear to attach singularly little importance to incidents of academic dishonesty; rarely do they suggest a punishment that is stringent. A failing grade on a test or a warning appear to suffice for any form of academic dishonesty. Only the students who are satisfied with their religious involvement suggest more severe types of punishment;

8. Very few students are apprehended for academic dishonesty, which is among the stated reasons for being academically dishonest. It could be concluded, therefore, that students are more interested in the grades they receive and in passing the course than they are in acquiring knowledge. It could be concluded that the faculty is either oblivious to, hesitant to confront, or disinterested in students' academic dishonesty. It could be concluded that the system for handling academic dishonesty is unwieldy and therefore ignored. It could be concluded that most grading systems are obsolete. It could be concluded that the moral premise and integrity of honesty are disregarded by students and faculty alike. Since the religiously active and satisfied students are less likely to be caught in an academically dishonest incident, it could be concluded that these students are more crafty; however, it also could be concluded that since such

students are less likely to be academically dishonest, the odds against being caught are in their favor.

Inferences

Similar to the findings of Bonjean and McGee (5), Ellenburg (9), and Smith, Ryan, Diggins (16), this study indicates that the practice of academic dishonesty continues to flourish; both students and faculty members appear to accept or accommodate this behavior. Although most students were found to be continuing a dishonest behavior learned, and possibly perfected, at a previous academic level as Graham [cited by Martin (12)] would concur, the data reveal that the predictive success rate for those who participate in academic dishonesty actually perpetuates and reinforces this activity. It appears that while most college students (84 per cent) have witnessed an academically dishonest incident by a peer, most of these students continue to avoid taking any type of action in response to this event. The inference is that unless students identify academic dishonesty as a means of cheating themselves and others of educational benefits, the lines of enforcement will continue to be students on one side, professors on the other.

Although Bowers (6) remarks on the overall ineffectiveness of available enforcement systems to curtail academic dishonesty, it may be that the key to regulating

academic deception lies in the reward system. The use of intrinsic rewards (educational benefits) has been mentioned previously, and extrinsic rewards also might be modified. The student-felt need to improve poor grades, which was found to be a leading cause of academic dishonesty, will continue to be an issue in any educational system, although the traditional grading system appears to undermine this well-intentioned desire. Grades, as such, have become a substitute for learning. The traditional grading system fosters distorted educational values and makes the appearance rather than the substance of learning the motivational force (14). In addition, traditional grading systems have been found to increase test anxiety and decrease true test performance (16), intensify peer competition (14), promote academic dishonesty (2), and minimize the goal of intrinsic learning (11). The solution may lie in an academic conversion to contract or mastery grading systems, which purport to combat many of these effects (1, 3, 4, 7, 15).

Similar to the findings of Brown and Annis (8), who report that religious denomination is unrelated to moral behavior, the data from this study reveal that the role of religious denomination is the only religious variable that has no significant relationship to any of the surveyed attitudes or behaviors concerning academic dishonesty. This finding implies that variations in religious

instruction appear to make little (if any) difference in the behaviorally measured practice of academic dishonesty.

The findings of Nash (13) were confirmed by this study in regard to the influence of religious participation, as well as religious satisfaction and religious importance, on both attitudes and behaviors toward academically dishonest activities. While variations in each of these religious variables appear to influence responses to the deceptive practices of others, the data demonstrate that [similar to the findings of Bonjean and McGee (5)] religious satisfaction and religious importance appear to effect the likelihood and frequency of academically dishonest behavior.

With this in mind, plus the recent rebirth of religious participation on both high school and college campuses (10), the academic community might be able to anticipate a number of attitude and behavioral responses. One of these may influence the practice of academic dishonesty.

Recommendations for Further Research

Based on the findings and conclusions of this study, the following recommendations for further research are made:

1. Since attitudes and behaviors concerning academic dishonesty were measured at institutions that have principally used the traditional grading system, research

should be initiated at both public and private institutions that corporately make use of mastery, contract, or other grading system to determine the role of the grading system in relation to academic dishonesty.

2. Research should be initiated to investigate each of the demographic items of sex, marital status, academic classification, grade point average, race, field of study, and fraternity or sorority affiliation in greater detail. In addition, those religious variables which generated a large amount of significant correlations need to be better understood, as the reasons for these relationships are far from being discovered or verified. Research concerning the religious variables and their effect on other issues of concern in higher education including predicting academic competence, attitudes toward dating and sexual activities at college, alcohol and drug abuse on campus, and desire and need for counseling services would prove useful.

3. Since the results of this study reflect the current attitudes and behaviors toward the practice of academic dishonesty, systematic follow-up studies (possibly every three or five years) would yield profitable information concerning trends in this area and clarify the direction of such student attitudes and behaviors.

4. While student attitudes and behavior toward academic discipline were solicited and measured in this

study, further research concerning the attitudes and practices of professors and administrative personnel would prove useful to identify and understand other ramifications in this area.

5. This study should be replicated using a continuum that ranges from uncertain through moderate to strong attitudes toward religious ideology. The use of such a continuum might explain the few bipolar findings of this study.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Alheim, W. R., "An Analysis of the Effectiveness of Traditional Teaching, Team Teaching, and Contract Teaching Methods of Basic Health Education for Junior College Students," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, Gainesville, Florida, 1973.
2. Astin, Alexander N., R. J. Panos, and S. A. Creagor, National Norms for Entering College Freshmen, Fall, 1966, American Council on Education, 1967.
3. Barlow, R. M., "An Experiment with Learning Contracts," Journal of Higher Education, 45 (June, 1974), 441-449.
4. Barret, E. M., "Contract Learning: Negotiations and Agreement in the Teaching-Learning Process," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California, 1974.
5. Bonjean, C. M., and R. McGee, "Scholastic Dishonesty among Undergraduates in Different Systems of Social Control," Sociology of Education, 38 (Winter, 1965), 127-137.
6. Bowers, W. J., Student Dishonesty and Its Control in College, New York, Bureau of Applied Research, Columbia University Press, 1964.
7. Bredderman, T. A., and D. J. Haggerty, "Factors Affecting Attitudes and Success in a Contract and Traditional Grading Approach," Educational Research Quarterly, 5 (Fall, 1980), 63-73.
8. Brown, Dawn M., and Lawrence Annis, "Moral Development Level and Religious Behavior," Psychological Reports, 43 (December, 1978), 1, 230.
9. Ellenburg, F. C., "Cheating on Tests: Are High Achievers Greater Offenders than Low Achievers?" The Clearing House, March, 1973, pp. 427-429.

10. Hastings, Philip K., and Dean R. Hoge, "Religious Trends among College Students, 1948-1979," Social Forces, 60 (December, 1981), 517-529.
11. Huntley, John E., "Academic Evaluation and Grading: An Analysis and Some Proposals," Harvard Educational Review, 46 (November, 1976), 612-631.
12. Martin, R. G., "Plagiarism and Originality: Some Remedies," English Journal, 60 (May, 1971), 621-625.
13. Nash, John, Developmental Psychology, Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.
14. Power, Marian E., "The Grading Syndrome," Journal of Reading, 19 (April, 1976), 568-572.
15. Sheeran, Thomas J., "Contract Grading," College Student Journal, 15 (Spring, 1981), 4-7.
16. Smith, Charles, Edward Ryan, and Dean Diggins, "Moral Decision-Making: Cheating on Examinations," Journal of Personality, 40 (December, 1972), 640-660.

APPENDICES

RESEARCH ASSISTANTS

SURVEY DISTRIBUTION AND COLLECTION PROCEDURES FOR
FRATERNITY AND SORORITY MEMBERS

Each research assistant, upon receiving the surveys designated for their fraternity or sorority, will distribute them to insure that each participating student receive only one questionnaire envelope. Either individually or corporately, the research assistant will stress the following items to the selected students (all of which have been discussed thoroughly by the researcher):

1. To fill out only one survey--please do not take another, or influence the rest of the group in their attempt to respond to the questionnaire in an honest manner;
2. The importance of the survey;
3. The need for the returned survey;
4. The confidentiality of the completed survey;
and
5. The procedure for collecting the completed survey.

After discussing these important items, the research assistant should suggest that each student fill out the questionnaire in privacy, following the directions enclosed in the survey envelope. The research assistant will allow 15 to 20 minutes and begin to collect the completed surveys (sealed within the enclosed envelope). The research assistant will continue to distribute and collect the

surveys in this manner, making note of the total number of completed surveys collected, and continuing until the minimum return rate (60 per cent) is realized.

SURVEY DISTRIBUTION AND COLLECTION PROCEDURES FOR
RESIDENCE HALL AND UNIVERSITY
APARTMENT STUDENTS

The following procedures will be followed by those directly involved with the distribution and collection of the questionnaire.

Residence Halls

A. The residence hall directors will be careful to insure that the resident assistants receive only those surveys designated for their respective student populations.

B. Each resident assistant, upon receiving the surveys designated for their floor, will distribute them to each student identified by name on the front of the survey envelope. The resident assistant will stress the following items to each student participant (all of which will have been discussed thoroughly by the researcher):

1. The importance of the survey;
2. The need for the returned survey;
3. The confidentiality of the completed survey;
and
4. The procedure for collecting the completed survey.

At this point the resident assistant should suggest the student fill out the questionnaire in privacy, following the directions inside the envelope, and return it to them in 15 to 20 minutes. (The resident assistant may wish to

return to the student's room to pick up the completed form.) When the completed form is received, the resident assistant will place a check by the student's name on the floor sub-master list (given to each resident assistant by the residence hall director).

April, 1982

Dear Student,

Your help is needed. A random selection of students from three local institutions of Higher Education have been requested to participate in an important research project, investigating various student attitudes in relation to academic dishonesty. The survey attached to this letter will be the instrument used to examine these attitudes.

The information that you and other college students provide will make it possible to understand such attitudes and practices.

This is a survey, and not a test. There are no correct answers. Your responses and input are of the utmost importance so please take the time to respond to the survey in an honest manner. Please, do not put your name on this survey as extreme measures have been taken to ensure the confidentiality of the survey participants and their responses.

Upon completion, please put the survey in the enclosed, blank envelope. Seal the envelope and return it directly to the research assistant who is aiding in the distribution and collection of this questionnaire. Because I respect what you have to offer, I am anxiously awaiting the return of your input on this form.

Thank you for your time and cooperation concerning this important research project.

Sincerely,

Chuck Borsellino
Doctoral Student
North Texas State University

ACADEMIC DISHONESTY ATTITUDE AND BEHAVIOR SURVEY

INSTRUCTIONS TO PARTICIPANTS: Listed below are a series of questions referring to you as an individual (1-10), followed by a series of questions and attitude statements concerning academic dishonesty (11-47). Please read each question carefully and respond in an honest manner to insure the validity of this study. Your name will not be used and extreme confidentiality of the survey results will be exercised.

1. SEX: Male _____ Female _____
2. MARITAL STATUS: Single _____ Married _____
Divorced _____ Widowed _____
Other: _____
3. CLASSIFICATION: Freshman _____ Sophomore _____
Junior _____ Senior _____
Graduate _____
4. GRADE POINT AVERAGE: 1.5 or below _____
1.6 to 2.5 _____
2.6 to 3.5 _____
3.6 or above _____
5. RACE: White American _____ American Indian _____
Black American _____ International _____
Mexican American _____ Other: _____
6. FIELD OF STUDY: Major: _____
School: NTSU _____ TWC _____ UTA _____
7. FRATERNITY/SORORITY AFFILIATION: At the present time, do you
belong to a fraternity or sorority?
Yes _____ No _____
8. POLITICAL ATTITUDES:

	<u>AGREE</u>	<u>UNSURE</u>	<u>DISAGREE</u>
a) I am pleased with the American political system	_____	_____	_____
b) Economically, the U. S. is better off now than it was 10 years ago	_____	_____	_____
c) Overall, Russia has surpassed the U. S. in military strength	_____	_____	_____

9. RELIGIOUS ATTITUDES:

a) AFFILIATION:

Agnostic	_____	Episcopal	_____
Assembly of God	_____	Jewish	_____
Atheist	_____	Lutheran	_____
Baptist	_____	Methodist	_____
Catholic	_____	Presbyterian	_____
Church of Christ	_____	Non-Denominational	_____
Disciples of Christ	_____	Other:	_____

b) PARTICIPATION: Concerning your average church attendance (excluding funerals, weddings, etc.) how often do you attend?

1) Do not attend church	_____
2) Less than 33% of all services	_____
3) Between 33% and 66% of all services	_____
4) Greater than 66% of all services	_____

c) SATISFACTION: To what degree are you presently fulfilled or satisfied with your religious involvement?

1) Greatly Satisfied	_____
2) Somewhat Satisfied	_____
3) Uncertain	_____
4) Somewhat Unsatisfied	_____
5) Greatly Unsatisfied	_____

d) IMPORTANCE: How important is your religious or spiritual development to you at the present time?

1) Extremely Important	_____
2) Somewhat Important	_____
3) Uncertain	_____
4) Somewhat Unimportant	_____
5) Extremely Unimportant	_____

10. FAMILY ATTITUDES:

	<u>AGREE</u>	<u>UNSURE</u>	<u>DISAGREE</u>
--	--------------	---------------	-----------------

- | | | | |
|--|-------|-------|-------|
| a) The responsibility for raising the children should be equally divided between both parents. | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| b) I believe the male should be the one to initiate sexual activity in the marriage. | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| c) The financial responsibilities of the family should fall primarily on the male. | _____ | _____ | _____ |

(II)

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS REFER TO THE PRACTICE AND ATTITUDES TOWARD ACADEMIC DISHONESTY. THE TERM "ACADEMIC DISHONESTY" REFERS TO:

. . . the use of crib sheets, unauthorized books, notes or otherwise securing of assistance during a test or examination; turning in assignments produced in whole or part by other people; knowingly furnishing the university with false information; or the act of plagiarism, copying of tests or reports. All behavior which intentionally misrepresents a student's true performance or level of achievement would fall into the category of academic dishonesty.

THROUGHOUT THE REMAINDER OF THIS SURVEY MANY OF THE ATTITUDE STATEMENTS ARE FOLLOWED BY THE LETTERS: SA, A, U, D, AND SD.

PLEASE CIRCLE ONLY ONE OF THE APPROPRIATE LETTERS USING THE FOLLOWING SCALE:

SA STRONGLY AGREE
A AGREE
U UNCERTAIN
D DISAGREE
SD STRONGLY DISAGREE

11. While at college, have you personally witnessed any behavior (at any time) that would qualify as academic dishonesty?

1) Yes _____ 2) No _____

12. If you have witnessed any academically dishonest behavior, how often?

1) 1-5 times per semester _____
 2) 6-10 times per semester _____
 3) 11-20 times per semester _____
 4) Greater than 20 times per semester _____
 5) Not applicable (answered no to 11) _____

IN MY OPINION, MOST STUDENTS PARTICIPATE IN ACADEMICALLY DISHONEST ACTIVITY BECAUSE: (ANSWER EACH RESPONSE)

13. Not adequately prepared	SA	A	U	D	SD
14. Students seldom get caught	SA	A	U	D	SD
15. Overcrowded classrooms and a lack of supervision	SA	A	U	D	SD

16. Unreasonable demands from the professors SA A U D SD
17. Competition for graduate school or employment SA A U D SD
18. Lack of interest and applicability of subject matter SA A U D SD
19. If I were to discover a student participating in an academically dishonest incident, I would: (SELECT ONE)
- a) Not be disturbed and do nothing _____
- b) Be disturbed but do nothing _____
- c) Be disturbed but my action would depend on who the student was _____
- d) Express my concern to the student only _____
- e) Express my concern to the professor (using no names) _____
- f) Report the student by name to the professor _____
- g) Other: _____

IF I OBSERVED BUT FAILED TO REPORT AN ACADEMICALLY DISHONEST INCIDENT, MY REASONING FOR DOING SO WOULD BE THAT: (ANSWER EACH RESPONSE)

20. The dishonest student was a friend. SA A U D SD
21. I did not want to become involved. SA A U D SD
22. It is the faculty's responsibility to monitor dishonesty (not student's). SA A U D SD
23. Academic dishonesty does not warrant any type of punishment. SA A U D SD
24. I do not feel comfortable reporting on a fellow student. SA A U D SD
25. If during a test or examination I recognized widespread dishonest activities by my fellow classmates, and I knew that I would not be caught, I would feel justified in this case to participate in equally dishonest behavior. SA A U D SD
26. I feel that there could be times or situations resulting from inappropriate behavior by professor or students, whereby academic dishonesty would be situationally justified. SA A U D SD

27. Keeping in mind the definition of academic dishonesty, in your opinion, what percentage of college students have at some time participated in academically dishonest behavior?
- 1) None (0%) _____
 - 2) Relatively few have (below 25%) _____
 - 3) Many have (25% to 50%) _____
 - 4) Most have (50% to 75%) _____
 - 5) Practically all have (above 75%) _____
28. During the past academic year (1981-82), what percentage of students enrolled in your classes were you certain participated in some form of academic dishonesty?
- 1) Less than 15% _____
 - 2) 15% to 29% _____
 - 3) 30% to 44% _____
 - 4) 45% to 60% _____
 - 5) Greater than 60% _____
29. What percentage of students enrolled in your classes during the past academic year (1981-82) do you feel participated in some form of academically dishonest behavior but whom you did not observe?
- 1) Less than 15% _____
 - 2) 15% to 29% _____
 - 3) 30% to 44% _____
 - 4) 45% to 60% _____
 - 5) Greater than 60% _____

CONCERNING COURSE GRADES, IN MY OPINION MOST STUDENTS PARTICIPATE IN ACADEMICALLY DISHONEST BEHAVIOR IN ORDER TO: (ANSWER EACH RESPONSE)

- | | | | | | |
|---|----|---|---|---|----|
| 30. Maintain poor grades (from getting any worse) | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 31. Raise poor grades | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 32. Maintain good grades | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 33. Raise good grades | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 34. In my opinion, a certain percentage of students will participate in academically dishonest behavior regardless of classroom conditions or academic demands. | SA | A | U | D | SD |

35. In my opinion, compared to when I first entered college, the occurrence of academic dishonesty is:
- 1) Definitely more frequent _____
 - 2) Slightly more frequent _____
 - 3) Unchanged _____
 - 4) Slightly less frequent _____
 - 5) Definitely less frequent _____
36. Keeping in mind the definition of academic dishonesty, have you personally used any means to misrepresent your true performance on a test or term paper while at college or university?
- 1) Yes _____
 - 2) No _____
37. If you have participated in any form of academic dishonesty, at which school level did your first dishonest incident occur?
- 1) Elementary School (K-8) _____
 - 2) High School (9-12) _____
 - 3) College or University _____
 - 4) Not applicable _____
38. If you have participated in any form of academic dishonesty, have you ever been caught?
- 1) Yes _____
 - 2) No _____
 - 3) Not applicable _____
39. Concerning occurrence, approximately how many times have you participated in any form of academically dishonest behavior during the past academic year (1981-82)?
- 1) Never _____
 - 2) 1-5 times _____
 - 3) 6-10 times _____
 - 4) Greater than 10 times _____
40. Please indicate by the appropriate answer, any method that you have personally used at any time during your college or university years: (check more than one if necessary)
- 1) Crib sheets _____
 - 2) Plagiarized on a term paper _____
 - 3) Turned in work completed by others _____
 - 4) Copied answers from a classmate during a test _____
 - 5) Used unauthorized books or notes _____
 - 6) Knowingly furnished the university with false information _____

- 7) None of the above _____
- 8) Other: _____

41. Please indicate the most frequent or most common method of academic dishonesty that you have personally used: (select only one)

- 1) Crib sheets _____
- 2) Plagiarized on term papers _____
- 3) Turned in work completed by others _____
- 4) Copied answers from classmates during tests _____
- 5) Used unauthorized books or notes _____
- 6) Knowingly furnished the university with false information _____
- 7) None _____
- 8) Other: _____

42. In my opinion, if a student were to allow a fellow student to copy from his test during an examination, I feel both should be punished for academic dishonesty.

SA A U D SD

I FEEL THAT JUST PUNISHMENT FOR THOSE CAUGHT PARTICIPATING IN THE FOLLOWING ACADEMICALLY DISHONEST BEHAVIORS SHOULD BE:

SCALE
(for questions 43-47)

- Should not be punished 1
- A warning 2
- A failing grade on the test 3
- A failing grade in the course 4
- Dismissed or expelled from school 5

- 43. Using crib sheets 1 2 3 4 5
- 44. Plagiarism 1 2 3 4 5
- 45. Turned in work completed by others 1 2 3 4 5
- 46. Copied answers during a test or examination 1 2 3 4 5
- 47. Used unauthorized books or notes 1 2 3 4 5

PLEASE PLACE THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE BLANK ENVELOPE. SEAL THE ENVELOPE TO GUARANTEE CONFIDENTIALITY, AND RETURN IT TO THE RESEARCH ASSISTANT RESPONSIBLE FOR THE DISTRIBUTION AND COLLECTION OF THIS SURVEY.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Allport, G. W., The Individual and His Religion, New York, MacMillian, 1956.
- Anastasi, A., Psychological Testing, Toronto, MacMillian Co., 1970.
- Eysenck, H. J., The Structure of Human Personality, London, Methuen, 1970.
- Freud, S., Future of an Illusion, edited by James Strachey, New York, Liveright, 1953.
- Frankl, V., Psychotherapy and Existentialism, New York, Washington Square Press, 1969.
- Gardner, Riley W., and Alice Moriarity, Personality Development and Preadolescence, Seattle, University of Washington Press, 1968.
- Garrett, H. E., Statistics in Psychology and Education, New York, David McKay Co., 1966.
- Goldsen, R., M. Rosenberg, R. Williams, and E. Suchman, What College Students Think, Princeton, D. Van Nostrand, 1960.
- Hartshorne, H., and M. A. May, Studies in Deceit, New York, MacMillian, 1928.
- Jones, E., Papers on Psychoanalysis, London, Bailliere, Tindall and Cox, 1923.
- Jung, Carl, Psychology and Religion, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1938.
- Leonard, W. M., Basic Social Statistics, New York, West Publishing Co., 1976.
- Levy, D. M., Material Overprotection, New York, Columbia University Press, 1943.

- McCandless, Boyd R., and Ellis O. Evans, Children and Youth: Psychosocial Development, Hinsdale, The Dryden Press, 1973.
- Mead, Frank S., Handbook of Denominations in the United States, New York, Abingdon Press, 1970.
- Munsinger, H., Fundamentals of Child Development, 2nd ed., New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975.
- Murray, H. A., editor, Explorations in Personality, New York, Oxford University Press, 1938.
- Nash, John, Developmental Psychology, Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.
- National Council of Churches, Churches and Church Membership in the United States, New York, National Council of Churches, 1970.
- Oppenheim, A., Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement, New York, Basic Books, Inc., 1966.
- Reik, T., Dogma and Compulsion, Westport, Greenwood, 1951.
- Roscoe, John T., Fundamental Research Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences, New York, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1969.
- Sevenson, H. W., editor, Child Psychology, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1963.
- Shurtleff, R. F., Academic Dishonesty: A Bibliography, Boston, Northeastern University Press, 1966.
- Strunk, O., Jr., editor, Readings in the Psychology of Religion, New York, Abingdon Press, 1959.

Articles

- Atkins, B. E., and R. E. Atkins, "A Study of the Honesty of Prospective Teachers," Elementary School Journal, 36 (April, 1936), 595-603.
- Barlow, R. M., "An Experiment with Learning Contracts," Journal of Higher Education, 45 (June, 1974), 441-449.
- "A Barrage Hits West Point's Code," Time, 108 (December 27, 1976), 16.

- Barton, K., and G. Vaughan, "Church Membership and Personality," Social Behavior and Personality, 4(1976), 11-16.
- Bonjean, C. M., and R. McGee, "Scholastic Dishonesty among Undergraduates in Differing Systems of Social Control," Sociology of Education, 38 (Winter, 1965), 127-137.
- Bowers, W. J., Student Dishonesty and Its Control in College, New York, Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University Press, 1964.
- Bredderman, T. A., and D. J. Haggerty, "Factors Affecting Attitudes and Success in a Contract and Traditional Grading Approach," Educational Research Quarterly, 5 (Fall, 1980), 63-73.
- Brickman, W. W., "Ethics, Examination, and Education," School and Society, 89 (December, 1961), 412-415.
- Brown, Daniel G., and Warner L. Lowe, "Religious Beliefs and Personality Characteristics of College Students," Journal of Social Psychology, 33 (February, 1951), 103-129.
- Brown, Dawn M., and Lawrence Annis, "Moral Development Level and Religious Behavior," Psychological Reports, 43 (December, 1978), 1, 230.
- Campbell, W. G., "Measurement in Determining the Personality and Behavior of the College Cribber," Education, 53 (January, 1933), 403-408.
- Canning, R. W., "Does an Honor System Reduce Classroom Cheating? An Experimental Answer," Journal of Experimental Education, 24 (June, 1956), 292-296.
- Chaffin, W. W., "Dangers in Using the Z Index for Detection of Cheating on Tests," Psychological Reports, 45 (December, 1979), 776-778.
- Chandler, Russell, "Survey Shows Impact of Religious Beliefs in America," Dallas Times Herald, May 9, 1981, F4.
- "Cheating, Inc.," Newsweek, 79 (March 20, 1972), 89.
- "Cheating in Colleges," Time, 107 (June 7, 1976), 29-30.
- "Cheating in Florida," Time, 105 (March 10, 1975), 73.

- "Cheating in Schools," New Statesman, 98 (July 6, 1979), 6.
- "Crackdown on Fakes," Time, 99 (March 27, 1972), 76.
- Drake, C. A., "Why Students Cheat," Journal of Higher Education, 12 (November, 1941), 418-420.
- Ellenberg, F. C., "Cheating on Tests: Are High Achievers Greater Offenders than Low Achievers?" The Clearing House, March, 1973, pp. 427-429.
- Etzioni, A., "Paper Mills," Science, 192 (April 23, 1976), 2.
- Fraker, Susan, and Eric Gelman, "A Point of Honor," Newsweek, 87 (May 24, 1976), 29.
- Harp, J., and P. Taietz, "Academic Integrity and Social Structure: A Study of Cheating among College Students," Social Problems, 13 (Spring, 1966), 365-373.
- Harris, S., P. Mussen, and E. Rutherford, "Some Cognitive, Behavioral, and Personality Correlates of Maturity and Moral Judgement," The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 128 (March, 1976), 123-135.
- Hastings, Philip K., and Dean R. Hoge, "Religious Trends among College Students, 1948-1979," Social Forces, 60 (December, 1981), 517-529.
- Hetherington, E. M., and S. E. Feldman, "College Cheating as a Function of Subject and Situational Variables," Journal of Educational Psychology, 55 (August, 1964), 212-218.
- Hill, John, and Roy Kochendorfer, "Knowledge of Peer Success and Risk Detection as Determinants of Cheating," Developmental Psychology, 1 (May, 1969), 231-238.
- Howells, T. H., "Factors Influencing Honesty," Journal of Social Psychology, 9 (February, 1938), 97-102.
- Humes, I., "Cheating," Harper's, 247 (September, 1973), 107.
- Huntley, John E., "Academic Evaluation and Grading: An Analysis and Some Proposals," Harvard Educational Review, 46 (November, 1976), 612-631.
- Hynes, K., N. Givner, and K. Patil, "Detection of Test Cheating Behavior," Psychological Reports, 42 (June, 1978), 1070.

- "It's Not Only West Point that Has Cheating Problems,"
U. S. News and World Report, 80 (June 14, 1976),
35-36.
- Jacobson, L. I., S. E. Berger, and J. Millham, "Individual Differences in Cheating during a Temptation Period when Confronting Failure," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 15 (May, 1970), 48-56.
- Johnson, C. D., and J. Gormly, "Academic Cheating: The Contributions of Sex, Personality, and Situational Variables," Developmental Psychology, 6 (March, 1972), 320-325.
- _____, "Achievement, Sociability, and Task Importance in Relation to Academic Cheating," Psychological Reports, 28 (February, 1971), 302.
- Kanfer, Frederick, H., and P. H. Duerfeldt, "Age, Class Standing, and Commitment as Determinates of Cheating in Children," Child Development, 39 (June, 1968), 547.
- Kleiman, Dena, "Cheating," Seventeen, 40 (April, 1981), 174-175.
- Leveque, Kenneth L., and Ronald E. Walker, "Correlates of High School Cheating Behavior," Psychology in the Schools, 7 (April, 1970), 159.
- Martin, R. G., "Plagiarism and Originality: Some Remedies," English Journal, 60 (May, 1971), 621-625.
- McCarthy, Abigail, "The Walker Makes the Road," Commonweal, 100 (September 27, 1974), 518.
- Mischel, W., and C. Gilligan, "Delay of Gratification for the Prohibited Gratification and Responses to Temptation," Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 69 (October, 1964), 411-417.
- Nassivera, Joan, "The Race for Grades," Seventeen, 34 (May, 1975), 41.
- Nelson, E. A., R. E. Grinder, and M. L. Mutterer, "Sources of Variance in Behavioral Measures of Honesty in Temptation Situations: Methodological Analyses," Developmental Psychology, 1 (May, 1969), 265-279.
- Parr, F. W., "The Problem of Student Honesty," Journal of Higher Education, 7 (June, 1936), 318-326.

- Pendleton, James D., "Education for Honesty?" Today's Education, 64 (April, 1975), 72.
- Power, Marian E., "The Grading Syndrome," Journal of Reading, 19 (April, 1976), 568-572.
- Rosenberg, Philip, "Why Johnny Can't Flunk," Esquire, 79 (April, 1973), 134-137.
- Roskens, R. W., and H. F. Dizney, "A Study of Unethical Academic Behavior in High School and College," Journal of Educational Research, 59 (January, 1966), 231-234.
- Schab, F., "Cheating in High Schools: Differences between the Sexes," Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, 33 (Winter, 1969), 39-42.
- Schwartz, S. H., K. A. Feldman, M. E. Brown, and A. Heingartner, "Some Personality Correlates of Conduct in Two Situations of Moral Conflict," Journal of Personality, 37 (March, 1966), 41-57.
- Sewall, G., S. Drake, and D. L. Elliott, "An Epidemic of Cheating," Newsweek, 95 (May 26, 1980), 63.
- Sheeran, Thomas J., "Contract Grading," College Student Journal, 15 (Spring, 1981), 4-7.
- Sheils, M., and T. Fuller, "The Cheaters," Newsweek, 85 (April 21, 1975), 97.
- Shelton, J., and J. P. Hill, "Effects of Cheating on Achievement, Anxiety, and Knowledge of Peer Performance," Developmental Psychology, 1 (September, 1969), 449-455.
- Simmons, Don, "Punishment Varies for Cheaters," The Short-horn, University of Texas at Arlington, April 29, 1982.
- Slater, E., "Neurosis and Religious Affiliation," Journal of Mental Science, 93 (October, 1947), 392-398.
- Smith, Charles, Edward Ryan, and Dean Diggins, "Moral Decision-Making: Cheating on Examinations," Journal of Personality, 40 (December, 1972), 640-660.
- Srull, T. K., and S. A. Karabenick, "Effects of Personality, Situation, Locus of Control Congruence," Journal

- of Personality and Social Psychology, 32 (October, 1975), 617-628.
- Stone, Marvin, "The Crime of Cheating," U. S. News and World Report, 83 (September 19, 1977), 92.
- "Term Paper Hustlers," Time, 97 (April 19, 1971), 67.
- Vitro, F. T., "The Relationship of Classroom Dishonesty to Perceived Parental Discipline," Journal of College Student Personnel, 12 (November, 1971), 427-429.
- Wellborn, Stanley N., "Cheating in College Becomes an Epidemic," U. S. News and World Report, 89 (October 20, 1980), 39.
- "West Point's Tom Browns," The Economist, 259 (May 22, 1976), 39.
- "What Price Honor," Time, 107 (June 7, 1976), 18-29.
- White, W. F., A. W. Zielonka, and E. L. Gaier, "Personality Correlates of Cheating among College Women under Stress of Independent Opportunistic Behavior," Journal of Educational Research, 61 (October, 1967), 68-70.
- Woods, R. C., "Factors Affecting Cheating and Their Control," Proceedings of the West Virginia Academy of Science, 29 (June, 1957), 79-82.
- Yepsen, L. N., "An Experimental Study of Intellectual Honesty," School and Society, 29 (May 25, 1929), 681-682.
- Zastro, C. H., "Cheating among College Graduate Students," Journal of Educational Research, 64 (December, 1970), 157-160.

Reports

- Astin, A. W., R. J. Panos, and S. A. Creagor, National Norms for Entering College Freshmen, Fall 1966, research projects report, Washington, American Council on Education, 1967.

Unpublished Materials

- Alheim, W. R., "An Analysis of the Effectiveness of Traditional Teaching, Team Teaching, and Contract Teaching Methods of Basic Health Education for Junior College Students," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, Gainesville, Florida, 1973.
- Barrett, E. M., "Contract Learning: Negotiation and Agreement in the Teaching-Learning Process," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California, 1974.
- Gulligan, C. F., "Responses to Temptation: An Analysis of Motives," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, Boston, Massachusetts, 1963.
- Hamby, J., "Some Personality Correlates of Religious Orientation," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee, 1973.
- Malinowski, C. I., "Cheating as a Function of Moral Judgment and Selected Personality and Situational Factors," unpublished doctoral dissertation, City University of New York, New York, New York, 1979.
- Wiebe, K. F., "Personality Correlates of Intrinsic, Extrinsic, and Non-Religious Orientations," unpublished paper, meeting of the Western Psychological Association, San Diego, California, April, 1979.