

A STUDY OF FACULTY AND STUDENT ATTITUDES
TOWARD CHEATING AT SELECTED CHURCH-
AFFILIATED AND SECULAR COLLEGES

By

WILLIS EDWARD KIRK

Bachelor of Science
Abilene Christian College
Abilene, Texas
1948

Master of Science
Kansas State Teachers College
Emporia, Kansas
1954

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
May 1970

OKLAHOMA
STATE UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY
OCT 12 1970

A STUDY OF FACULTY AND STUDENT ATTITUDES
TOWARD CHEATING AT SELECTED CHURCH-
AFFILIATED AND SECULAR COLLEGES

Thesis Approved:

Wm P Ewens

Thesis Adviser

Julia L. McHugh

Ken E. Waggoner

D. Surhan

Dean of the Graduate College

762402

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Although it would be virtually impossible to acknowledge all who have given encouragement and assistance to this research project, special mention should be made of those who have been most deeply involved.

To the Chairman of the Advisory Committee, Dr. W. Price Ewens, I express my deepest gratitude for his readiness to assist at all times, and his very valuable suggestions. Very early in the research, Dr. Julia McHale was particularly helpful in helping me define the problem and determine the institutions which should be involved. I appreciate the counsel also which Dr. Kenneth Wiggins gave, and to both of these who have served on the Advisory Committee, my warmest thanks.

Several administrators and faculty members of the four colleges involved in the study were most helpful in arranging for the administration of the opinionnaire at their institutions. These men not only assisted in arranging for students to complete the opinionnaire, but also secured faculty cooperation in the project. I am particularly indebted to Dr. Walter Adams, Vice President for Academic Affairs, and Dr. Bill Humble, Dean, of Abilene Christian College, Abilene, Texas; to Dr. James J. Spurlock, Vice President for Academic Affairs at North Texas State University, Denton, Texas; Dr. Robert Collier, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dr. John Kouldos, Dean of Students, at East Texas State University, Commerce, Texas; and to Dr. R. S. North, Dean of Instruction, Oklahoma Christian College, Oklahoma City,

Oklahoma.

The Board of Trustees of Christian College of the Southwest under Dr. Seth Cowan, Chairman, was most gracious in allowing me time off from my duties to complete the project.

I am most grateful to the following people who in many different ways contributed to the project: Mr. Ray McClung of El Centro College, Dallas, Texas; Mrs. Jane Waggoner of East Texas State University, Commerce, Texas; Dr. Rex Johnston, Columbia Christian College, Portland, Oregon; Dr. Tom Cunningham, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma; Dr. Merle Bonney, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas; and Dr. Carey Looney, Christian College of the Southwest, Dallas, Texas. It was my secretary, Mrs. Lloyd Neal, who very patiently and dedicatedly assisted me in typing early copies of the thesis, and to her I am very thankful.

More than any, it is to my family that I owe so much. For their patience and understanding, I am most grateful. My wife, Virginia, and two daughters, Jeanne and Joan, have constantly encouraged me and sacrificed personally that this effort might be completed. A great source of encouragement through the years has been that of my father and mother, and to them I owe everlasting gratitude.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. THE PROBLEM	1
Introduction	1
Background of the Problem	2
Statement of the Problem	7
Hypothesis	7
Value of the Study	9
Definition of Concepts and Terms	10
Limitations	11
Basic Assumptions	12
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	13
Early Research	13
Causes of Cheating	13
Sex and Cheating	15
Intelligence and Cheating	16
Role of the Faculty	17
The Punishment of Cheating	19
Cheating Is a Specific Act	22
Other Findings	22
Further Areas for Research	23
III. DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	25
Design of the Instrument	25
Subjects	32
Method of Data Collection	33
Treatment of the Data	36
IV. RESULTS OF THE STUDY	38
Introduction	38
Behavior Which Constitutes Cheating	39
Seriousness of Cheating	44
Academic Setting as an Aspect of Cheating	48
Summary	53
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	56
Summary	56
The Purpose of This Study	56
The Instrument	57

Chapter	Page
Statistical Method	58
The Sample	58
Findings	58
Implications	63
Further Research	65
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	67
APPENDIX A - STUDENT DESCRIPTIONS	71
APPENDIX B - A SURVEY OF ATTITUDES TOWARD CHEATING	77
APPENDIX C - LETTER TO ABILENE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE FACULTY	87
APPENDIX D - LETTER TO EAST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY	88
APPENDIX E - LETTER TO NORTH TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY	89
APPENDIX F - LETTER TO FRESHMEN AND SENIORS AT OKLAHOMA CHRISTIAN COLLEGE	90

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Administration of Tests for Reliability	30
II. Coefficients of Correlation Reliability	31
III. Comparison of Difference Between the Mean Ratings of Faculty and Students on the Behaviors Which Constitute Cheating	39
IV. Comparison of Difference Between the Mean Ratings of Freshmen and Seniors on the Behaviors Which Constitute Cheating	40
V. Comparison of Difference Between the Mean Ratings of Faculty of Church-Affiliated and Faculty of Secular Colleges on the Behaviors Which Con- stitute Cheating	41
VI. Comparison of Difference Between the Mean Ratings of Students of Church-Affiliated and Students of Secular Colleges on Behaviors Which Constitute Cheating	42
VII. Comparisons of "t" Tests of Different Groups on Behaviors Which Constitute Cheating	43
VIII. Comparison of Difference Between the Mean Ratings of Faculty and Students on the Seriousness of Cheating	44
IX. Comparison of Difference Between the Mean Ratings of Freshmen and Seniors on the Seriousness of Cheating	45
X. Comparison of Difference Between the Mean Ratings of Faculty of Church-Affiliated and Faculty of Secular Colleges on the Seriousness of Cheating	45
XI. Comparison of Difference Between the Mean Ratings of Students of Church-Affiliated and Students of Secular Colleges on the Seriousness of Cheating. . .	46
XII. Comparisons of "t" Tests of Different Groups on the Seriousness of Cheating	47

Table	Page
XIII. Comparisons of Difference Between the Mean Ratings of Faculty and Students on the Academic Setting in Which Cheating Occurs	48
XIV. Comparison of Difference Between the Mean Ratings of Freshmen and Seniors on the Academic Setting in Which Cheating Occurs	49
XV. Comparison of Difference Between the Mean Ratings of Faculty of Church-Affiliated and Faculty of Secular Colleges on the Academic Setting in Which Cheating Occurs	50
XVI. Comparison of Difference Between the Mean Ratings of Students of Church-Affiliated and Students of Secular Colleges on the Academic Setting in Which Cheating Occurs	51
XVII. Comparisons of "t" Tests of Different Groups on the Academic Setting in Which Cheating Occurs	52

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Through the years there have been periodic exposures of widespread cheating on college campuses. The nationwide scandal at West Point in August, 1951, in which 90 cadets of the United States Military Academy were expelled for cheating during examinations is one example. More recently within the military academies, some 109 Air Force Academy cadets were involved in a cheating scandal with the result that they resigned their appointments. This happened in January, 1965, and despite the fact that two months after he enters the academy each cadet is bound by the honor code which states, "We will not lie, steal or cheat, or tolerate among us anyone who does." The widespread publicity given the incident and the punishment inflicted did not apparently deter cheating, since two years later, in February, 1967, 33 more cadets resigned for cheating.

To what extent is cheating practiced on the American college campus? Are these isolated incidents occurring only in military academies, or is there widespread cheating taking place at most, if not all, American colleges? If we can accept the findings of most researchers, and the impressions of many outstanding educators, we have a real problem facing us with the incidence of college cheating. Professor Philip E. Jacob (23, p. 23) of the University of Pennsylvania stated in 1957,

"Frequent cheating is admitted by 40 per cent or more at a large number of colleges, often with no apology or sense of wrong doing." A questionnaire given college students by Hendricks (19, pp. 413-414) revealed that 57 per cent of those questioned had cheated, and 75 per cent of the seniors admitted to having cheated at some time during their college career. Dr. Edward D. Eddy, Jr., vice president of the University of New Hampshire, told a discussion group of the American Council on Education that cheating "has become a part of the student culture--it's taken for granted" (12, p. 58). The exposure of college cheating made by Jerome Ellison (12, p. 57) in January, 1960, entitled "American Disgrace: College Cheating," revealed that cheating is almost universally practiced, and "Institutions where large-scale, organized cheating has not been known are a small minority." Investigation of college cheating by William J. Bowers (7, p. 193) indicated that at least 50 per cent of students he investigated admitted to having cheated since coming to college.

There is little doubt that cheating constitutes one of the most serious moral and social problems on college campuses.

Background of the Problem

The most recent and most exhaustive study of college cheating was undertaken by William J. Bowers (7) at the Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University. The study was completed in December, 1964, and was entitled Student Dishonesty and its Control in College. This research was financed under the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. It involved over 800 colleges and universities, and the

findings were based on information gathered from deans, student body presidents, and students on the various campuses.

Some 5000 students reported on their attitudes and experiences with cheating at their colleges. The report itself deals with the prevalence of academic dishonesty; the characteristics of college students who cheat; why some colleges have more cheating than others, and some methods for dealing with the problem. Some of the more significant findings are: (1) cheating is prevalent on the American college campus; (2) the magnitude of the problem is grossly underestimated by members of the campus community; (3) only a small proportion of those who cheat are caught, and even then the punishment is rather lenient; (4) most students feel cheating is wrong on moral grounds; (5) academic performance is only a minor factor in cheating; (6) students who value the social aspects of college life are more apt to cheat than those who emphasize intellectual interests; (7) students who cheated in high school, but who now attend colleges where cheating is not tolerated and where there is strong disapproval, tend to give up their cheating, and conversely, students who might have cheated in high school will cheat in college if the college climate tolerates it; (8) the nature and size of colleges has something to do with the prevalence of cheating (co-educational and larger colleges report more cheating); (9) colleges which allow students to handle academic dishonesty have less cheating than those where the administration or a combined administration-student group attempt to control it; and (10) the institution with an honor system seems to effectively control cheating more than other colleges (7, pp. 193-198).

A new approach in studying the problem of cheating was initiated

by William F. Anderson (2) in 1956 when he attempted to determine attitudes of university students toward cheating. The study involved some 505 students attending five colleges at the University of Alabama. The opinionnaire devised by Anderson depicted 28 different situations which were originally labelled by a group of students as cheating. They ranged from students who stopped after class to talk with the instructor to using files of old tests. It is interesting to observe that Anderson found that many of the situations depicted were not considered cheating at all by students. Emerging from this study is the definite conclusion that not all students look at cheating alike, and that much misunderstanding exists even among students as to what is acceptable study and test behavior.

Using the same instrument, Jack R. Frymier (13, p. 120) of Ohio State University pursued this further by attempting in 1960 to determine if there were significant differences in attitudes between faculty and students with respect to possible cheating situations. Frymier administered Anderson's opinionnaire to students and faculty at three undergraduate colleges of a large Eastern University. In appraising the results, Frymier stated, "These data seem to indicate that faculty members and university students see cheating differently." However, he goes on to say,

Faculty and students actually seem to see various examples of student behavior similarly in direction, but differently in degree. And as might be expected, it is the faculty members who generally seem to be more severe in describing a particular behavioral act as cheating than are the students.

So far as this writer has been able to determine, there have been no further studies into faculty and student attitudes toward what actually constitutes a cheating behavior in the college environment.

Many educators and writers, including Jacob (23), Eddy (12), Ellison (12) and Bowers (7), feel there is a lack of seriousness toward the problem of cheating. Bowers feels this is true because only a very small number of students are ever disciplined for cheating and plagiarism. Professor Jacob (12, p. 59) states one of the prime causes of cheating is the "widespread student tradition of tolerance toward the practice." In an effort to determine student attitudes toward the seriousness of cheating, Hendricks (19, p. 413) gave a questionnaire to college students and found that only 13 per cent thought cheating was basically dishonest. Only 7 per cent of the students felt stealing and cheating go hand in hand. Apparently only 1 per cent felt it was serious enough to justify expulsion, and only 3 per cent thought the student should get an F in the course. There has been no effort, so far as this writer knows, to study faculty attitudes toward the seriousness of cheating as might be indicated by the punishment to be administered.

Since the Hartshorne and May (18) studies, continual references have been made by researchers to the fact that cheating is an act which takes place in a certain situation. They considered the situation more important than the character of the individual (30, p. 402). Gordon and Gordon (16, p. 235) refer to the instructor's own behavior as being the factor which affects the level of cheating in his class. Uhlig and Howes (38, p. 411) found that one third of a class will cheat if the climate is an advantageous one. The strongest case for this point of view is an article by Shirk and Hoffman (32, p. 132) who state:

Of all facets of classroom exchange and interaction, that which seems most susceptible to instructional dishonesty is the host of attitudes and practices regarding that particularly tempestuous situation of the giving and taking of an examination.

Since there has been a limited amount of research into the causes of cheating within the academic setting, it is felt that an investigation into how students and faculty perceive a student's actions within a certain academic setting might lead to a clearer understanding of how each perceives the other's actions.

Some of the studies of cheating which have been pursued indicate a difference between freshmen and seniors both with respect to attitudes toward cheating and the incidence of cheating. Students at Indiana University were surveyed by Mueller (28, p. 468) in 1953, and when they were asked if offered information on an examination, would you accept and use it, the proportions answering in the affirmative are: freshmen 36 per cent; sophomores 37 per cent; juniors 37 per cent; and seniors 46 per cent. Anderson (2, p. 587) found in his survey freshmen were as strict as graduate students, but sophomores were more tolerant in their attitudes. He concludes, "men acquire more tolerant attitudes toward cheating as they advance and experience numerous pressures, but when they graduate they acquire stricter attitudes." Bowers (7, p. 62) states from his study, "It should come as no surprise, therefore, that the level of cheating increases from freshman to senior year." In this research an effort is made to determine the differences which may exist between freshmen and seniors in their attitudes toward cheating.

A peculiar aspect of this research was to determine the significant differences between students and faculty at church-affiliated and secular colleges regarding cheating behaviors, the seriousness of the cheating act, and the academic setting in which cheating occurs.

There has been considerable doubt as to whether the church-affiliated college which has as its goal the development of character

is really operative in the area of academic honesty. Church-affiliated colleges have for a long time assumed their objectives were being accomplished because they were stated publicly. There needs to be more objective evidence than this if a college is to make progress toward its goals. Myron F. Wicke (40, p. 45) states,

No purpose is more difficult to achieve than the development of a community ethos in which intellectual adventure is possible in an atmosphere of moral concern and commitment. Studies which have attempted to measure the changing value structures of college students show no evidence that church related colleges are any more effective generally on this point than any other type of institution. The well-known summary of Philip E. Jacob in Changing Values in College gives no comfort at all to church colleges.

Statement of the Problem

It was the purpose of this study to determine if there are significant differences in terms of faculty and student views as to three aspects of cheating: (1) behaviors which constitute cheating; (2) the seriousness of cheating as indicated by punishment administered; and (3) the academic setting in which cheating occurs. Comparisons were also made between freshman and senior students and the faculty and students of church-affiliated and secular colleges.

Hypothesis

Stated in null form, the tentative major hypotheses examined by this investigation are:

1. There are no significant differences at the .05 level of confidence between faculty and student responses to instruments designed to assess:

- a. behaviors which constitute cheating.

- b. the seriousness of cheating behaviors.
- c. the academic setting or situation in which cheating behavior occurs.

2. There are no significant differences at the .05 level of confidence between freshman and senior student responses to instruments designed to assess:

- a. behaviors which constitute cheating.
- b. the seriousness of cheating behaviors.
- c. the academic setting or situation in which cheating behavior occurs.

3. There are no significant differences at the .05 level of confidence between responses of faculty of church-affiliated colleges and faculty of secular colleges to instruments designed to assess:

- a. behaviors which constitute cheating.
- b. the seriousness of cheating behaviors.
- c. the academic setting or situation in which cheating behavior occurs.

4. There are no significant differences at the .05 level of confidence between responses of students at church-affiliated colleges and students at secular colleges to instruments designed to assess:

- a. behaviors which constitute cheating.
- b. the seriousness of cheating behaviors.
- c. the academic setting or situation in which cheating behavior occurs.

The statistical significance of the difference between the mean scores of the groups will be determined by computing "t" tests.

Value of the Study

No one doubts the fact that cheating is prevalent on the American college campus. Although there are other significant causes, the difference in views between faculty and students may be a factor. If we can gain a better understanding of faculty and student attitudes toward cheating, we may be able to initiate efforts which will reduce cheating on the college level.

After determining the view which is held regarding cheating on its campus, an institution may well want to look into its "climate of values." Philip Jacob states (23, p. 95),

A look at whole colleges . . . reveals that sometimes a combination of factors can produce a distinctive institutional atmosphere, a 'climate of values,' in which students are decisively influenced. The incoming student is quick to sense "what goes" on his particular campus. He tends to follow along in the groove he finds, and in short order the pattern of his beliefs and attitudes comes to bear the stamp of his institution.

Bowers (7, p. 196) in his study found that the characteristics of a college including student attitudes determine to a very real extent whether cheating was widely practiced on that campus.

One of the most frequent causes of disciplinary action on a college campus is cheating. In Bower's (7, p. 15) study, deans and student body presidents listed academic dishonesty, including cheating on tests and examinations, and plagiarizing on papers and assignments as second in seriousness among all disciplinary problems. Some institutions have a policy that if a student is caught cheating, he will automatically be given an F in the course. In many colleges, a student may be dismissed for cheating. An evaluation of faculty and student views toward defining a cheating act and the seriousness of a certain behavior may

help us in dealing with the problem.

Ellison (12, p. 57f) points out that more and more in our crucial national efforts it is important that we have truth and accurate knowledge. He states,

For example, the lessons of history, correctly interpreted are vital to the national safety. But if our historians are sloppy workmen, who will tell us of such things? The space age demands rockets that will work, and these are not produced by designers who won their A's in math by cheating. The surgeon at the operating table needs knowledge, not just a grade. There is an ever-increasing number of fields where fooling with the truth, either through incompetence or fraud, can produce disaster.

Since moral integrity is basic in our scale of values in the home, in education and in a democratic society, every effort which is made to elevate this value will be beneficial to our way of life.

Definitions of Concepts and Terms

The following are definitions of concepts and terms as they are used in this study.

1. Cheating--Any act of a student which intends to deceive the teacher for the benefit of earning a higher grade. This can be done by being dishonest on tests, having someone else do outside work, or plagiarism.
2. Academic setting--The classroom environment existing at a college.
3. Opinionnaire--A form containing statements to which one is asked to respond with his own views and persuasions.
4. College environment--The characteristics of a college, i.e., acceptable behavior, values held and encouraged by the institution.
5. Plagiarism--A failure to acknowledge the source of written

statements not originating with the individual.

6. Academic dishonesty--Any form of cheating or plagiarism undertaken by students at college.

7. Attitudes--An existing predisposition to evaluate objects, persons or situations in certain ways.

Limitations

The attitudes which are expressed in these instruments cannot be construed to indicate actual behavior of the respondents. In fact there is growing evidence to indicate that attitudes toward cheating may have little relation to what takes place in actual practice. Lee J.

Cronbach (11, p. 646) discusses Corey's findings:

Corey asked college students what they thought about cheating on tests, and to no one's surprise they stated that cheating is sinful and contrary to the cheater's best interests. The next step was to find out if they would cheat, given a good chance. After each Friday's quiz, Corey left the papers unmarked and passed them out in class on Monday for each person to grade his own. Then Corey compared the scores on the papers with the grades he had secretly recorded before returning them on Monday. In five weeks, only one quarter of the class consistently refrained from changing answers to raise their scores. Whether or not a person was honest had no relation to the attitude he expressed.

Uhlig and Howes (38, p. 411) conducted an experiment using Anderson's attitudinal measurement instrument, and then subjected students to an actual situation in which they might cheat, and found that "Attitudes toward cheating as measured by Anderson's scale do not appear to reflect actual behavior of the respondents." It is impossible under these circumstances to infer predictions based on attitudes or perceptions of cheating.

An attempt was made to secure random sample individuals from each institution, but one should exercise caution in inferring these students

and faculty at each institution actually represent the attitudes held by the majority of these two groups on each college campus.

Any generalizations to other institutions will have to be made with considerable caution since the selected institutions may or may not be generally representative in the sense of being models or prototypes.

Basic Assumptions

One basic assumption made for this study is that the students and faculty who completed the "Survey of Attitudes Toward Cheating" are representative samples of student and faculty populations at the institutions providing data for this study.

It is assumed that attitudes toward appropriate punishment for cheating indicate the seriousness with which individual treats cheating.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Early Research

"Studies in Deceit" is one of the first research efforts in America on cheating (18). It was conducted by psychologists Hartshorne and May in 1927 and has become a classic in its field. These men studied hundreds of children; they administered 21 different tests of honesty or deceitfulness to children in grades five to eight in three different communities. Several conclusions were drawn from their studies. They observed wide variations in cheating among children; there were no outstanding sex differences; and older children were slightly more likely to cheat than younger children. A comment made by Murphy and Newcomb (30, p. 402), who reviewed these studies, suggests the importance of the situation in cheating:

Cheating in one situation gives almost no information at all as to the likelihood that a child will cheat in another . . . character is found to be a much less important variable than is the situation.

Causes of Cheating

A notion since the earliest research, which has continued through the years, is that the necessity to make good grades is a vital factor in cheating. T. H. Howells (22) in 1938 found when he increased the difficulty of tests to high school students, the number of individuals

cheating increased and the amount of cheating per individual increased. Barclay (4) contends too much emphasis on marks by teachers and pressure from parents increases the incidence of cheating. L. H. Johnson (24) found that when parents offered rewards for high grades the cheating among junior high students was substantially higher. Rogosin (30), in his article "What About Cheating on Examinations and Honesty," quotes E. R. Groves, an outstanding authority on family relations, as saying that cheating in school is largely due to the strain resulting from an overemphasis on marks and from the failure of the school to adjust work to the individual's capabilities and attitudes.

In an effort to learn from college students themselves why they cheated, Dr. Howard Wilson (39, p. 42), who served on the faculty of Loyola University and the Illinois Institute of Technology, asked college students to write him anonymously telling why they cheated. More than 700 students from 30 different states replied and ranked highest in causes the pressures for high marks. It appears from the responses received by Dr. Wilson that students competing for entrance to graduate schools, particularly medicine, engineering and dentistry, felt the pressure greatest. He stated that a number of students wrote, "Everybody does it, so I have to in self-protection. If I don't cheat, those who do beat me out." Many students complained of unfair examinations while others attributed the causes to crowded classrooms.

A national exposure of cheating was made by Jerome Ellison (12) in an article in the Saturday Evening Post in January, 1960, entitled, "American Disgrace: College Cheating." While treating many other facets of cheating, Ellison states that the most common reason given in all his investigations is the pressure to succeed, reinforced by the

fear of failing. One student he interviewed expressed the thought that in our society emphasis is on grades rather than character and integrity. Considerable blame was placed on the faculty by students who considered them to be inconsistent and stated they did not give adequate supervision. A lack of standards was also cited by Ellison as a fundamental cause.

Barclay (4), in her article, cites a book, The Normal Child and Some of His Abnormalities, by C. W. Valentine, past president of the British Psychological Society, in which Valentine summarized his feelings as a boy as to why he and his classmates cheated. These reasons were summarily: (1) resentment against adult teachers, particularly those who were dictatorial, unsympathetic or odd; (2) esprit among classmates or group pressure; and finally (3) a feeling that the subject matter of the course had little meaning or worth to him.

While most of the studies and articles indicate that pressure for high grades is a prime cause of cheating, Bowers (7) found that when the student himself desires good grades, he is not more likely to cheat than others. On the contrary, a commitment by the student to good grades acts as a constraint against cheating, but when parents are assumed to place high value on grades, it has the opposite effect. This agrees with Johnson's (24) findings that when parents offered rewards for high grades, students were more likely to cheat.

Sex and Cheating

Some contradictory results seem to exist regarding sex and frequency of cheating. Hartshorne and May (18) found there were no outstanding differences between the sexes in the incidence of cheating,

and Johnson (24) concluded from his studies that sex has little to do with cheating. Both of these studies involved elementary and junior high school students.

On the college level, William F. Anderson (2) found in his studies on "Attitudes of University Students Toward Cheating" that women expressed stricter feelings toward cheating than men. His conclusions were verified by Uhlig and Howes (38) who made a study of graduate and undergraduate students at Eastern Kentucky State College and found girls manifested a stricter attitude toward cheating than men. It should be observed that both of these studies were concerned with attitudes toward cheating and may or may not be indicative of what might take place in actual practice.

While expressing several reasons why men are under more pressure to cheat in college due to their status and need for success in the financial world, Bowers (7), after sampling some 2810 males and 2568 females, concludes that while in the total sample males are more likely to cheat than females, in the context of strong disapproval from the college environment there is little difference between the sexes.

While there are indications that females are stricter in their attitudes toward cheating, there is still no valid research, particularly at the college level, to conclude there are any significant differences between the sexes on the incidence of cheating in actual practice.

Intelligence and Cheating

Most of the research available on intelligence and cheating indicates that students with higher intelligence are less likely to cheat

than students of lower intelligence. T. H. Howells (22) in his study on "Factors Influencing Honesty" found that intelligence correlates negligibly (.08) with cheating, but most of the other studies indicate different results. Hartshorne and May (18) observed that children with low intelligence, who were prodded to keep up, were more apt to cheat than others. Gross (17) found the mean I. Q. for the "honest" group was 4.85 higher than the "dishonest" group. It was not determined in the study, however, whether this was a significant difference. Atkins and Atkins (3) in their study found the mean I. Q. of non-cheaters to be higher than that of cheaters. In his study of junior high students in Corvallis, Oregon, Johnson (24, p. 73) concluded, "There is a consistent increase in the per cent of cheating from the fourth or highest quartile of the range of intelligence to the first or lowest quartile." Hoff (21, p. 129) found a correlation between cheating and intelligence of .324 and concluded, "Bright pupils tend to cheat as well as pupils of less ability; although not to as great an extent." It should be noted there has been no research for several years, with some of the more refined intelligence tests, on the relationship of intelligence and cheating.

Role of the Faculty

It has been only in recent years that attention has been given to the role of the faculty member in the cheating situation and to the climate he creates in his classroom as related to cheating. This, despite the fact that Atkins and Atkins (3, p. 603) found as early as 1936, the proportion of students who are dishonest in tests is in direct relation to the procedure of the teacher. They stated, "The

honesty of a group of students seems to be in control of the instructor."

In talking with students in different sections of the country, Ellison (12) discovered many students lay the blame for cheating squarely on the faculty. They say the faculty pretends to be against cheating, but when it's under their noses, they close their eyes and pretend not to see. They also stated that while some teachers are strict regarding cheating, others do not seem to know that it is going on.

Two Hofstra college professors, Shirk and Hoffman (34), in their article "The Academic Setting of the Dishonest Student," call attention to the important role which the teacher plays in creating an atmosphere in his classroom which encourages or discourages cheating. They feel that where the following conditions exist in a classroom, the faculty member has consciously or unconsciously contributed to a cheating situation. The conditions are: (1) Where the faculty member asserts he is the sole source of authority on truth; (2) A lackadaisical attitude of the teacher toward his class; (3) When a student is reduced to his grades; (4) Where the faculty member indicates the grade is the only indication of the intelligence of the student; (5) Where the teacher attempts to trick the student or catch him unawares with a test.

Dr. Richard E. Gordon, consulting psychiatrist at Wagner College in New York, and Katherine K. Gordon (16) in their article for The Journal of the American College Health Association, indicate teachers can produce cheating by making assignments too difficult. More cheating occurs in large and impersonal classes; where grading on the curve

forces competition; from using multiple-choice rather than essay-type examinations; and from instructors using the same test with several different sections of a class at different times.

It was because of the lack of research data that this study is investigating several aspects of the academic setting. Part II of the "Survey of Attitudes Toward Cheating" administered to faculty and students in this study depicts the instructor acting in many of the ways indicated above to determine whether students feel they are justified in cheating when they observe a faculty member acting in what they might consider an unfair way.

The Punishment of Cheating

Marvin L. Hendricks (19) found in his research, "Changing Mores Concerning Cheating on Examinations," that only one per cent of those interviewed thought cheating justified expulsion; only two or three per cent thought it deserved an F, and most felt the student involved in cheating should simply be spoken to.

Apparently the number of students who are punished at all for cheating is relatively small. Bowers (7) states it is less than one per cent of the student body of an average-sized school. It is Bowers' (7, p. 23) feeling that this constitutes one of the dilemmas in controlling cheating:

Whatever the reason, relative to other disciplinary problems, academic dishonesty presents a paradox: campus authorities consider it to be one of the more serious disciplinary problems and yet sanctions against it are considerably more lenient than those imposed on other forms of student misconduct.

Numerous incidents were found by Ellison (12) where cheating students were completely exonerated by either administrators or faculty

committees even when concrete evidence was presented indicating cheating had taken place. One incident he cited was a graduating senior who had flagrantly plagiarized an entire article and turned it in for a term paper. The faculty member became suspicious and discovered the article in a periodical in the library. He promptly gave the student an F in the course. A faculty committee ruled in the student's favor. In another case four instructors observed a youth cheating. He was given an F in the course by his instructor, but an appeal to the Dean of Students absolved the student of any guilt.

While finding considerable evidence of a lack of definite policy in colleges regarding cheating, and a lack of consistent punishment for cheating, Ellison (12) also found cases where students were suspended for a semester as at two New England women's colleges. It is his feeling that the administrators of a college can put a stop to cheating any time they want to, but every institution has to determine its standards and punishment for violators.

As is apparent, the type of punishment administered by college officials varies widely. Sometimes the instructor is allowed to handle the matter entirely himself with a warning, whereas in an institution such as the Air Force Academy, there is automatic dismissal of any student caught cheating.

Within the last two years some flagrant violations of cheating have resulted in the expulsion of students involved. Ten students were expelled at Ohio State in June, 1966, and disciplinary action was taken against 29 others. At Duke University in September, 1968, 13 students were suspended for cheating. One must be aware, however, in each of these cases there was an organized group of students involved. They

had jointly contrived a plan for cheating and were caught in the act.

A strong appeal is made by Herman (20) for punishment of cheating to be educative, and not retaliatory. He makes a distinction between the "simple" cheater (an individual student who may cheat one time and feel remorse) and the "non-simple" cheating (involves several students and is premeditated and repetitive). While not ignoring the fact that simple cheating must be dealt with, Herman is more concerned with how to handle non-simple cheating. He feels the ground rules for punishment must have two criteria: (1) the punishment should not be psychologically or socially damaging to the student; and (2) the punishment must make the student aware he has cheated and his conduct is unacceptable. Several proposals are suggested by Herman, but the ones that he considers meet his criteria and accomplish an educative purpose are: place students who cheat (simple and non-simple) in seminars attended by the cheater, instructor and administrators and make efforts to determine the causes of cheating; a student honor court or student council could meet with the student in special seminars for cheaters; or a panel composed of cheaters, faculty, administrators and other students could discuss the matter of cheating openly. The advantages of this approach, according to Herman, are that it would involve other students, which would put the students who are guilty of cheating at ease with support and understanding from their peer group, and it would involve the faculty in a realistic and objective discussion of cheating. "The main purpose of this paper," states Herman (20, p. 266), "is to encourage us to re-think our methods of handling cheaters."

Since considerable confusion exists over punishment and over the seriousness with which cheating is considered, this research will

determine if there are significant differences between the way faculty and students look at the punishment to be administered in cases where cheating has occurred.

Cheating Is a Specific Act

One of the findings of Hartshorne and May (18) was that cheating had low correlations with other forms of misbehavior. Rogosin (30, p. 402) quotes from this study,

There is no generalized uniform trait of honesty that characterizes a child in all his activities. . . Honesty and Dishonesty are largely a function of and dependent upon the actual situation itself rather than upon a generalized moral trait.

R. V. Burton (8) confirmed this in his research and found low positive correlations between different types of deviant behavior.

A most interesting research was conducted by Garfield, Cohen and Roth (14) in an attempt to determine whether cheating involved a general morality matrix or whether it should be considered a specific act standing alone. The evidence again is clear that cheating did not correlate significantly with other forms of guilt and further support is given to a specificity hypothesis of cheating.

McQueen (27, p. 649), as a result of his study entitled "Examination Deception as a Function of Residual, Background and Immediate Stimulus Factors," concludes, "The practice of regarding deception as a relatively fixed or stable trait among different individuals is cast in some doubt by the results of the present study."

Other Findings

Personality characteristics and cheating were investigated by Keehn

(25). A conclusion which he reached was that students who scored low on both neuroticism and extroversion scales cheated less frequently than those who scored high on these measures.

A study by Donald R. Black (5) on the falsification of reported examination marks was conducted in a senior class at the University of Alberta. Three groups were involved with the first group having their papers incorrectly totaled by the instructor with a lowering of their grade; a second group had their papers marked correctly; and a third group were given higher grades than they earned. Every opportunity was given the students to raise their marks without detection. One concrete finding uncovered was that the majority would falsify marks if it was in their favor and might be construed as the fault of the instructor.

Some other interesting findings which have been made are: McQueen (27) found when one student broke the silence on a grading error and was praised for so doing, it reduced cheating; Atkins and Atkins (3) found the extent of cheating will be in proportion to the ease of cheating; Hoff (21) found that pupils tended to cheat less when grading their neighbor's paper than when grading their own. Kruger (26) found that when students are allowed to cheat, cheating increases.

Further Areas for Research

Since the institutional climate may determine to a large extent the amount of cheating which is engaged in by students, some research would be most profitable which examines institutions where cheating is controlled.

Some longitudinal studies would be interesting to determine why seniors have a more tolerant attitude toward cheating than freshmen. Exactly what takes place in the college experience which accounts for this change?

Much more research is needed to determine the effect which certain faculty behaviors have on students. While this study investigated whether students feel justified in acting a certain way when they perceive a faculty member has been unfair with them on an examination, it was not within the scope of this study to determine exactly how students perceive an instructor as to grading on the curve, the giving of pop quizzes, or the climate he creates in the classroom.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Design of the Instrument

Since the approach in this study was unique from what has been done before in evaluating attitudes toward cheating, it was apparent that a new instrument would be necessary to obtain the desired information. The only instrument which approximated that needed by the author was William F. Anderson's attitudinal measurement scale (2). Anderson depicted 28 behavioral situations in which fictitious students were described as conducting themselves in ways that might be considered either as cheating or as acceptable behavior. The first five situations on his instrument (1-5) were generally considered to be the desirable and appropriate ways of acting in competing for an acceptable or desirable course grade. The next five situations described (6-10) were intended to be puzzling to students as to their appropriateness. Following this, nine actions (11-19) were described, and these were intended to be objectionable, but not to the degree they were always completely unjustified. The last group of eight actions (20-28) perceived by students who helped develop the instrument to be highly objectionable. Students were then asked to rate the 28 potential cheating situations as to the degree of the students' behavior being justified or not justified. Each rating was on a five-point scale. If the respondent felt the student was entirely justified in the action

as depicted, he was to place a figure (5) in front of the behavior. While Anderson's instrument was not appropriate for this study, some of the basic concepts were incorporated in the instrument "A Survey of Attitudes Toward Cheating" utilized in this study.

The general content of student behaviors described in the 50 different situations of the author's instrument came from three different sources. The first source was 38 students enrolled in an Educational Psychology class at Oklahoma Christian College during the spring semester of 1965. These students, mostly seniors, were asked: (1) to describe all possible cheating situations they had ever engaged in or heard about including all possible types of cheating; (2) to consider how seriously they regard cheating--to indicate possible degrees of punishment ranging from the student's being warned to dismissal; and (3) to describe all possible situations which might occur in the classroom in connection with taking an examination or in assignments of term papers which they felt would be unfair to students. The responses described about 57 different actions of students which might be considered cheating (see Appendix A for students' descriptions) and approximately 31 situations in the academic setting of the classroom which they felt were unfair to the student. The second source for ideas of the situations used in this investigation was Anderson's (2) instrument. The third source was Bowers' (7, p. 47) thirteen specific acts which might be considered dishonest in the light of academic standards. Students were asked to check those they had committed in college.

Per Cent of Students Admitting Ever Having Committed
Each of 13 Specific Acts

Item No.	Specific Act	Per Cent of Sample	Number of Students Admitting Each
1	Copying a few sentences of material without footnoting in a paper- - - - -	43	2,348
2	Getting questions or answers from someone who has already taken the same exam - - - - -	33	1,769
3	Copying answers from a text or other source instead of doing the work independently- - - - -	31	1,698
4	"Padding" a few items on a bibliography- - - - -	28	1,534
5	Giving answers to other students during an exam - - - - -	17	929
6	Copying from someone's test or exam paper without his knowing about it - -	16	893
7	Working on the same homework with several other students when the teacher does not allow it - - - - -	11	622
8	Copying from someone's test or exam paper with that person's knowledge - -	11	611
9	Writing a paper for another student - -	9	467
10	Arranging to sit next to someone who will let you copy from him during a test or exam - - - - -	4	243
11	Arranging with other students to give or receive answers by use of signals -	2	106
12	Taking an exam for another student - - -	1	30
13	Having another student take an exam for you - - - - -	a	12
			11,262
			(5,422)

The overall plan of the instrument developed was to include every conceivable form of cheating. These consisted of 50 items which were summarized under one of the following four groupings:

1. Cheating in connection with the preparation of or taking of an examination. (36 items)

Situations 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 30, 31, 32, 36, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 47, 48, 49, 50.

2. Cheating in preparation of term papers (copying, plagiarism, etc.) (9 items)

Situations 3, 9, 11, 28, 29, 33, 35, 38, 45.

3. Cheating in connection with grading one's own paper or others. (3 items)

Situations 12, 37, 46.

4. Cheating by turning in homework or papers done entirely or in part by others. (2 items)

Situations 34 and 44.

The arrangement of the situations in Part I of the survey was made in several forms but a final decision was made to put them in random order so there would be no indication of the acceptability or unacceptability of the students' actions which might influence the response. This is contrasted with Anderson's (2) arrangement, which was arranged on a continuum with behaviors from acceptable to completely objectionable in that order.

In an effort to determine the seriousness with which students and faculty considered acts of cheating, as indicated on the instrument, space was made available following each of the 50 student behaviors for the respondent to check one of the following: Should not be punished; Should be warned; Should receive an F on paper; Should receive F in course and be dropped from class; Should be suspended for remainder of term with opportunity of readmission; Should be dismissed with disciplinary action noted on transcript. (See "A Survey of Attitudes Toward Cheating" in Appendix B.)

A very important part of this study was to investigate for significant differences between the groups involved in the academic setting in which cheating occurs. Part II of the instrument depicts 28 behavioral situations, most of which depict the instructor acting in ways which many students have felt were unfair. The student's behavior in these situations is in response to the actions of the instructor, and the respondent is asked to rate the behaviors on a scale from one to five (from behavior entirely justified to behavior definitely not justified with three as no judgment on behavior). Again the situations are placed at random in the survey used in this study. The only two types of cheating covered in this part are:

1. Cheating in connection with the preparation or taking of an examination. (25 items)

Situations 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28.

2. Cheating in preparation of term papers (copying, plagiarism, etc.) (3 items)

Situations 17, 19, 24.

Several attempts were made to establish reliability of the instrument before it was actually accomplished. The first efforts with students at Christian College of the Southwest and Dallas Baptist College were unsuccessful largely due to the attempt of the author to handle the testing with students remaining anonymous. When it was determined that anonymity was not absolutely necessary, when students were assured responses would be seen only by the author and that he was interested only in total results, the testing proceeded smoothly.

The test-retest method was used for determining reliability. Both faculty and student groups were used in testing for reliability.

TABLE I
ADMINISTRATION OF TESTS FOR RELIABILITY

Group	Institution	Number	Original Test	Retest
Faculty	El Centro College, Dallas, Texas	13	1-19-69	3-26-69
Student	East Texas State Univ.	33	3-20-69	5-15-69

The faculty of El Centro College was composed mainly of those who serve a counseling function at that institution.

Students used in the reliability determination were enrolled in Sociology 112, Social Problems, at East Texas State University. These students were freshmen and sophomores at that institution.

After the test and retest, it was necessary to eliminate seven student surveys, due to incompleteness of the instrument, and two faculty surveys for the same reason.

The statistical treatment involved the use of the Product moment correlation. The formula is (29, p. 89):

$$R = \frac{\Sigma XY - \frac{\Sigma X - \Sigma Y}{N}}{\sqrt{\left(\Sigma X^2 - \frac{(\Sigma X)^2}{N} \right) \left(\Sigma Y^2 - \frac{(\Sigma Y)^2}{N} \right)}}$$

Correlation was considered good on all parts with the exception of the faculty on Part I, B (punishment). This was difficult to explain since apparently no large scale incidents of cheating or punishment

occurred between test and retest which would have affected the results.

TABLE II
COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION RELIABILITY

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Part I</u>		<u>Part II</u>	<u>Composite</u>
		<u>*A</u>	<u>*B</u>		
Students	33	.78	.67	.88	.84
Faculty	13	.72	.13	.96	.77

*A of Part I is How Do You Feel About Student's Behavior
B of Part I is Punishment

To determine the validity, the instrument was submitted to four educators for their appraisal of the extent the device measured, the attitudes it was purporting to measure, i.e., situations which might be considered cheating, different punishments which might be administered, and the academic setting in which cheating occurs. Letters and the instrument were sent January 4, 1968, to the following educators: Dr. M. E. Bonney, Distinguished Scholar, North Texas State University, Denton Texas; Dr. R. S. North, Dean of Instruction, Oklahoma Christian College, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma; Dr. Thomas Cunningham, Extension Division, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma; and Dr. Rex Johnston, Academic Dean, Christian College of the Southwest, Dallas, Texas. These men felt the instrument did measure what was purported to be measured, and also made several helpful suggestions in wording and design of the instrument which were incorporated into a revised edition.

Wherever the situation as depicted appeared to be ambiguous to these educators, changes were made by the author. The criterion as previously determined was if any two of the educators felt an item should be deleted or reworded, this would be considered sufficient evidence to change the item. The author took the further liberty that if he felt one educator made a recommended change which would improve the instrument, a change would be made.

Subjects

The student and faculty subjects who constituted the sample in this study were from two secular institutions of higher education, viz., East Texas State University, Commerce, Texas, and North Texas State University, Denton, Texas, and two church-affiliated colleges, viz., Abilene Christian College, Abilene, Texas, and Oklahoma Christian College, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. It should be understood the church-affiliated institutions involved in this study are operated and controlled by members of Churches of Christ.

The total number of subjects who constituted the student sample was 320--149 males and 171 females. They consisted of 40 freshmen and 40 seniors from each of the four involved institutions.

The only criterion for the student subjects was they be enrolled as freshman or senior students at each of the respective institutions for the summer session, 1969. The survey was administered during a regularly constituted class period in each of the colleges with the exception of Oklahoma Christian College where a student assembly provided the opportunity for securing student cooperation in completing the survey. Where it was possible larger classes were chosen to

minimize the number of different administrations required to secure the sample. There was no preference given to any subject area so students may be considered to have been taken at random at each of the institutions.

There was a total of 100 faculty members involved in the study with 25 subjects from each of the four institutions. They consisted of 89 males and 11 females, and their subject areas cover a broad spectrum of disciplines in higher education. In some cases the faculty was approached personally and asked to assist in the study, while others were contacted by mail. Those contacted by mail were selected at random from the faculty rosters of the institutions.

Method of Data Collection

All subjects were asked to read carefully the instructions on the instrument. Either orally or by letter they were told the purpose of the study, an explanation was given of the survey, the approximate time it would take to complete the survey, and for identification purposes, they should affix either their name or initials in the upper right hand corner of the instrument.

Abilene Christian College. The freshman students were enrolled in English and Bible. (Bible is a required course for all freshmen, and so enrollees would be the same as those enrolled in English.) The seniors were enrolled in Education and Business Administration courses. Arrangements were made by the Dean for the author to administer the instrument to these classes while they were in session during the first six-week session in the summer of 1969. Administration actually took place on June 11, 1969.

Twenty faculty members completed the instrument during a faculty session on June 11. Five more surveys were needed following this initial administration. Surveys were mailed at random to faculty members at this institution on June 18; they were returned by July 10. The request was made that faculty members identify their instrument either by name or initials. (See Appendix C.) A careful tabulation was kept of faculty to which the survey was sent and those returned.

East Texas State University. Through the cooperation of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Dean of Students, arrangements were made for the author to administer the survey to 40 freshmen enrolled in History and 40 seniors enrolled in an Education course. The administration of the instrument took place on June 17 and was completed that day with the exception of one senior. The head of the Education Department at the university assumed the responsibility for securing a senior to complete the final survey needed. This was received three days later.

A letter with enclosed survey (see Appendix D) was forwarded to 50 faculty members taken at random from the roster of East Texas State University. The first 25 returned were used in this study. More than 28 faculty surveys were completed and returned.

North Texas State University. An attempt to secure students at this university on an entirely voluntary basis proved futile. When this approach failed, the author personally contacted faculty members to enlist their cooperation in administering the instrument to their classes. The 40 freshmen who completed the survey were enrolled in English, General Psychology and Physical Education courses. The 40 seniors were enrolled in History, Advanced Speech, and Physical

Education. The instructors in these courses were most cooperative, and administration of all these students took place on the campus of this university between June 30 and July 11.

Faculty subjects were contacted by letter written on June 13. They were selected at random from different departments at the university. (See Appendix E.) The first 25 completed surveys were used in this study although more than 28 were returned. No reminder was necessary to secure cooperation of this faculty.

Oklahoma Christian College. After a student-faculty assembly on June 13, freshman and senior students enrolled at the college were asked to remain to assist in completing the survey on cheating. Faculty were also asked to remain if they could. Excellent cooperation was received, but due to the small enrollment for the summer trimester only 15 freshmen and 17 seniors completed the instruments at that time. A letter with enclosed survey was sent to 30 freshmen and 32 seniors enrolled for the summer session. (See Appendix F.) Twenty-one of the freshmen had returned these instruments (a reminder was necessary) by July 12. Four other freshmen needed were secured personally by the author on a visit to the campus of this college on July 14. Eighteen completed surveys were received from seniors by July 12. A visit to the campus secured the final senior on July 14.

Faculty members completing the survey at the time of the initial administration of the survey on June 13 numbered 18. The Dean of Instruction assisted the author in securing 5 more. Two were lacking at the time of the author's visit to the campus, and these were secured personally by the author on July 14.

Treatment of the Data

Summary of the data was made by the author who added all responses vertically on 420 instruments with a total for each column of Parts I and II. There were five columns under "How Do You Feel About the Student's Behavior" with columns labelled 1 to 5, and six columns under punishment. These columns were labelled: Should not be punished; Should be warned; Should receive an F in course and be dropped from class; Should be suspended for remainder of term with opportunity of readmission; and Should be dismissed with disciplinary action noted on transcript. Each of these columns was totaled. The five columns labelled 1 to 5 of Part II were totaled. Results were recorded on forms provided by the University Computer Center at Oklahoma State University.

The method used to determine whether there were significant differences between the means of each student and faculty group on each of the three sections measured in the survey was to compute "t" tests. The actual computations were done on an IBM System 360, Model 50. The following procedure was followed in computing values of "t."

1. Standard deviation

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{\sum X^2}{n}}$$

2. Standard error of the mean

$$SE_M = \frac{SD}{\sqrt{n}}$$

3. Standard error of the difference between means

$$SE_D = \sqrt{SE_{M_1}^2 + SE_{M_2}^2}$$

$$4. t = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{SE_D}$$

From this analysis the resulting "t" was compared to the "t" value in the table, with the appropriate degrees of freedom, and at the .05 level of confidence, to determine whether the differences between the means were significant.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine whether there were significant differences between the means of four distinct groups on three aspects of cheating.

The first of the three aspects of cheating studied was to determine behaviors which constitute cheating. A high mean rating indicates more behaviors were considered doubtful or definitely cheating, whereas, a lower mean rating indicates more behaviors were considered non-cheating.

A second aspect studied was the seriousness of cheating behaviors. The higher mean ratings indicated more severe punishment, thus implying that these respondents considered cheating more seriously than did those registering lower mean ratings.

The third aspect studied was the academic setting in which cheating behavior occurs. The attempt was to determine how students perceived the actions of teachers in an academic setting, principally the classroom. A high rating indicates the student was not justified in his actions irrespective of the actions of the professor. A lower mean rating indicates the respondents consider the actions of the faculty member unfair; therefore, the student was justified in his behavior.

It should be recognized in appraising the results of this study

that reliability was highest on the academic setting aspect and lowest on the seriousness of cheating behaviors.

Behavior Which Constitutes Cheating

Data for student and faculty attitudes toward behaviors which constitute cheating are presented in Table III.

TABLE III
COMPARISON OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE MEAN RATINGS
OF FACULTY AND STUDENTS ON THE BEHAVIORS
WHICH CONSTITUTE CHEATING

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	"t"
Faculty	100	186.23	19.62	3.82*
Students	320	174.44	28.84	

*Significant at the .01 level of confidence.

The findings in Table III indicate there is a significant difference between faculty and students as to what constitutes a cheating behavior. Faculty members definitely consider more situations as cheating than do students.

The null hypothesis which stated there is no significant difference at the .05 level of confidence between faculty and student responses to instruments designed to assess behaviors which constitute cheating was rejected. A significant difference was found at the .01 level of confidence.

Table IV presents data on freshman and senior attitudes toward behaviors which constitute cheating.

TABLE IV
COMPARISON OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE MEAN RATINGS
OF FRESHMEN AND SENIORS ON THE BEHAVIORS
WHICH CONSTITUTE CHEATING

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	"t"
Freshmen	160	173.88	29.94	.35
Seniors	160	175.01	27.78	

The above table indicates there is little difference in the attitudes of freshman and senior students toward cheating behaviors. This is apparently contrary to some research which indicates that freshmen tend to look at cheating situations more strictly than seniors. Actually this study shows seniors' mean ratings as slightly higher and thus more strict than those of freshmen.

The null hypothesis which states there is no significant difference at the .05 level of confidence between freshman and senior student responses to instruments designed to assess behaviors which constitute cheating was accepted.

Results from a comparison of the attitudes of the faculty of church-affiliated and the faculty of secular colleges on behaviors which constitute cheating are given in Table V.

TABLE V
 COMPARISON OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE MEAN RATINGS
 OF FACULTY OF CHURCH-AFFILIATED AND FACULTY OF
 SECULAR COLLEGES ON THE BEHAVIORS WHICH
 CONSTITUTE CHEATING

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	"t"
Faculty of Church- Affiliated	50	190.10	21.08	2.00*
Faculty of Secular	50	182.36	17.41	

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

According to Table V, the faculty of secular colleges do not consider as many behaviors of students as definite cheating acts as do the faculty of church-affiliated colleges.

The null hypothesis stated there is no significant difference at the .05 level of confidence between faculty of church-affiliated and faculty of secular colleges to instruments designed to assess behaviors which constitute cheating. It was rejected at the .05 level of confidence as a significant difference was found.

Data for attitudes of students of church-affiliated colleges and students of secular colleges are shown in Table VI. This table indicates there is a significant difference between the students of church-affiliated colleges and students at secular colleges on attitudes of what is considered cheating. Students at church-related colleges perceive many more situations as doubtful or definitely cheating than do their counterparts in secular institutions.

TABLE VI
 COMPARISON OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE MEAN RATINGS OF STUDENTS
 OF CHURCH-AFFILIATED AND STUDENTS OF SECULAR
 COLLEGES ON BEHAVIORS WHICH
 CONSTITUTE CHEATING

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	"t"
Students of Church- Affiliated	160	184.99	23.15	7.02*
Students of Secular	160	163.89	30.14	

*Significant at the .01 level of confidence.

The null hypothesis, which states there is no significant difference at the .05 level of confidence between responses of students at church-affiliated colleges and students at secular colleges to instruments designed to assess behaviors which constitute cheating, was rejected. There was a significant difference found at the .01 level of confidence.

A summary of the results comparing all groups on attitudes toward behaviors which constitute cheating is shown in Table VII. It indicates the significance of the "t" values at the .05 and .01 levels of confidence.

The freshman and senior groups apparently interpreted behaviors which might be considered cheating much the same, but the students of church-affiliated and students of secular colleges differed significantly in their attitudes.

TABLE VII
 COMPARISONS OF "t" TESTS OF DIFFERENT GROUPS ON
 BEHAVIORS WHICH CONSTITUTE CHEATING

Group	N	"t"
Faculty and Students	420	3.82**
Freshmen and Seniors	320	.35
Faculty of Church-Affiliated and Faculty of Secular	100	2.00*
Students of Church-Affiliated and Students of Secular	320	7.02**

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

**Significant at the .01 level of confidence.

It might have been anticipated the greatest differences would be found between faculty and students in their attitudes toward what constitutes a cheating behavior, but this study indicates the most significant differences were between the students of church-affiliated and students of secular colleges. Apparently much stricter attitudes toward cheating acts exist among students attending church-affiliated colleges than those in secular institutions. Since the student populations studied consisted of both freshmen and seniors, it is more likely this is representative of the attitudes of the entire student body at the two different types of institutions.

Three of the four groups which were compared on this behavioral aspect of cheating differed significantly, and two of these were at the .01 level of confidence. The differences, however, were not in the hypothesized direction.

Seriousness of Cheating

Table VIII shows the comparison between student and faculty attitudes toward the seriousness of cheating.

TABLE VIII
COMPARISON OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE MEAN RATINGS OF FACULTY AND STUDENTS ON THE SERIOUSNESS OF CHEATING

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	"t"
Faculty	100	107.47	18.25	2.25*
Students	320	102.49	19.68	

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Faculty members apparently consider cheating a more serious offense than do students. They would inflict more severe penalties for cheating than would students. It should not be inferred from Table VIII that either faculty of secular colleges or faculty of church-affiliated colleges is more severe than the other, but these findings do indicate the combined faculties consider cheating to be more serious than do students.

The null hypothesis stated there is no significant difference at the .05 level of confidence between faculty and student responses to instruments designed to assess the seriousness of cheating behaviors. It was rejected as there was a significant difference found at the .05 level of confidence.

In Table IX are presented data for freshman and senior attitudes toward the seriousness of cheating.

TABLE IX
COMPARISON OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE MEAN RATINGS OF FRESHMEN
AND SENIORS ON THE SERIOUSNESS OF CHEATING

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	"t"
Freshmen	160	101.45	21.57	.94
Seniors	160	103.53	17.61	

The null hypothesis which stated there is no significant difference at the .05 level of confidence between freshman and senior student responses to instruments designed to assess the seriousness of cheating was accepted.

Data for the assessment of attitudes of faculty of church-affiliated colleges and faculty of secular colleges are given in Table X.

TABLE X
COMPARISON OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE MEAN RATINGS
OF FACULTY OF CHURCH-AFFILIATED AND FACULTY
OF SECULAR COLLEGES ON THE SERIOUS-
NESS OF CHEATING

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	"t"
Faculty of Church-Affiliated	50	107.52	18.01	.03
Faculty of Secular	50	107.42	18.67	

From the findings in Table X, apparently the faculties of both secular and church-affiliated institutions consider the seriousness of cheating very much alike. (The difference between the mean ratings of faculties of both institutions is the smallest of any comparisons, producing the lowest "t" value.) The null hypothesis stated there is no significant difference at the .05 level of confidence between responses of faculty of church-affiliated colleges and faculty of secular colleges to instruments designed to assess the seriousness of cheating. It was accepted.

Table XI presents the data for the attitudes of students of church-affiliated and students of secular colleges on the seriousness of cheating behaviors.

TABLE XI

COMPARISON OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE MEAN RATINGS OF STUDENTS OF CHURCH-AFFILIATED AND STUDENTS OF SECULAR COLLEGES ON THE SERIOUSNESS OF CHEATING

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	"t"
Students of Church-Affiliated	160	107.46	20.62	4.66*
Students of Secular	160	97.52	17.39	

*Significant at the .01 level of confidence.

Students at secular colleges are more lenient in the punishment they would administer to students guilty of cheating. This is only

natural since more of the behavioral situations were not considered cheating by secular students. The null hypothesis which stated there is no significant difference at the .05 level of confidence between response of students at church-affiliated colleges and students at secular colleges to instruments designed to assess the seriousness of cheating behaviors was rejected. A significant difference was found at the .01 level of confidence.

The summary of all groups on attitudes toward the seriousness of cheating is shown in Table XII.

TABLE XII
COMPARISONS OF "t" TESTS OF DIFFERENT GROUPS ON THE
SERIOUSNESS OF CHEATING BEHAVIORS

Group	N	"t"
Faculty and Students	420	2.25*
Freshmen and Seniors	320	.94
Faculty of Church-Affiliated and Faculty of Secular	100	.03
Students of Church-Affiliated and Students of Secular	320	4.66**

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

**Significant at the .01 level of confidence.

A greater amount of similarity exists among all groups on attitudes toward the seriousness of cheating than any other aspect of cheating studied. The faculties of the two types of institutions were

exceedingly alike in their views. There was also no significant difference found between freshman and senior students. Both considered the seriousness of cheating about alike.

While the smallest "t" value was between faculty of church-affiliated colleges and faculty of secular colleges, the largest "t" value was between the students at these two types of institutions. The students of church-affiliated colleges consider cheating a much more serious offense and would inflict more severe punishment than students at secular institutions. The difference was at the .01 level of confidence. A significant difference was also found between the combined groups of faculty and students from both types of institutions.

Academic Setting As An Aspect of Cheating

The results from a comparison of differences between the mean ratings of faculty and students on the academic setting in which cheating occurs is given in Table XIII.

TABLE XIII
COMPARISONS OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE MEAN RATINGS
OF FACULTY AND STUDENTS ON THE ACADEMIC
SETTING IN WHICH CHEATING OCCURS

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	"t"
Faculty	100	134.08	7.87	4.37*
Students	320	125.53	19.07	

*Significant at the .01 level of confidence.

A higher mean on Table XIII indicates faculty is more severe than students in condemning student behavior irrespective of the teacher's actions as depicted in the situations described in the instrument. From the student's standpoint, the findings infer a much more tolerant attitude toward other students' behavior. The null hypothesis which stated there is no significant difference at the .05 level of confidence between faculty and student responses to instruments designed to assess the academic setting or situation in which cheating behavior occurs was rejected. A significant difference between the two groups was found at the .01 level of confidence.

Data for freshman and senior attitudes toward the academic setting in which cheating occurs are presented in Table XIV.

TABLE XIV
COMPARISON OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE MEAN RATINGS
OF FRESHMEN AND SENIORS ON THE ACADEMIC
SETTING IN WHICH CHEATING OCCURS

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	"t"
Freshmen	160	124.66	20.34	.81
Seniors	160	126.39	17.73	

The null hypothesis stated there is no significant difference at the .05 level of confidence between freshman and senior student responses to instruments designed to assess the academic setting in which

cheating behavior occurs. It was accepted as there was no significant difference found.

Table XV presents the data for attitudes of faculty of church-affiliated colleges and faculty of secular colleges on the academic setting in which cheating occurs.

TABLE XV
COMPARISON OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE MEAN RATINGS OF FACULTY OF CHURCH-AFFILIATED AND FACULTY OF SECULAR COLLEGES ON THE ACADEMIC SETTING IN WHICH CHEATING OCCURS

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	"t"
Faculty of Church-Affiliated	50	136.58	7.45	3.33*
Faculty of Secular	50	131.58	7.55	

*Significant at the .01 level of confidence.

In Table XV the faculty of church-affiliated institutions perceive student behaviors in the academic setting more strictly than does the faculty of secular colleges. This is the greatest difference between means observed when comparing the attitudes of the faculty of the two kinds of institutions.

The null hypothesis which stated there is no significant difference at the .05 level of confidence between the faculty of church-affiliated colleges and faculty of secular colleges to instruments designed to assess the academic setting or situation in which cheating

behaviors occur was rejected as a significant difference was found at the .01 level of confidence.

In Table XVI data are presented for attitudes of students of church-affiliated and students of secular colleges on the academic setting in which cheating occurs.

TABLE XVI

COMPARISON OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE MEAN RATINGS OF STUDENTS OF CHURCH-AFFILIATED AND STUDENTS OF SECULAR COLLEGES ON THE ACADEMIC SETTING IN WHICH CHEATING OCCURS

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	"t"
Students of Church-Affiliated	160	133.07	9.89	7.69*
Students of Secular	160	117.99	22.75	

*Significant at the .01 level of confidence.

The largest "t" value occurred when the mean ratings of students of church-affiliated and students of secular colleges were compared. Students at secular institutions consider a student's behavior as justified in the academic setting much more frequently than do students of church-affiliated colleges. The strictness with which students perceive another student's behavior may indicate that, irrespective of the teacher's behavior, the student is not justified in actions which might be considered cheating. By the same token students at secular colleges, when they see a teacher acting in a way they might consider

unfair, feel the student is justified in his reactions to this behavior.

The null hypothesis stated there is no significant difference at the .05 level of confidence between responses of students at church-affiliated colleges and students at secular colleges to instruments designed to assess the academic setting in which cheating behavior occurs. The null hypothesis was rejected as a significant difference was found at the .01 level of confidence.

Table XVII summarizes the attitudes of all groups on the academic setting in which cheating occurs.

TABLE XVII

COMPARISONS OF "t" TESTS OF DIFFERENT GROUPS ON THE
ACADEMIC SETTING IN WHICH CHEATING OCCURS

Group	N	"t"
Faculty and Students	420	4.37**
Freshmen and Seniors	320	.81
Faculty of Church-Affiliated and Faculty of Secular	100	3.33**
Students of Church-Affiliated and Students of Secular	320	7.69**

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

**Significant at the .01 level of confidence.

Here the differences are marked between the way different groups look at the academic setting in which cheating occurs. Three of the four groups studied differed at the .01 level of confidence.

It might ordinarily be expected that the greatest differences in attitudes would be between faculty and students since these are the basically different groups involved in the academic enterprise. They did differ significantly and at the .01 level of confidence. But again the largest "t" value was found between students of church-affiliated and students of secular colleges. The faculties of the two different types of institutions differed also at the .01 level of confidence.

Summary

There are 12 tables which compare the differences between the mean ratings of the four groups studied on three aspects of cheating. Three tables summarize each of the aspects of cheating studied. The standard deviations were reported as an indication of the variability of the ratings. The "t" test was used to analyze differences between the designated means. Significance was always determined at the .05 level of confidence, unless it could be classed at the .01 level of confidence. When this was possible it was so indicated.

Attitudes toward behaviors which constitute cheating are recorded in Tables III, IV, V, and VI, with the summary of the "t" scores in Table VII. The largest "t" value of 7.02 was found between the students of church-affiliated colleges and the students of secular colleges. A significant difference based on a "t" value of 3.82 was found between the mean rating of faculty and students, and a "t" value of 2.00, which was significant at the .05 level of confidence, was found between the

faculty of church-affiliated and the faculty of secular colleges. No significant difference was found between freshmen and seniors on this phase of cheating when a "t" value of only .35 resulted. The null hypothesis was rejected three times, two at the .01 level of confidence and one at the .05 level of confidence, and accepted once.

The attitudes of all groups studied toward the seriousness of cheating are presented in Tables VIII, IX, X and XI, with the summary of all "t" values in Table XII. In two of the four groups compared, there was a significant difference. A "t" value of 4.66 was found between the students of church-affiliated and the students of secular colleges. This was significant at the .01 level of confidence. The other groups which showed a significant difference was between faculty and students. Here the "t" ratio was 2.25, which was significant at the .05 level of confidence. There was no significant difference found between the faculties of the two types of institutions nor was any difference found between freshmen and seniors. The smallest "t" value of the entire study was between the faculty of church-affiliated and the faculty of secular colleges on this aspect of cheating. A "t" ratio of only .03 was found.

The third aspect of cheating studied was the attitudes toward the academic setting in which cheating occurs. Tables XIII, XIV, XV, and XVI present the results of these comparisons. A summary of this aspect of cheating is found in Table XVII. The most significant differences of the entire study were found when this phase of cheating was studied. When students of church-affiliated colleges and students of secular colleges were compared, a large "t" value of 7.69 was found. A "t" value of 4.37 was found between faculty and students, and a "t" value

of 3.33 resulted from a comparison of the faculty of church-affiliated and the faculty of secular colleges. All three of these were significant differences at the .01 level of confidence. The only groups compared which failed to show a significant difference were freshmen and seniors.

Out of a total of four comparisons made on the three aspects of cheating, there was no significant difference between four of the groups compared. There were two groups compared which showed a significant difference at the .05 level of confidence, and six of the groups studied showed a significant difference at the .01 level of confidence. The null hypothesis was accepted four times and rejected eight times at the .05 or better level of confidence.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Most educators have been acutely aware of the problem of cheating among students in college. They have felt the need for clarification of what constitutes a cheating behavior, a better understanding between students and faculty on those practices of students which are acceptable and legitimate in the preparation of themes, and the preparation and taking of examinations. Faculty members have tended to feel strongly about certain practices, but apparently these are not as well understood by students as might be hoped. Students on the other hand have been deploring practices engaged in by the faculty members which they consider unfair. Policies which are formulated by students and faculty and then stated and understood by the entire academic community regarding cheating seem to be the order of the day.

The Purpose of this Study

The purpose of this study has been to examine student and faculty attitudes toward three aspects of cheating behaviors. Where it is apparent that there are different prevailing attitudes toward cheating, it seems that further objective evidence is needed to clarify those differences and, hopefully, initiate efforts to reduce the differences and arrive at clearer understandings of acceptable practices. The

groups compared for differences were: faculty and students at four selected colleges; freshmen and seniors at all involved colleges; the faculty of two secular colleges and the faculty of two church-affiliated colleges; and the students at church-affiliated colleges compared with the students at secular colleges. The distinctive nature of this study was to explore in greater depth student behaviors which might be considered cheating, the seriousness with which students and faculty consider cheating, and the academic setting in which cheating occurs.

The Instrument

Since there were two completely new aspects of cheating to be investigated and one aspect which needed elaboration, the author devised an opinionnaire which he felt would secure the needed information regarding attitudes toward cheating. Face validity for the instrument was secured by competent educators. The reliability coefficient was determined by using the Product-Moment Correlation formula and computation resulted in a positive r of .84 for students and a positive r of .77 for faculty. Fifty different student behavioral situations were depicted in Part I of the instrument in an effort to determine those situations the respondent felt were cheating. The respondents were asked to indicate the punishment they felt appropriate if they indicated the student was cheating in the depicted situation. This was to determine attitudes toward the seriousness of cheating. Finally an effort was made to determine attitudes toward the academic setting in which cheating occurs. Twenty-eight academic settings were depicted in Part II of the instrument, and the respondents were asked whether they felt the student's behavior was justified, not justified,

or whether they had no judgment on the matter.

Statistical Method

The statistical technique used to compare the significance of the difference between the means of the groups on the three aspects of cheating was the "t" test.

The Sample

While sampling procedures varied some due to circumstances existing at the different colleges, students were selected at random from two secular and two church-affiliated institutions of higher education. The only criterion was they be regularly enrolled as either freshmen or seniors at these colleges. Student sample was 320 students (80 from each institution) with 149 being male students and 171 female students. A total of 100 faculty members (25 from each institution) were secured at random, and this sample consisted of 89 males and 11 females.

Findings

The null hypothesis stated there are no significant differences in attitudes at the .05 level of confidence between faculty and students; freshmen and seniors; faculty of church-affiliated colleges and faculty of secular colleges; students of church-affiliated colleges and students of secular colleges on three aspects of cheating. The three aspects investigated were: behaviors which constitute cheating; the seriousness of cheating behaviors; and the academic setting in which cheating occurs. When the statistical analysis was completed, eight of the null hypotheses were rejected and four were accepted at the

.05 level of confidence.

Students and faculty do differ significantly on all three aspects of cheating. (1) Behaviors which constitute cheating. The faculty had a mean score of 186.23 on this item as compared with the student mean score of 174.44. This resulted in a "t" value of 3.82, which is significant at the .01 level of confidence. (2) The seriousness of cheating behaviors. The faculty mean score was 107.47, whereas the student mean score was 102.49. A "t" value of 2.25 resulted, which was significant at the .05 level of confidence. (3) The academic setting or situation in which cheating behavior occurs. The faculty had a mean rating of 134.08 and the students a mean score of 125.53. This resulted in a "t" value of 4.37, which was significant at the .01 level of confidence. Of the four groups studied, the differences between faculty and students were significant on all three aspects of cheating. It might be expected that faculty would view student behaviors with greater strictness than do students, and this was confirmed.

Despite some findings by other educators which seemed to indicate seniors are more lenient than freshmen in their attitudes toward cheating, this study revealed there were no significant differences between these groups on any of the three phases of cheating studied.

(1) Behaviors which constitute cheating. The freshman mean score was 173.88 and the senior mean score was 175.01. This resulted in a "t" value of .35, which was not significant. (2) The seriousness of cheating behaviors. The freshman mean rating was 101.45 and the senior mean score was 103.53. A "t" value of .94 resulted, which was not significant. (3) The academic setting or situation in which cheating behavior occurs. The freshman mean score was 124.66 and the senior

mean was 126.39, which resulted in a "t" value of .81, which was not significant. Of all groups compared, the freshmen and seniors were the only ones which failed to result in a significant difference.

The faculty members of church-affiliated colleges differ significantly with the faculty members of secular colleges on two of the three aspects of cheating studied. (1) Behaviors which constitute cheating. The faculty of church-affiliated colleges had a mean score on this item of 190.10, whereas the faculty of secular colleges had a mean score of 182.36. This resulted in a "t" value of 2.00, which was significant at the .05 level of confidence. (2) The seriousness of cheating behaviors. The faculty of church-affiliated colleges had a mean score of 107.52, and the faculty of secular colleges had a mean score of 107.42. This resulted in a "t" value of .03, which was the smallest difference of the entire study. (3) The academic setting or situation in which cheating behavior occurs. The mean score of the faculty of church-affiliated colleges was 136.58, and the mean of the faculty of secular colleges was 131.58. A "t" value of 3.33 resulted, which was significant at the .01 level of confidence. As can be seen, there was no significant difference between these groups on attitudes toward the seriousness of cheating behaviors. On the other two aspects of cheating studied, the faculty of church-affiliated colleges were significantly stricter than their counterparts in secular institutions.

The most significant differences were found when the students of church-affiliated colleges and the students of secular institutions were compared. (1) Behaviors which constitute cheating. The students of church-affiliated colleges had a mean rating of 184.99, whereas the students of secular colleges had a mean score of 163.89. A "t" value

of 7.02 resulted, which was significant at the .01 level of confidence. (2) The seriousness of cheating behaviors. The students of church-affiliated colleges had a mean score of 107.46, whereas the students of secular colleges had a mean score of 97.52. This resulted in a "t" value of 4.66, which was also significant at the .01 level of confidence. (3) The academic setting or situation in which cheating behaviors occur. The students of church-affiliated colleges had a mean score of 133.07 and the students of secular colleges had a mean rating of 117.99. A "t" value of 7.69 resulted, which was significant at the .01 level of confidence. The largest "t" value of the entire study resulted from a comparison of students of church-affiliated colleges and students of secular colleges on the academic setting in which cheating occurs. On all three aspects of cheating, the students of secular colleges were more lenient in their attitudes toward cheating than students of church-affiliated institutions.

Since a basic concern of this study was to determine attitudes of faculty and students regarding what actually constitutes a cheating behavior, the seriousness with which each looked at cheating, and how each interprets the academic setting in which cheating occurs, a summary of the results on these three phases of cheating appears appropriate. The first aspect of cheating studied was (1) Behaviors which constitute cheating. Three of the four groups were significantly different in their interpretation of acts which constitute a cheating behavior. The greatest difference here was between students of church-affiliated colleges and students of secular colleges. A "t" value of 7.02 resulted from the statistical analysis. The faculty of church-affiliated colleges and the faculty of secular colleges also differed

significantly. A "t" value of 2.00 resulted here. Faculty and students were also significantly different. A "t" value of 3.82 resulted from this comparison of means. All these differences were significant at the .05 or better level of confidence. The only group which did not show a significant difference was when freshmen and seniors were compared. (2) The seriousness of cheating behaviors.

There was no significant difference between two of the groups studied, viz., freshmen and seniors, and the faculty of church-affiliated colleges and the faculty of secular colleges. A significant difference, however, was found between faculty and students, where a "t" value of 2.25 resulted from the analysis and between the students of church-affiliated colleges and students of secular colleges, where a "t" value of 4.66 resulted. The least difference between all groups studied occurred on this aspect of cheating. (3) The academic setting in which cheating occurs. A greater difference on attitudes toward cheating was found on this aspect of cheating than any other. Three of the four groups studied were significantly different at the .01 level of confidence. When students and faculty were compared, a "t" of 4.37 resulted. The faculty of church-affiliated colleges and the faculty of secular colleges had a "t" value of 3.33. Students of church-affiliated colleges and students of secular colleges had a "t" value of 7.69. The only groups where no significant difference resulted were freshmen and seniors.

There is apparently a more significant difference between the groups compared on attitudes toward the academic setting in which cheating occurs than any other. Also, the groups differed most significantly on behaviors which constitute cheating, and the least difference

resulted from comparisons of groups on the seriousness of cheating.

Implications

When analyzing the data, the findings, and limitations of this study, several implications emerge. These findings should contribute to a better understanding of the nature of cheating and initiation of policies and practices which will reduce this questionable practice on college campuses.

The disparity between faculty and students on what constitutes a cheating situation, the punishment or seriousness of cheating, and the academic setting in which cheating occurs suggests the need for better understanding on all these aspects of cheating. Apparently students and faculty perceive cheating differently. It appears that a clearly defined policy at each institution, formulated by students and faculty, and published for the guidance of the entire academic community would do much to reduce cheating. Students often mention the need of knowing what is acceptable and unacceptable behavior on a certain college campus. Each institution of higher education has its goals and purposes. If the development of academic integrity and responsibility of citizenship in a democratic society is found in these goals, efforts should be initiated so an institution could move forward in achieving its goals.

A distinctive approach of this research deals with the academic setting in which cheating occurs. Several articles have been written calling attention to faculty practices in connection with the giving of examinations which contribute to cheating. The significant differences noted in this study between all groups, with the exception of freshmen and seniors, suggest some wide variations in the way students and

faculty perceive a faculty member's actions in the classroom. Faculty members of the two different types of institutions differ on how they look at their own behaviors in the classroom. Students have become in recent years more perceptive of actions of their professors which they consider unfair and also more vocal in expressing their disapproval, as evidenced by the comments students make to faculty and researchers. While the instrument is of such a nature that those with strong moral convictions might be inclined to state that a student is not justified in what might be considered deviant behavior irrespective of the actions of the professor, others feel they are perfectly justified in reacting to a situation which they consider unfair. Since faculty members themselves show considerable difference on this aspect of cheating and many faculty members wrote notations on their instruments indicating they did not approve of the faculty behavior depicted on the instrument, some discussions among faculty and students on these controversial practices should prove profitable.

It was apparent to the author when asking students at a church-affiliated college to assist him in compiling cheating situations they had heard of, or practiced themselves, that a considerable amount of cheating is engaged in on the campuses of such institutions. While this study shows students at church-affiliated colleges and faculty of church-affiliated colleges perceive cheating more strictly, a limitation of this study mentioned earlier is that one cannot relate attitudes with actual practice with any degree of certainty. The faculty members of the two different types of institutions do show some confusion exists between them on what actually constitutes a cheating situation.

Since the study shows no difference existing between freshman and senior students, one can only infer that attitudes remain much the same regarding cheating at all grade levels (whether in a church-affiliated college or a secular institution). This confirms Philip Jacob's long-standing assertion that little change in attitude or character development actually takes place during the student's college career. One can only feel encouraged by Newcomb's study at Bennington College, in which radical changes in attitudes took place in students' political views, and initiate measures which might change the direction of student attitudes toward cheating.

While the investigation reveals groups tend to perceive the seriousness of cheating similarly, there were still some wide individual variations in punishment. There was a significant difference between faculty and students on this aspect, and this further indicates a need for more clearly understood and accepted policies on punishment to be administered to those caught cheating.

Further Research

Several aspects of cheating which were not investigated in this research, but which have become apparent from the study, are:

1. A study which examines faculty and student responses on an individual item of this instrument such as those dealing with consulting old examinations, grading on the curve, etc.
2. A new instrument which would investigate faculty and student attitudes toward the practices of the classroom, without the limitation of student morality, should prove beneficial. A direct approach on all practices which have produced confusion

in the academic setting would produce some interesting results.

3. Some further study is needed in investigating actual practices in connection with cheating rather than studies dealing only with attitudes.

It is hoped that further studies will be made in these and other areas and more attention given to this very fundamental issue which faces the entire academic community. Discussions are needed which deal objectively and realistically with a situation which to a large extent has been so charged with emotion that it has been eliminated from faculty and student discussions.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (1) American Association of University Professors Bulletin. Vol. 46. (Winter 1960), pp. 383-384.
- (2) Anderson, William F. "Attitudes of University Students Toward Cheating." The Journal of Educational Research. Vol. 50. (April 1957), p. 581f.
- (3) Atkins, Blanche E., and Ruth E. Atkins. "A Study of the Honesty of Prospective Teachers." Elementary School Journal. Vol. 36. (April 1936), No. 8. pp. 595-603.
- (4) Barclay, D. "Why Children Cheat in School." New York Times. Jan. 18, 1958, p. 52.
- (5) Black, Donald B. "The Falsification of Reported Examination Marks in the Senior University Education Course." The Journal of Educational Sociology. (April 1962), pp. 346-354.
- (6) Bonjean, C. M., and R. McGee. "Scholastic Dishonesty Among Undergraduates in Differing Systems of Social Control." Sociology of Education. Vol. 38:132. pp. 127-137.
- (7) Bowers, William J. Student Dishonesty and Its Control in College. Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, New York, 1964.
- (8) Burton, R. V. Psychological Review. Vol. LXX. (1963), pp. 481-499.
- (9) Canning, R. R. "Does the Honor System Reduce Classroom Cheating?" The Journal of Experimental Research. Vol. 40. (Oct. 1946), pp. 133-140.
- (10) Corey, Stephen M. "Professed Attitudes and Actual Behavior." The Journal of Educational Psychology. Vol. XXVIII. (April, 1937), pp. 271-280.
- (11) Cronbach, Lee J. Educational Psychology. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1963. p. 646.
- (12) Ellison, Jerome. "American Disgrace: College Cheating." Saturday Evening Post, 232. (January 1960), pp. 57-61.

- (13) Frymier, Jack R. "Faculty and Student Perceptions of Cheating." The Journal of Educational Research. Vol. 54. (Nov. 1960), p. 118f.
- (14) Garfield, S. Jeffrey, Helen A. Cohen and Robert M. Roth. "A Correlative Study of Cheating in College Students." The Journal of Educational Research. Vol. 61. No. 4. (December 1967), pp. 172, 173.
- (15) Goldsen, Rose K., Morris Rosenberg, Robin M. Williams, Jr., Edward A. Suchman. What College Students Think. Princeton, N. J.: D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., 1960. p. 240.
- (16) Gordon, Katherine K., and Richard E. Gordon. "College Cheating: A Problem for the College Mental Health Service." The Journal of the American College Health Association. Vol. 14. No. 4. (April 1966), pp. 234-238.
- (17) Gross, M. Mynette. "The Effect of Certain Types of Motivation on the Honesty of Children." The Journal of Educational Research. Vol. 40. (Oct. 1946), pp. 133-140.
- (18) Hartshorne, H., and M. A. May. Studies in Deceit. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1928.
- (19) Hendricks, Marvin L. "Changing Mores Concerning Cheating on Examinations." School and Society. Vol. 86. (Nov. 1958), p. 413-414.
- (20) Herman, A. L. "College Cheating, A Plea for Leniency." The Journal of Higher Education. Vol. XXXVII, No. 5. (May 1966), pp. 260-266.
- (21) Hoff, G. "A Study of the Honesty and Accuracy Found in Pupil Checking of Examination Papers." Journal of Educational Research. Vol. 34. (Oct. 1940), pp. 127-129.
- (22) Howells, T. H. "Factors Influencing Honesty." Journal of Social Psychology. 1938. pp. 97-102.
- (23) Jacob, Philip E. Changing Values in College. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1957.
- (24) Johnson, L. H. "Pupil Cheating." Clearing House. Vol. 18. (Oct. 1943), pp. 72-74.
- (25) Keehn, J. D. "Unrealistic Reporting as a Function of Extroverted Neurosis." Journal of Clinical Psychology. Vol. 12. (June 1956), pp. 61-63.
- (26) Krueger, W. C. F. "Students' Honesty in Correcting Grading Errors." Journal of Applied Psychology. Vol. 31. pp. 533-535.

- (27) McQueen, Robert. "Examination Deception as a Function of Residual, Background and Immediate Stimulus Factors." Journal of Personality. Vol. 25. (Sept. 1956-Dec. 1957), pp. 643f.
- (28) Mueller, Kate Hevner. "Can Cheating Be Killed?" Personnel and Guidance Journal. April 1953. pp. 465-468.
- (29) Popham, W. James. Educational Statistics. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.
- (30) Rogosin, H. "What About Cheating on Examinations and Honesty?" School and Society. Vol. 74. (December 1951), p. 402f.
- (31) Russell, May. "Helping Students Achieve High Moral Values Through College Honor System." Junior College Journal. Vol. 32. (Sept. 1961), pp. 37-39.
- (32) Shirk, Evelyn, and R. W. Hoffman. "The Academic Setting of the Dishonest Student." Improving College and University Teaching. Vol. IX. (Autumn 1961), pp. 130-134.
- (33) Shirk, Evelyn, and R. W. Hoffman. "The Administrators Contribution to Student Cheating." Improving College and University Teaching. Vol. IX. (Autumn 1961), p. 150f.
- (34) Shirk, Evelyn, and R. W. Hoffman. "The Student Cheater." Improving College and University Teaching. Vol. IX. (Autumn 1961), pp. 79-80.
- (35) Siegel, S. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. 1956.
- (36) Snead, William, Jr., with Jack Shepherd. "Air Academy's Cheating Scandal." Look. Vol. 31, No. 2. (January 24, 1967), pp. 23-25.
- (37) Strang, Ruth. Behavior and Background of Students and Secondary Schools. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1937.
- (38) Uhlig, George E., and Barry Howes. "Attitude Toward Cheating and Opportunistic Behavior." The Journal of Educational Research. Vol. 60, No. 9. (May-June), 1967.
- (39) Weinstein, George. "Does Your Child Cheat in School?" Look. March, 1953, p. 42f.
- (40) Wicke, Myron F. The Church Related College. Washington, D. C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc. 1964, p. 45.
- (41) Wrightman, Lawrence. "A Research Area in Need of Resuscitation." Peabody Journal of Education. Vol. 37. 1959-60. p. 145f.

- (42) Yanz, Sister M. Gretchen. "You've Got Tomorrow on Your Hands."
The Journal of Business Education. Feb. 1968. pp. 186-187.
- (43) Yepsen, N. L. "The Reliability of Self-Scored Measures." School
and Society. November 1927.

APPENDIX A

STUDENT DESCRIPTIONS OF POSSIBLE CHEATING SITUATIONS, PUNISHMENTS FOR CHEATING AND UNFAIR ACADEMIC SETTINGS

I. POSSIBLE CHEATING SITUATIONS

1. "Looking on classmate's paper."
2. "Notes on sleeve of blouse, inside sole of shoe, on palm of hand, on a large eraser."
3. "Leaving during test for restroom where notes are hidden."
4. "A long thin roll of paper with notes written on it; the paper is put inside a wristwatch case and fixed to the stem so when it is turned the paper rolls."
5. "There is special invisible ink you can buy and use to write notes with. Then, you can buy a specially-made type of sunglasses which enables you to see the notes."
6. "Here is a most ingenious method of cheating on an essay type examination: A college student studied for an essay test which had two questions. The first question he answered with facts and supporting material. The second question he knew nothing about. He turned in the first answer, went back to his dormitory room, and wrote out a lucid discussion on the second question with the use of the book. After he completed this, he wrinkled the paper, stepped on it, leaving a footprint. His roommate, who had the same class later in the day took the paper and gave it to the teacher, telling him that he had found it on the floor in the back of the room. The first boy made the only A in the class."
7. "Using masterplots for a book report instead of reading the book."
8. "Copying someone else's term paper."
9. "Using some else's term paper or old themes."
10. "Plagiarism."
11. "Studying old tests."
12. "Stealing copy of test."
13. "Writing in answers after test is returned and saying grader made mistake."
14. "Signal to friend and vice versa answers especially on true and false exams."

15. "Turning research paper in year after year in different classes."
16. "Turning same paper in two different classes."
17. "Having answers inside belt, watch, shoes."
18. "Getting answers from someone who has already taken test."
19. "Talking during test, giving answers."
20. "Cheating while grading your own paper."
21. "Looking up information during a break in the test period."
22. "Using another's notes for outside reading assignment."
23. "When you do not footnote everything that's not original on a term paper."
24. "Bring work (like art work) for art projects another did and saying its your work."
25. "Discussing with a teacher answers you know real well that may be on a test."
26. "People wearing sunglasses and looking on another's paper from behind sunglasses."
27. "Paying for someone else to write paper."
28. "Making 'canned' speech."
29. "Some kids on the English Proficiency test will write themes before they take the test and have them checked for errors then go in and write or copy that paper they wrote in their rooms."
30. "Taking a late test and getting information from those who took it before."
31. "Copying from the book on daily assignments when the answers are given in the back of the book."
32. "To write on the desk the answers in code form that they have already taken but you will have later."
33. "To send off for a term paper that was already done."
34. "Writing notes on the inside of one's contact lens."
35. "Writing possible answers and definitions on one's arm."
36. "Getting out notes when teacher leaves the room."
37. "Writing in one's blue book before the test begins."
38. "Stealing or copying a copy of the test before it is taken."
39. "Looking up answers in the book during a test."
40. "When an open-book test is to be given--making notes of things you think he will ask."
41. "Faking illness in middle of test to go look at notes."
42. "When told not to check homework with others but do anyway."

43. "If a time limit called, keep on working pretending not to hear time called."
44. "Sneak out answer book and fill in answers to homework."
45. "If allowed to check papers, filling in blank answers or changing wrong answers then telling teacher he graded wrong."
46. "Turning over paper before instructor said to."
47. "Have textbook open during class."
48. "Steal a 'key' from the professor."
49. "Make up footnote references."
50. "Have someone else take a test when the class is large enough."
51. "Using pretense of talking to the teacher to get answers from his notes."
52. "Feigning illness to avoid a test."
53. "Having another make a garment for which you get credit in Home Economics."
54. "Writing book critiques taken from someone else."
55. "Asking questions of a teacher during exam."
56. "Having a student grader or a student majoring in the field grade the paper before it is turned in."
57. "Formulas on back of sliderule."

II. SUGGESTED PUNISHMENTS FOR CHEATING

1. "I do realize this cannot go unheeded, but a serious talk to a person and a warning should have some effect."
2. "I believe a second chance is important."
3. "I believe that the first time a student's caught cheating his paper should be taken up and no grade given. The second time he should be given a zero for the test and if caught again an "F" for the course."
4. "Nothing should be done to the student who cheats--he's just cheating himself. It should, naturally, be discouraged by virtue of its moral wrongness."
5. "If the term cheating is clearly defined for that class, disciplinary measures could be rather harsh. However, if the term is not clearly defined, disciplinary action could be deemed unjust."
6. "An instructor should simply call the student in after class the first time and warn him, and give him an "F". If cheating happens again, drop him from the course with an "F".
7. "This is the same as stealing and should so be dealt with. When cheating is quite clear and there is no doubt that it

- has occurred I believe the student should be forced to drop the course and if caught again dropped from school."
8. "Cheating hurts the individual because he loses self respect. For some of us this is good enough reason not to cheat."
 9. "Cheating should be considered a very serious problem when it is prevalent, because students who cheat in school will be incompetent in their field when they graduate."
 10. "Teacher should handle the situation."
 11. "At least one, but no more than two warnings to a person."
 12. "A failing grade given, or test should be taken over (a different test)."
 13. "If student given a failing grade and it happens the second time in the course, and if the nature is of serious enough consequences, should be dismissed from college."
 14. "Teacher should warn the student in private--one time. Next time occurs student's paper should be taken up and a zero given. If it reoccurs then the Dean should be told and conference should be arranged. No student should be allowed to cheat and stay in class."
 15. "Consider the person cheating. Does he have a long record of trouble-making, bad attitudes, uncooperativeness, cheating, etc. Has he always been a serious hard working, honest student. Discuss it with him in the light of this."
 16. "If found cheating in a number of classes, discuss with the Dean or such--should possibly not be allowed to continue in school. Depends on student's attitude."
 17. "If a student hasn't the ability, make the work on his level, group him or give him extra time."
 18. "Cheating on a test seems more serious than a term paper."
 19. "I don't feel that a student should be expelled for cheating unless he is consistent."
 20. "First offense--The student should be given a zero for the test. Second offense--the student should be dropped from the course. Third offense--dismissed from school."
 21. "Have him appear before Student Council and let them decide what should be done."

III. ACADEMIC SETTING - WHAT STUDENTS CONSIDER UNFAIR PRACTICES IN THE CLASSROOMS

1. "Curving the grades."
2. "Normal distribution curve when the class is above normal."
3. "Questions which have no bearing upon the material covered (on tests)."

4. "Picking at minute details for questions on a test."
5. "Multiple choice questions which have little difference in responses, except for wording or language."
6. "Teaching above the student's level."
7. "Demanding too much of the student for one class."
8. "Giving a 'B' as the highest grade, unless extra work is completed."
9. "Not stressing the main points in class which will be covered on tests."
10. "Not writing outside material on the board or repeating slowly for students to take notes, and then asking questions on that material."
11. "A teacher being out of the room usually shows me that this teacher is placing his trust in me and therefore I would do what is expected of me."
12. "Crowded conditions do affect cheating to a certain extent because of the availability of answer getting."
13. "Also the student's attitude toward the course affects in my opinion the desire to cheat. If he or she doesn't think the course is important they don't care how they get through."
14. "If the student is worried only about his grade--cheating is more prevalent. Teacher should stress the importance of knowledge."
15. "Its, of course, easiest to cheat, if you're going to, when a teacher is not present during a test."
16. "When a teacher is too hard."
17. "When a teacher asks unfair questions, like questions that could go either way; but are keyed to teachers opinion."
18. "A relaxed and informal class is less likely to have cheating because the student doesn't feel that this test is the end and his mind is relaxed and the answers come to him freely. In this classroom if the teacher leaves the room the students aren't likely to cheat, but in the strict classroom cheating will occur."
19. "When teachers give pop tests."
20. "Self grading of exams."
21. "A teacher who does not penalize students caught cheating will encourage cheating."
22. "Allowing students to bring anything into the classroom besides pen and paper encourages cheating."
23. "Not fair for students to be given a grade because of personal liking for them by a teacher."
24. "'can' tests--I think these are cheating the student."

25. "I think its cheating the student when a teacher has someone else give his tests and he is not there to clarify his questions."
26. "Classroom where there is an obvious attitude of 'not caring' by the teacher. If the teacher doesn't care if the students cheat, then a few are bound to do so. This leads the rest of the class to cheat in order to maintain their grade average."
27. "A teacher who gives the same test year after year is asking for cheating."
28. "Too much material covered in detail on a test is very conducive to cheating."
29. "When a teacher assigns a term paper, he should read them. The student's time is also valuable. If the teacher hasn't got time to read them, he shouldn't assign them."
30. "Another pupil grading a fellow pupil's test."
31. "When the teacher grades much too strictly."

APPENDIX B

A SURVEY OF ATTITUDES TOWARD CHEATING
PART I

Instructions

You are asked to respond to each of the following situations according to how you personally feel about the student's behavior. Base your response only on the moral issue involved. Please rate the behavior on the scale from 1 to 5 depending on how you feel about the behavior. If you feel the student is entirely justified in behaving this way, place a check (✓) under 1 following the behavior described. If you feel the student is definitely not justified in behaving this way, place a check (✓) under 5. Be sure to put a check after each statement.

After you have rated the behavior, please respond to whether you feel the student should be punished. If the student should be punished, please indicate the type of punishment which you feel is fair.

How Do You Feel About
The Student's Behavior

Punishment

	How Do You Feel About The Student's Behavior					Punishment					
	Behavior entirely justified.		No Judgment on behavior.		Behavior definitely not justified.	Should not be punished.	Should be warned.	Should receive an F on paper.	Should receive an F in course and be dropped from class.	Should be suspended for remainder of term with opportunity of readmission.	Should be dismissed with disciplinary action noted on transcript.
	1	2	3	4	5						
1. On a two part essay test, Tom did well on the first part, On the second part, he knew nothing about the subject so he went to his room to prepare that part. After completing it, he made it look dirty by crumpling it and walking on it. Then he asked Stanley, his roommate, to take it to the instructor saying he found it in the hall.											
2. John secured some invisible ink, and made some notes on a piece of paper. Securing proper sunglasses to be used in reading notes made with this ink, John consulted his notes during a test.											
3. Faced with needing to prepare an assignment, Frank asks William to go to the library, and do the work for him. The paper is turned in as William has prepared it.											
4. Knowing that Phil has taken the course, John approached him to talk about the kind of tests this particular instructor gives.											

A SURVEY OF ATTITUDES TOWARD CHEATING
PART II

Instructions

You are asked to respond to each of the following situations according to how you personally feel about the student's behavior. Base your response only on the moral issue involved. Please rate the behavior on a scale from 1 to 5 depending on how you feel about the behavior. If you feel the student is entirely justified in behaving this way, place a check (✓) under 1 following the behavior described. If you feel the student is definitely not justified in behaving this way, place a check (✓) under 5. Be sure to put a check after each statement.

How Do You Feel About
The Student's Behavior

	Behavior Entirely Justified.		No Judgment on Behavior.		Behavior Definitely Not Justified.
	1	2	3	4	5
1. Realizing that the instructor would make the test so difficult that few could pass it, Joe thought it justified that he conceal notes in his pocket to be used during the test.					
2. When the instructor left the room, June felt it all right to cheat.					
3. Knowing how easy it is to cheat when chairs are close together, June felt it was perfectly satisfactory for her to look on her neighbor's paper.					
4. Since the English teacher has given the same test year after year, John felt there was no wrong in securing old tests, and using them in his preparation for present tests.					
5. Several students perceive that the instructor is aware that cheating is being practiced in his classes, but does nothing about it. Susan aware of this decided to take some notes to class which would help her during the test.					
6. Feeling that the instructor is only interested in grades, Jane felt she was right in talking over the answers on a test with a student near her.					
7. Very often the chemistry teacher gives pop quizzes. Delores felt these were unfair, so she looked in the notebook at her feet to answer questions on the test.					
8. The instructor has impressed his students with the importance of tests. He leaves the impression that the only important thing is the grade. She feels that he is not interested in them really knowing the material, but only in getting a good grade. With this feeling, Elizabeth believes it is satisfactory to copy from her neighbor.					

A SURVEY OF ATTITUDES TOWARD CHEATING
PART II

Page 2

How Do You Feel About
The Student's Behavior

	Behavior Entirely Justified.		No Judgment on Behavior.		Behavior Definitely Not Justified.
	1	2	3	4	5
9. A math instructor is very friendly and congenial in his classes. When he leaves the room, Jane feels this is a license for her to cheat.					
10. Since the lectures were dull, Maggie felt it was all right to cheat.					
11. Mr. Johns, the history professor, indicates to his class that he is not really interested in this course, but it was assigned to him because an instructor was needed. Having been told this, Jan felt it was all right if she cheated on a test.					
12. Realizing that the instructor will grade on the curve, and therefore competition will be great, Jesse cheats on the final examination.					
13. Being in a large class, and feeling there will be less likelihood of being caught, Joe cheats on a test.					
14. Faced with a True-False Test and realizing it will be easy to look on his neighbor's paper, Don cheats.					
15. Feeling the course he was taking was not too important, Ricky felt justified in getting help on a test.					
16. Since most of the students felt the instructor was lenient on cheating, and would probably do nothing about it, Susie decided to copy from her neighbor.					
17. With the assignment of several outside papers in Professor Adams' class, Bill felt it was all right for him to copy his roommate's term paper, and turn it in for his own.					

A SURVEY OF ATTITUDES TOWARD CHEATING
PART II

Page 3

How Do You Feel About
The Student's Behavior

	Behavior Entirely Justified.		No Judgment on Behavior.		Behavior Definitely Not Justified.
	1	2	3	4	5
18. John saw others cheating and knowing this would raise the average, felthe was justified in cheating.					
19. While Shirley would not cheat on an examination, she felt it was all right to copy outside work.					
20. Feeling the instructor was unreasonable, Susie felt cheating in his class was justified.					
21. Sensing the only way to pass the course was to cheat, Frank brought notes to class.					
22. Because Professor Milton was suspicious and distrusting of students in his class, Jill felt justified in cheating.					
23. Knowing that Professor Sparks would assign a limited number of good grades, Joel cheated during a test.					
24. Having been assigned large amounts of outside work, and hearing that the instructor would never grade it, Frank copies the work from another student.					
25. Since the instructor had determined in advance the percentage of students who would get good grades no matter how hard others worked, Joe felt justified in cheating.					
26. Being unaware of any punishment the instructor would give to a student caught cheating, Sylvia decided to cheat on a test.					
27. With several others in the class cheating, Steve decided it was all right to copy from his friend's paper.					
28. Because he was convinced Dr. Hughes would be unfair in grading his test, Joe felt justified in cheating.					

APPENDIX C

LETTER TO ABILENE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE FACULTY

June 18, 1969

I was on the campus of Abilene Christian College last week administering "A Survey of Attitudes Toward Cheating" to faculty and students but find that I am needing a few more faculty members to complete the survey. I will greatly appreciate it if you can take about 15 or 20 minutes of your time and complete the survey. It can be returned to me in the self-addressed, stamped envelope which is enclosed. For identification purposes, will you please place your name in the upper right hand corner.

So that you might know the design of the survey, it is to determine whether there are significant differences in attitudes toward cheating between faculty and college students. The three areas it explores are: what is a cheating situation, how seriously do you consider cheating, and the academic setting in which cheating occurs. I am hopeful the study, which is being done in connection with a doctoral thesis, will contribute something to our understanding of this matter and enable us as educators to deal more realistically with this moral issue.

I am hopeful the data can be completed on Abilene Christian College within seven days.

Thank you so much for your cooperation.

Very sincerely yours,

W. E. Kirk

APPENDIX D

LETTER TO EAST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY

June 13, 1969

I have talked with Dr. Robert E. Collier, Vice President for Academic Affairs, and have secured his permission to approach you about completing a "Survey of Attitudes Toward Cheating." While granting permission for me to contact you, Dr. Collier said you should feel under no obligation to complete the survey, but your cooperation will be most appreciated by me.

So that you might know the design of the survey, it is to determine whether there are significant differences in attitudes toward cheating between faculty and college students. The three areas it explores are: what is a cheating situation, how seriously do you consider cheating, and the academic setting in which cheating occurs. I am hopeful the study, which is being done in connection with a doctoral thesis, will contribute something to our understanding of this matter and enable us as educators to deal more realistically with this moral issue.

The survey will be administered to faculty and students at four selected colleges, of which E. T. S. U. is one. I will be administering the survey to 40 freshman and 40 senior students, and will be seeking 25 faculty members to complete the survey. Therefore, it will be greatly appreciated if you, as one of the 25 faculty members contacted, will complete the survey. It will only take about 15 to 20 minutes of your time, and may be returned in the self-addressed, stamped envelope, which is enclosed. I will be happy to make the results available to you if you are interested. For identification purposes, will you please place your initials in the upper right hand corner.

Again, thanks for your cooperation.

Very sincerely yours,

W. E. Kirk

APPENDIX E

LETTER TO NORTH TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY

June 12, 1969

I have talked with Dr. J. J. Spurlock, Vice President for Academic Affairs, and have secured his permission to approach you about completing a "Survey of Attitudes Toward Cheating." While granting permission for me to contact you, Dr. Spurlock said you should feel under no obligation to complete the survey, but your cooperation will be most appreciated by me.

So that you might know the design of the survey, it is to determine whether there are significant differences in attitudes toward cheating between faculty and college students. The three areas it explores are: what is a cheating situation, how seriously do you consider cheating, and the academic setting in which cheating occurs. I am hopeful the study, which is being done in connection with a doctoral thesis, will contribute something to our understanding of this matter and enable us as educators to deal more realistically with this moral issue.

The survey will be administered to faculty and students at four selected colleges, of which N. T. S. U. is one. I will be administering the survey to 40 freshman and 40 senior students, and will be seeking 25 faculty members to complete the survey. Therefore, it will be greatly appreciated if you, as one of the 25 faculty members contacted, will complete the survey. It will only take about 15 to 20 minutes of your time, and may be returned in the self-addressed, stamped envelope, which is enclosed. I will be happy to make the results available to you if you are interested. For identification purposes will you please place your initials in the upper right hand corner.

Again, thanks for your cooperation.

Very sincerely yours,

W. E. Kirk

APPENDIX F

LETTER TO FRESHMEN AND SENIORS AT
OKLAHOMA CHRISTIAN COLLEGE

June 17, 1969

I was on the campus of Oklahoma Christian College on June 13 administering "A Survey of Attitudes Toward Cheating" to faculty members and senior and freshman students. I will, therefore, greatly appreciate it if you will complete the enclosed survey which should only take about 20 minutes and return it to me in the self-addressed, stamped envelope within seven days.

You should first of all read the instructions carefully. It will be appreciated if you will put your name in the upper right hand corner of the survey for identification purposes only. I will be the only one who sees the survey and they will be fed into a computer to get the overall results.

I am making a study of faculty and student attitudes toward cheating at four selected colleges, Abilene Christian, Oklahoma Christian, East Texas State and North Texas State Universities. I want to see if there are significant differences in the way that faculty and students at Christian colleges may differ from faculty and students at secular colleges regarding their attitudes toward cheating. I also want to see if there are overall differences between faculty and students regarding cheating.

Thank you so much for your cooperation.

Very sincerely yours,

W. E. Kirk

VITA

Willis Edward Kirk

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: A STUDY OF FACULTY AND STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARD CHEATING AT
SELECTED CHURCH-AFFILIATED AND SECULAR COLLEGES

Major Field: Student Personnel and Guidance

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born at Topeka, Kansas, May 23, 1919, the son of
Willis R. and Grace C. Kirk.

Education: Attended elementary and junior high school in Topeka,
Kansas; was graduated from Evanston Township High School,
Evanston, Illinois, 1937. Received the Bachelor of Science
degree from Abilene Christian College with a major in
Business Administration in May, 1948; received the Master of
Science degree from Kansas State Teachers College with a
major in Philosophy and Psychology in May, 1954; attended
Oklahoma State University 1962-65 and completed the require-
ments for the Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State
University.

Professional Experience: Served as a minister of the Church of
Christ in Emporia, Kansas, 1948-50; Waxahachie, Texas, 1950-
54; Hartford, Connecticut, 1954-62. Editor of North American
Christian, 1958-60. Dean of Students at Oklahoma Christian
College, 1962-65. President of Christian College of the
Southwest in Dallas, Texas, 1965-69. Appointed Acting Head
of Division of Education and Professor of Education at
Christian College of the Southwest, September, 1969.

Organizations: American Personnel and Guidance Association, Kappa
Delta Pi, American Association for Higher Education.