Do Birds of a Feather Cheat Together?

How Personality and Relationships Affect Student Cheating

Alex J. Scrimpshire
Oklahoma State University

Thomas H. Stone
Oklahoma State University

Jennifer L. Kisamore
University of Oklahoma-Tulsa

I. M. Jawahar
Illinois State University

Paper published in:

Scrimpshire, A.J., Stone, T.H., Kisamore, J.L., & Jawahar, I.M. (2017). Do birds of a feather cheat together? How personality and relationships affect student cheating. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, *15*(1), 1-22.

Abstract

Academic misconduct is widespread in schools, colleges, and universities and it appears to be an international phenomenon that also spills over into the workplace (Nonis and Swift 2001; Sims 1993; Stone et al. 2011). To this end, while a great deal of research has investigated various individual components such as, demographic, personality and situational factors that contribute to cheating, research has yet to examine *why* students help others cheat and *which* students are being asked to help others cheat. In this study, we investigated if the closeness of the relationship to the individual requesting help in cheating to the individual being asked to help cheat, influenced the decision to help cheat. We also investigated if past cheating behavior predicted how an individual would respond to requests to cheat. Additionally, we sought to answer the following questions; *whether* minor cheating is more prevalent than serious cheating, *what* personality factors predict helping others cheat, *who* is helped, and *how* people rationalize helping others cheat. Results indicate minor cheating to be more prevalent, prudent personalities are less likely to have cheated or to help others cheat, individuals are more likely to help friends cheat than to help strangers, and past cheating behaviors is indicative of helping others to cheat. Implications for research and practice are discussed.

Keywords: academic integrity; cheating; personality; helping; misconduct

Do Birds of a Feather Cheat Together?

How Personality and Relationships Affect Student Cheating

There is considerable evidence that academic misconduct, whether cheating, plagiarism, or other forms of academic wrongdoing is a widespread and significant problem in high schools (Josephson Institute of Ethics 2006, 2009, 2012), colleges, and universities (Davis et al. 1992; McCabe and Treviño 1993, 1997). Academic misconduct is an issue prevalent at all levels of education; cheating also occurs at prestigious universities. For example, a recent survey of incoming Harvard freshman found that 42% of students cheated on homework (Moya-Smith 2013). Additionally the U.S. Air Force Academy recently had its fourth investigation of cheating since 2004 (Roeder 2014). Numerous studies have shown the alarming rate of academic misconduct in the U.S. (for instance see Davis et al. 1992; McCabe and Treviño 1993, 1997; McCabe et al. 2002; Whitley 1998) and abroad including Canada (Christensen-Hughes and McCabe 2006; Genereux and McLeod 1995), Australia (Brimble and Stevenson-Clarke 2005; Marsden et al. 2005), the U.K. (Newstead et al. 1996), Singapore (Lim and See 2001), and central European countries (Magnus et al. 2002). Clearly, there is considerable research suggesting academic misconduct is a global phenomenon. Cheating in school is not only a serious issue for faculty and academic administrators; employers should also be concerned. Several studies show a relationship between cheating in school and unethical as well as counter-productive work behavior (CWB) once these individuals enter the workplace (Nonis and Swift 2001; Sims 1993; Stone et al. 2011).

Virtually all academic integrity research has focused on the individual student in terms of student characteristics, past behavior and personality (i.e., McCabe et al. 2012); very little attention has been focused on students who help others students cheat. A number of studies,

however, show that a student's likelihood of cheating is closely associated with the behavior of the student's peers, i.e., the perception that peers cheat (McCabe et al. 2002; McCabe et al. 2006; Stone et al. 2009). That is when students share a cheating culture (McCabe et al. 2001) and a subjective norm that cheating is acceptable (Stone et al. 2011), it is likely that the students will solicit help from others to cheat.

Purpose of the Current Study

The focus of this exploratory study is the examination of student responses to requests from other students for cheating assistance. Although a great deal is known about why students cheat, their characteristics and how cheating can be reduced, how students *respond* to cheating requests from other students and how their relationship to the requester influences their response to these requests has not been examined. Based upon established correlates of cheating (Brimble and Stevenson-Clarke 2005; McCabe et al. 2012; Whitley 1998), this study examines age, gender, personality, justifications for cheating, cheating behavior, attitudes toward cheating and the relationship to the requester. Unlike most prior studies, this study does not treat cheating as a unidimensional construct. Instead, we examine two forms of cheating; the first, minor cheating is broken into two sub-categories, copying homework and prohibited collaboration. The second form, is cheating that is serious, or test cheating. Because students and many schools' academic integrity policies distinguish different cheating behaviors based on their severity from minor to serious (McCabe et al. 2012; Stone et al. 2014), we examine helping cheat for minor and serious cheating offenses.

Serious vs. Minor Cheating

During the last 30 or so years, a significant portion of research investigating cheating and plagiarism in academia has utilized a 10-item scale developed by McCabe and colleagues as part

of the Duke University Center for Academic Integrity project (McCabe and Treviño 1993; McCabe et al. 2002; McCabe et al. 2006). Although not the first to study academic integrity, many surveys have used this 10-point scale or adaptations of it (see for example, Anderman and Murdock 2007; Bing et al. 2012; Kisamore et al. 2007; Stone et al. 2010). McCabe et al. (2012), however concluded in a recent review of their data that a "sea change" in how cheating is perceived and defined is occurring, in that, various behaviors are viewed differently in terms of severity. This sea change was presaged in McCabe and Treviño's 1993 survey findings that showed that 83% of students felt that prohibited collaboration was not a serious violation and 25% believed collaboration was not even really cheating. The sea change was also evident when McCabe, Treviño and Butterfield (2001) defined what they believed constituted instances of "serious cheating" including violations involving examinations. Specifically, McCabe et al. (200l, p. 223) indicated:

> A serious test cheater is defined as someone who admits to one or more instances of…test cheating (that) includes students who engaged in copying on an exam— with or without another student's knowledge—using crib notes on an exam, or helping someone else to cheat on a test or exam.

Following McCabe's distinction between serious and minor cheating, Stone et al. (2014) contended it is not appropriate to sum across all forms of academic misconduct to derive one index of violation of academic integrity. Stone and colleagues argued that while this approach has been used in the vast majority of academic integrity studies, it is not conducive to examining the person and situational interactions inherent in cheating among today's students.

Indeed, the distinction between serious and minor cheating is reflected in the nature of punishment prescribed for violations by some college and university academic integrity policies as well as in a handful of studies. For example, Brimble and Stevenson-Clark (2005) found a high degree of agreement regarding what constituted serious as opposed to minor cheating

among students at two universities; research results suggested moderate agreement of these distinctions among faculty. Brimble and Stevenson-Clarke's study found approximately 10% of students engaged in offenses categorized as serious cheating. Similarly, serious cheating across a wide range of behaviors has generally been found among 10% to 20% of subjects in field and laboratory social psychology experiments (Ariely 2012; Gino et al. 2009; Mazar et al. 2008). Stone et al. (2014), echoing Brimble and Stevenson-Clarke (2005), found, in a study of management and marketing undergraduates, that students reported significantly more instances of minor cheating (i.e., copied material without citation and collaboration) than serious cheating (i.e., test-related cheating). McCabe et al.'s. (2012) review of decades of their data show fewer incidents of serious than minor offenses. For example, McCabe and colleagues (2006), in one of the few studies to report separate findings for serious and minor cheating, found that only 10% of business students admitted to serious test cheating while 53% admitted to cheating on minor work such as homework or assignments. Additionally, Ariely's (2012) research suggested most people tend to engage in some, albeit minor, cheating possibly because minor cheating may create less dissonance, depending on the reasons for it, than engaging in more serious offenses (cf., Festinger, 1957). Reflecting this perspective, McCabe and colleagues (2006, p. 205) issued a call to future researchers to "...delve further into how students think about different types of cheating with different levels of perceived seriousness." Therefore, as prior research indicates minor cheating is more frequent than serious offenses we expect to find different antecedents to offenses that differ in severity.

Generalizing from the extant research of Ariely (2012), Brimble and Stevenson-Clarke (2005), McCabe et al. (2006), and Stone et al. (2014), we expect students will report fewer incidents of requests to aid with serious as opposed to minor cheating offenses.

H1: Students will report more requests for assistance in minor as compared to serious cheating violations.

Minor cheating: Collaboration versus copying

As previously mentioned, there is a growing body of research that suggests differences in perceptions between serious and minor cheating. What is lacking however, is whether or not such offenses, specifically perceptions of minor offenses is further subdivided. Minor cheating has been defined as copying homework and collaborating on individual assignments (Brimble and Stevenson-Clarke, 2005; McCabe et al. 2012). We sought to investigate if these two types of minor cheating were viewed differently in the eyes of students. As many business school students are increasingly encouraged to work in groups and teams, the line may be blurred as to when professors expect collaboration and when they prohibit it. Because of this, students may not view collaboration as really cheating even when it is not authorized. Of course, similar attitudes may exist for homework, as students may feel that anything outside the classroom is "fair game". Hence, while research has suggested students have separate views on minor and serious cheating, within minor cheating, there may also be differences regarding what is considered cheating such that collaborating on individual assignments and copying homework may be viewed with different levels of perceived acceptability.

H2: Students will be more likely to engage in inappropriate collaboration than copying homework.

Personality and Responses to Cheating Requests

Relatively few studies have examined personality variables and academic integrity. In their comprehensive review of more than two decades of academic integrity literature, Crown and Spiller (1998) found only one personality variable, locus of control (Rotter, 1966), was a significant predictor in academic misconduct studies. Specifically, "externals" were more likely to cheat than "internals." Seven studies reviewed by Whitley (1998) examined locus of control,

but the effect size, as with virtually all other personality studies, was small (d = .21). More recently, Kisamore, Stone and Jawahar (2007) and Stone, Kisamore and Jawahar (2010) found Prudence, a Hogan Personality Inventory (HPI) (Hogan and Hogan, 2007) scale analogous to conscientiousness, was a significant predictor of self-reported cheating. That is, students who scored high on Prudence were less likely to admit cheating than those with low scores. Low Prudence scores are associated with impulsive and irresponsible behavior. Individuals who lack prudence are characterized as careless about rules and venturesome, while high-prudence students are conscientious, follow rules, and are more likely to resist the influence of norms and pressures to cheat. Because we contend students who themselves cheat are more likely to help others cheat we expect students with low Prudence scores are more likely to help others than those with high Prudence scores.

> *H3: Students who score low on the HPI Prudence scale are more likely to help other students cheat than those with high scores.*

Justifications

Because one of the best predictors of cheating is the perception that others cheat (Ariely 2012; McCabe et al. 2012), students may justify cheating as a way to "level the playing field" (McCabe et al. 2012). At the same time, students generally believe cheating is wrong (Smyth and Davis, 2004, McCabe et al., 2012) and seek to maintain positive self-images (Steele, 1988). Thus, cheating for most students triggers cognitive dissonance (Festinger, 1957) which occurs when an individual behaves in ways inconsistent with his or her self-concept (Aronson, 1969). In order to cope with this dissonance, students may seek to justify the incongruity between their own beliefs and actions. For instance work by Haines et al. (1986) found that cheaters invoked more justifications than non-cheaters and Daniel, Blount and Ferrell (1991) found a strong relationship between the number of justifications students gave and cheating.

Understandably, there may be numerous reasons why a student would justify partaking in cheating. One explanation may be captured in the theory of unethical pro-organizational behavior (UPB) (Umphress and Bingham 2011), which explains how unethical behaviors may be undertaken with the intention of benefitting a group and/or organization (Thau et al. 2015; Umphress et al. 2010; Wiltermuth et al. 2013). Although the concept of UPB is still considered an unethical behavior that violates social norms and values (Jones, 1991), it differs from other unethical behaviors because the means justify the ends in that the employee's intention is to help the organization (Thau et al. 2015). In our case, concerned students may agree to act unethically in order to help the requesting student. While the student may be aware that it is wrong to cheat, the student's concern for the welfare of his or her peer may overwhelm the student's decision-making capacity and result in the student helping the peer cheat. Therefore, in our study, we suggest that the extent to which students justify providing cheating assistance out of concern for the other student will be a significant predictor of actually helping other students cheat.

H4: Concern justifications will be a significant predictor of helping other students cheat.

Past Cheating Behavior

Students generally believe cheating is wrong (Smyth and Davis, 2004; McCabe et al. 2012). At the same time, they seek to maintain a positive self-image (Steele 1988). This behavior that is inconsistent with students' self-concept tends to create dissonance (Festinger 1957). A potential avenue for dissonance reduction is to learn that cheating is not deviant behavior but rather normative behavior among a set of peers. Therefore, engaging in this behavior by both cheating themselves and helping others cheat, may reduce felt dissonance. At the same time, because not all cheating offenses are identical, that is students (and faculty) differentiate among forms of cheating, students are unlikely to help others cheat in minor and serious offenses equally. Findings of Brimble and Stevenson-Clarke (2005) as well as McCabe and colleagues

(2012) show that relatively few students report engaging in serious cheating while half or more admit to minor cheating involving collaboration and copying. Indeed, McCabe et al. (2012) found many students do not regard collaboration on assignments designated as individual work to be cheating. Therefore, consistent with "attitudes follow behavior" (Festinger 1957), we believe that students who have cheated themselves are more likely to help others cheat than those who have not. Indeed, samples of past behavior are often better predictors of future behavior than "signs" such as attitude and personality measures (Hunter and Hunter 1984; Wernimont and Campbell 1968). Ariely's (2012) extensive experimental research on honesty finds that "one immoral act leads to others" (p. 140). Therefore, we contend that students who cheat are more likely than non-cheaters to help others cheat.

Both McCabe et al. (2012) and Brimble and Stevenson-Clarke (2005) found that minor cheating is far more common and more likely to be accepted by students. This suggests students will be more willing to help others engage in minor rather than serious cheating. Additionally serious cheating both results in more serious sanctions than minor and is often generally regarded as more deviant behavior. Although there is evidence minor and serious cheating are distinct in some ways, a recent study by Stone et al. (2014) found in a large sample of business students that many students who engaged in serious cheating also engaged in minor cheating. Therefore, when students have engaged in violations of any level of academic integrity in the past, we expect past cheating will be positively associated with helping others cheat.

> *H5: Students who have engaged in minor cheating are more likely to help others engage in minor cheating and students who have engaged in serious cheating are more likely to help others engage in serious cheating.*

Report Cheating of Others

Another indicator of students' attitudes toward cheating and their likelihood of helping others cheat is their willingness to report cheating. Very few studies have examined how often

students report cheating. Of the studies that have examined this issue, results show of those who observe cheating only a very small proportion of students report it. For example, Nuss (1984) found that 3% of students of students who observed cheating said they would report it, 28% said they would report serious cheating and 43% said they would ignore it. Similarly, Burton and Near (1995) found that while between 67% and 75% of their sample of 550 undergraduate business students witnessed cheating, only 3% to 5% reported cheating to "someone official." Stone et al. (2012) found willingness to report cheating was highly negatively correlated (-.60) with favorable attitudes toward cheating. Similarly, Simon et al. (2004) found students with favorable attitudes toward academic policies were more likely to report cheating. We contend that students who are willing to report cheating are less likely to help others cheat.

> *H6: Students willing to report cheating are less likely to help others engage in cheating, in particular, they are less likely to help others engage in serious cheating than minor cheating.*

Peer Cheating Relationship

Much of the academic integrity research has focused on characteristics of cheaters, including how they perceive others, in order to determine the role of individual factors influencing academic dishonesty. For example, McCabe (1992) showed that students use neutralization (e.g., denial, deflecting blame to others, rationalization) techniques to justify or disregard their dishonest behavior. Later, based on a study of 5,331 graduate students, McCabe et al. (2006) found the perception that others were cheating, was the best predictor of self-reported cheating behavior. Based on such results, McCabe and others (c.f., McCabe and Treviño 1997; McCabe et al. 2002; McCabe et al. 2012; Smyth and Davis, 2004) argued that students learn cheating from friends and cheating becomes a norm. Other researchers have examined individual factors in the contexts of the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) (Ajzen, 1985, 1991) and personality (e.g., Stone et al. 2008, 2010; Whitley, 1998).

While individual factors have been examined to determine how they are associated with student cheating, how students *respond* to requests by other students to help them cheat has not been so examined. Extant research has shown students' perception of their peers' behavior is an important predictor of violations of academic integrity (McCabe et al. 2001, 2012; Stone et al. 2010) which suggests perception of peers' behavior may also influence a student's tendency to help others cheat. This leads to the question, does the closeness of the relationship influence decisions to partake in cheating behaviors? Earlier work by McCabe showed that helping someone else cheat on a test is only slightly less prevalent than engaging in serious test cheating oneself (McCabe et al. 2001). Chapman, Davis, Toy and Wright (2004) showed that students were much more likely to cheat if their friends were involved. Specifically, Chapman et al.'s (2004) research found that 75% of respondents would join a friend in cheating but only 45% of respondents would engage in cheating with an acquaintance. Based on a sample of Australian students, research by Brimble and Stevenson-Clark (2005) showed that helping a friend was the most frequently cited justification for cheating. This friendship effect was replicated in a study of U.S. students conducted by Stone, Jawahar and Kisamore (2009). Results of Stone et al.'s (2009) study indicated that helping a friend and peer pressure were frequent justifications students used for cheating themselves.

> *H7: Students are more likely to help those closer to them (i.e., friends) than others (i.e., strangers) engage in violations of academic integrity.*

Finally, there is considerable research regarding characteristics of students who cheat which suggests cheaters tend to be younger and male (e.g., Anderman and Murdock 2007; McCabe and Treviño 1997; Whitley 1998; McCabe et al. 2012). In this study, age and gender will serve as control variables.

Method

Participants and Procedure

A total of 1872 undergraduate business students at a large, Midwestern public university in the United States were recruited via the university's SONA system. SONA is a web-based software that helps universities manage research study participation. Students were able to independently log into SONA and self-select to participate in the current study. This is an advantage of using SONA over traditional recruiting methods in that rather than recruiting students via an email from the instructor, which might be seen as coercive, SONA protects student privacy rights. SONA provides students with a chance to earn variable amounts of extra credit for a class of their choosing depending on the length or complexity of the study. Students may participate in as many studies as they choose but can only earn a maximum of five percent of their grade for a given class. During the semester in which this study was conducted, approximately 30 studies were available for students to choose within the SONA system. For this study, extra credit was offered as an incentive for participation and an alternative assignment was offered to students who did not wish to participate in a research study. Participants completed the integrity and personality inventories online outside of regular class time. From the total SONA sample, 198 students chose to participate in this study. Of the study participants, 96 (48.5%) were female and 102 (51.5%) were male. Thirty-two percent of participants were between the ages of 18 and 20, 37% between 21 and 23, 12% were between 24 and 27, 11% were between 28-30, 4% were between 31-35, and the rest were 36 years or older. Almost 80% of participants were full-time students. Thirty-one percent of the participants had earned 90 credit hours or more, 20% had earned between 60 and 90 credit hours, and the rest had earned less than 60 credit hours toward their degrees.

Measures

Items used to measure the constructs are included in the Appendix. All items except the personality measures were measured on 5-point Likert-type scales. Internal consistency reliability coefficients as well as correlations between study variables are provided in Table 1.

Personality. The Hogan Personality Inventory (HPI) was used to measure Prudence. The HPI is a self-report measure of normal personality based on the socio-analytic theory of personality and was designed to parallel the Big 5 personality factors (Hogan and Hogan, 2007). Two examples of Prudence scale items are: "I rarely do things on impulse" and "I always practice what I preach." The HPI manual reports coefficient alpha for Prudence as .71 (Hogan and Hogan, 2007). The HPI was administered online; the measure typically takes between 15 to 20 minutes to complete. Some students' HPI scores could not be linked to their responses on other measures in the study because they either did not take the HPI portion of the study or did not report the integrity survey code number when completing the HPI that would allow the researchers to link respondents' answers on the two parts of the study. The HPI includes a validity check to identify assessment takers who may be responding in a careless or random manner (Hogan 1992). We followed the Hogan's recommendation to disregard responses from participants whose Validity scale scores were lower than nine. Based on this recommendation, responses from 10 participants were eliminated due to probable careless responding.

Justifications for helping others cheat. Students' concern justifications for helping other students cheat or plagiarize were assessed with four items adapted from Stone et al.'s (2009) questions regarding reasons for engaging in cheating ($\alpha = .93$). These questions asked participants to indicate how likely they would be to help someone cheat due to concern for the other student. An example item is "To prevent the other student from failing." Higher scores

indicate students were more likely to allow circumstances to justify possible engagement in academic misconduct. In each condition response were made on a 5-point scale with options ranging from “very unlikely” to “very likely”.

Past behavior-Minor and serious cheating. Academic misconduct was measured using 10 items (α = .90) asking how often respondents engaged in behaviors such as cheating on a test, helping others cheat, collaborating without permission, and plagiarizing a paper. These questions were identical to those used by McCabe and colleagues in previous work (see McCabe 2005; McCabe and Treviño 1993, 1997; Stone et al. 2010). High scores indicate greater engagement in academic misconduct. Following Stone and colleagues (2014), we divided the 10 behaviors into serious and minor cheating behaviors. The minor cheating behavior scale included 5 items (α = .81). All items began with the stem “indicate how frequently you have done each of these while enrolled in college.” A sample item for minor cheating behavior scale was “Copied a few sentences from a published or internet source and not given credit to the author.” Similarly, we classified the remaining 5 items as serious cheating behaviors (α = .86). The same stem was used as for the minor cheating behaviors. A sample item for serious cheating behavior scale was “Helped someone else cheat on a test.” Responses to items on both the minor and serious cheating behavior scales were make on a 5-point scale with response options ranging from “never” to “many times”.

Report cheating. Intent to report cheating was assessed using eight items (α = .88). Items asked respondents how likely they would be to report cheating by a friend or a student they did not know and their beliefs regarding the importance of reporting cheating. A sample item for report cheating is “Reporting instances of cheating is necessary to be fair to honest students.” Four items were from Stone et al. (2012). High scores indicate intent to report observations of

academic misconduct. In each condition response options were on a five point scale with options ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”.

Relationship to those who asked to help cheat. For both minor and serious cheating incidents**,** we asked participants what their relationship was to the person who asked for help to cheat. Responses were made on a 4-point scale with answer choices of 1 = significant other, 2 = friend, 3 = acquaintance, or 4 = stranger. High scores indicated a more distant relationship.

Response to cheating requests. For both minor and serious situations our outcome variable was comprised of asking participants how they responded to the request for help cheating. Responses were made on a 5-point scale. Answer choices for minor cheating were, 1 = “reported the request to the instructor or other school official”, 2 = “refused their request”, 3 = “deny but allow” (e.g., “asked them to do as much as they could on their own, then I would help them.”), 4 = “asked them what they would do for you”, 5 = “collaborated with another student instead of working individually” (assignment collaboration) / “let them copy or use your homework or assignment” (copying homework). For serious cheating, 1 = “report the request to the instructor or other school official”, 2 = “refused their request, 3 = “deny but allow” (e.g., “it's their business, they can copy if they can see my sheet.”), 4 = “asked them what they would do for you”, 5 = “let them copy or use your test”. High scores indicate less willingness to help others cheat.

Frequency of other students asking to help cheat. For both minor and serious cheating incidents, we asked participants how frequently other students asked to help them cheat. All items began with the stem “In the past year, how frequently has another student asked you to do the following.” For the minor cheating examples, the question for copying homework was, “Let them copy/use your homework or assignment?”, and for the collaborating on an assignment it

was, “collaborate on an assignment when the instructor asked for individual work?” For the serious cheating situation, the items also began with the stem “In the past year, how frequently has another student asked you to do the following.” A sample question was, “Allow them to copy from your test?” In each condition their response options were on a 5-point scale from “never” to “many times”.

Insert Table 1 here

Results

To test for common method variance and to ensure our scales were not each measuring the same construct of cheating, perceptions of cheating, concern justifications, or past cheating behavior, we ran a confirmatory factor analysis with past cheating behavior, concern justifications, and attitudes toward reporting cheating. The past cheating behavior scale consists of ten items, the concern justifications contains four items, while the attitudes toward reporting cheating contains eight items. Results of a principal axis factoring using a varimax rotation revealed three distinct factors. These were attitudes towards reporting cheating (items all loaded > .48), concern justifications (items loaded > .76), and past cheating behavior (items loaded > .56). The results indicate that each scale loads on its own factor and there were no instances of cross-loadings.

To examine our first hypothesis, we tested for a difference in the frequency of being asked to engage in minor versus serious cheating. Results of the dependent samples t-test show the data support this hypothesis. We found a significant difference between the frequency with which individuals were asked to help cheat on homework and assignments (minor cheating) (M = 2.11, SD = 1.08) and the frequency with which individuals were asked to help them cheat on an

exam (serious cheating) (M = 1.27, SD = .72), $t(184) = 12.14$, $p < .001$. We also wanted to see if there was a significant difference between the two subdivisions of minor cheating: copying homework and collaborating on an assignment. There were no significant differences between the frequency students participated in copying an assignment (M = 2.13, SD = 1.23) and being asked to help them collaborate on an individual assignment (M = 2.09, SD = 1.16), $t(197) = -.47$, $p = .64$. Thus, while the frequency of being asked to help cheat was different between minor and serious offenses, there was not a difference between to the subdivisions of minor cheating, copying homework and collaborating on an individual assignment.

To see the individual influences of the personality factor Prudence, past behavior, concern justifications attitudes towards reporting cheating, and the relationship to the cheating requester, we conducted three hierarchical multiple regression analyses, one for minor cheating - copying homework, one for minor cheating - collaborating on an assignment and one for serious, or test or exam cheating. The first five-stage hierarchical multiple regression was conducted with the response to minor cheating - copying homework as the dependent variable. Age and gender were entered in stage 1 of the regression analyses to control for demographic variables. To test our third hypotheses, the Hogan personality variable Prudence was entered in stage 2. Concern justifications was entered in stage 3 to test hypothesis four. Minor past cheating behavior was entered in stage 4 to test our fifth hypothesis. To test our sixth hypothesis, we entered the reporting cheating variable. Finally, to test hypothesis seven, we entered the relationship to the individual requesting help cheating. The variables were entered in this order as it seemed to logically follow what may most directly affect a student's decision to cheat. Means, standard deviations, and correlations between the multiple regression variables are reported in Table 1 and the regression results are in Tables 2, 3, and 4.

For minor cheating- copying homework, the hierarchical multiple regression revealed that at stage 1, age and gender did not contribute significantly to the regression model, $F(2,103) = 2.23$, $p = .11$ and only accounted for 4.2% of the variation. Introducing personality at stage 2, Prudence was significant $F(1, 102) = 6.15$ $p < .001$ and explained an additional 11.2% of variation in response to minor cheating-copying homework, supporting our third hypothesis. Adding concern justifications at stage 3 to the regression model explained an additional 15.4% of variation in response minor cheating-copying homework; this change was also significant, $F(1, 101) = 11.2$, $p < .001$, supporting our fourth hypothesis. For stage 4, we added past minor cheating behavior and it explained an additional 3.2% of the variation in responses to minor cheating-copying homework; this change in R^2 was significant, $F(1, 100) = 10.25$, $p = .03$, supporting our fifth hypothesis. The addition of attitude toward reporting cheating for stage 5 to the regression model explained an additional 3.1% of the variation in responses to minor cheating-copying homework; this change in R^2 was significant, $F(1, 99) = 9.67$, $p = .03$, supporting hypothesis six. Finally, the relationship of the requester variable entered in stage 6 only explained an additional 0.04% of variation in responses to minor cheating-copying homework, and this change in R^2 was nonsignificant, $F(1, 98) = 8.35$, $p = .42$, failing to support our seventh hypothesis for copying homework. When all seven independent variables were included in stage six of the regression model, only gender and the relationship to the cheating requester were non-significant predictors of responses to minor cheating- copying homework, largely supporting our model structure and hypotheses. The single best predictor of responses to requests for help with minor cheating-copying homework was concern justification that uniquely explained 15.4% of the variation. Together the eight independent variables accounted for 38% of the variance in responses to requests for help with minor cheating- copying homework.

Insert Table 2 here

For minor cheating-collaborating on an assignment, the hierarchical multiple regression revealed that at stage 1, age and gender contributed significantly to the regression model, $F(2,102) = 3.34$, $p = .04$ and accounted for 6.1% of the variation. Introducing personality at stage 2, Prudence was significant $F(1, 101) = 3.77$, $p = .04$ and explained an additional 3.9% of variation in response to minor cheating-collaborating on an assignment, supporting our third hypothesis. Adding concern justifications at stage 3 to the regression model only explained an additional 1.7% of variation in response minor cheating-collaborating on an assignment; this change was not significant, $F(1, 100) = 3.35$, $p = .16$ thus our fourth hypothesis was not supported. For stage 4, we added past minor cheating behavior and it explained an additional 4.5% of the variation in responses to minor cheating-collaborating on an assignment; this change in R^2 was significant, $F(1, 99) = 3.87$, $p = .02$, supporting our fifth hypothesis. Adding attitude toward reporting cheating for stage 5 to the regression model explained an additional 8.8% of the variation in responses to minor cheating-collaborating on an assignment; this change in R^2 was significant, $F(1, 98) = 5.49$, $p = .001$, supporting hypothesis six. Finally, the relationship of the requester variable entered in stage 6 explained an additional 3.2% of variation in responses to minor cheating-collaborating on an assignment, and this change in R^2 was significant, $F(1, 97) = 5.49$, $p = .04$, supporting our seventh hypothesis for collaborating on an assignment. When all seven independent variables were included in stage six of the regression model, only gender and concern justification were non-significant predictors of responses to minor cheating-collaborating on an assignment, largely supporting our model structure and hypotheses. The single best predictor of responses to requests for help with minor cheating- collaborating on an assignment was attitude towards reporting cheating, which uniquely explained 8.8% of the

variation. Together the eight independent variables accounted for 28% of the variance in responses to requests for help with minor cheating-collaborating on an assignment.

Insert Table 3 here

For serious cheating, the hierarchical multiple regression revealed that at stage 1, age and gender did not contribute significantly to the regression model, $F(2, 26) = .84$, $p = .44$ and only accounted for 6.1% of the variation. Introducing personality at stage 2, Prudence was not significant $F(1, 25) = .68$, $p = .53$ and only explained an additional 1.5% of variation in response to serious cheating, not supporting our third hypothesis. Adding concern justifications at stage 3 to the regression model explained an additional 14.4% of variation in response serious cheating; this change was significant, $F(1, 24) = 1.68$, $p = .05$, supporting our fourth hypothesis. For stage 4, we added past serious cheating behavior and it only explained an additional 2.3% of the variation in responses to serious cheating; this change in R^2 was nonsignificant, $F(1, 23) = 1.47$, $p = .41$, rejecting our fifth hypothesis. Adding attitude toward reporting cheating for stage 5 to the regression model explained an additional 15.6% of the variation in responses to serious cheating; this change in R^2 was significant, $F(1, 22) = 2.43$, $p = .03$, supporting hypothesis six. Finally, the relationship of the requester variable entered in stage 6 did not account for any additional change in variation in responses to serious cheating, and this change in R^2 was not significant, $F(1, 21) = 1.99$, $p = .93$, thus, our seventh hypothesis for serious cheating was not supported. When all seven independent variables were included in stage six of the regression model, age, gender, Prudence, past serious cheating behavior, and the relationship to the requestor were non-significant predictors of responses to serious cheating, largely supporting our model structure and hypotheses of the differences between minor and serious cheating. The

single best predictor of responses to requests for help serious cheating was attitude towards report cheating uniquely explaining 15.6% of the variation. Together the eight independent variables accounted for 40% of the variance in responses to requests for help with serious cheating.

Insert Table 4 here

Discussion

Results of Hypothesis Tests

In this study, we investigated *whether* minor cheating is more prevalent than serious cheating, *what* factors predict helping others cheat, and *how* helping minor cheating differs from serious. While academic misconduct is prevalent, consistent with a few prior studies (Ariely 2012; McCabe et al. 2006; Stone et al. 2014), we argued that most cheating is minor and not of the serious kind. Indeed, our results indicate that requests for help with minor cheating were more frequent than for help with serious cheating. Second, we proposed that individuals who have cheated in the past are more likely to help others cheat; our results confirmed this expectation as past minor cheating (M = 1.59, SD = 0.69) was significantly related, r = -.45, $p <$ .01, to responding to requests for help to engage in minor cheating (M = 2.15, SD = 1.23). Specifically, with the exception of helping to test cheat, past cheating behaviors were the best predictors of providing minor cheating assistance. Third, given the inherent risks associated with cheating, as expected students were more likely to help a friend as opposed to a stranger cheat and this was particularly true for serious test cheating. Indeed, responses to open-ended questions offered examples of justifications for helping others cheat including, “Death in family and the teacher was gonna give him zeros for everything he was going to miss,” and “Regardless,

sometimes aid is required to understand a bogus assignment or task." This pattern of results was clearly evident for minor cheating. The findings for serious cheating differ from minor cheating for several possible reasons. First, as extant research (e.g., Brimble-Stevenson and Clark, 2005; McCabe et al. 2012; Stone et al. 2014) shows, serious cheating is much less common than minor cheating. Second, because serious, test-related cheating is associated with more serious consequences in terms of school sanctions, students may be less likely to engage in this behavior and less likely to self-report in a survey. Third, Stone et al. (2014) found that most minor cheating violations were spontaneous and unplanned while serious cheating tends to be planned, thus potentially negating the effect of some of our predictors.

Our data support hypothesis two, that students help one another engage in inappropriate collaboration to a greater extent than copying. Although this finding is consistent with McCabe et al.'s (2012) conclusion that many students do not regard collaboration as cheating, examination of how the two forms of cheating differ is insightful. First, because collaboration is virtually an informal norm, justification is not a significant predictor but it accounts for the most variance for copying; the correlation with justification for copying is r = -.49 versus -.23 for collaboration. Additionally, copying is much more closely associated with serious test cheating, r= .48, than collaboration, r =.16. Consistent with our theme, the relationship between those who helped is closer for collaboration than copying, r =.38 vs. .22.

Importantly, this study is only one of several to analyze the impact individual personality has on cheating behavior. In an attempt to capture this personality dynamic we analyzed a personality dimension from the Hogan Personality Inventory (HPI) (Hogan & Hogan, 2007), Prudence. Note that high scores on the "response to cheating requests" scale indicates that one

would report instances of requests for help cheating to the instructor or other school official and low scores indicate that one would provide cheating help.

As expected, those with high scores on Prudence were less likely to provide help to others requesting help to engage in minor offenses, however, Prudence was negatively but not significantly related to requests for help with serious offenses. It is significant however, that means for copy and collaboration were nearly equal, 17.1 and 17.7, respectively, and significantly higher than for test cheating, 14.9. Indeed, plots of the Prudence-helping variable showed that most all Prudence scores for serious cheating were lower than for copying or collaboration. Therefore, the non-significant negative Prudence-serious relationship is a small sample with Prudence scores in a low and narrow range.

Additional Analyses

To this point, we have analyzed how students who were asked to help others cheat in some way responded. Our sample, however, also included more than 90 students who reported never having been asked to help others cheat. Therefore, we conducted a post hoc analysis to examine differences between those who were asked to help cheat as compared to those not asked in the belief there were likely to be significant differences. That is, why do some students get asked and others not get asked to help fellow students cheat?

To test for differences, we conducted independent samples t-tests on our variables in the three cheating conditions: minor copy, minor collaborate, and serious. In each condition, those who had never been asked to help cheat were compared against those who have been asked to help cheat for each of our variables: Prudence, Sociability (another HPI personality scale), past cheating behavior (minor, for copying homework and collaborating on an assignment; serious,

for exam cheating), concern justifications, and intent to report cheating. The means, standard deviations, and significance levels can be seen in Tables 5a, b and c.[1]

In the copying homework condition, those who had never been asked to help cheat were higher in Prudence than those who had been asked to cheat. This suggests that a student who is intending to cheat will completely bypass a student who is known to be more conscientious, more likely to follow rules, and resists the pressure to cheat themselves. This is consistent with the fact that the large majority of students who are asked to cheat are close (e.g., a friend) to the student who asks them to help cheat. We also chose to analyze another personality trait, Sociability. Like Prudence, Sociability is a Hogan Personality Inventory (HPI) scale, but assesses behaviors that are different from Prudence. Sociability has been defined as, how much a person seems to desire and/or enjoy interacting with others (Hogan and Hogan, 2007). Those with low scores on Sociability will be seen as low energy, shy, and reserved. Conversely, high Sociability scores are associated with being energetic, and perhaps compulsively interactive. As such, a desire to be social can lead students to agree to requests for cheating, possibly as an act to be accepted by the requester. In other words, these highly social individuals may prioritize associating with and acceptance by others ahead of making an ethical choice and denying a request to help cheat. We find those who have been asked to help cheat were higher in Sociability than those who had never been asked to help cheat. Similarly, the mean for those who have participated in minor cheating was higher for those who have been asked than those who have never been asked. The same pattern holds for those who justify cheating perhaps because

[1] Our total participants represent all students who participated in the cheating surveys. For serious cheating, those who have been asked to cheat (N=45) is greater than the value in our regressions (N=29) due to some students who have been asked, but did not respond to the request.

they have a concern for the other student's well-being. Logically, students with higher intent to report instances of cheating were not asked to help cheat.

When looking at the results for collaborating on an assignment, there was not a significant difference in either of the personality variables, Prudence or Sociability, for those who have been asked to help cheat and those who have never been asked to help cheat. However, the direction of the difference is consistent with results for copying. The rest of the results matched those for copying homework.

When looking at serious cheating, there was once again a difference in Prudence as those who have never been asked have higher Prudence scores than those who have been asked. Although there was not a significant difference for Sociability, the direction was the same as copying and collaboration (i.e., higher for those who were asked than those who were not).

These results suggest that the students really know who they are asking to help cheat and that certain students are targeted while others are avoided. This implies that, indeed, birds of a feather truly do cheat together.

Insert Tables 5a, 5b, and 5c here

Implications

One major finding from this study is that students do not cheat alone. That is, while prior research has demonstrated that violations of academic integrity are significantly influenced by the perception that others also cheat, our data show that a large percent of our sample receive requests from their fellow students to help them cheat via copying (53%) or collaborating (54%). If the request is regarded as a friend by the target of the request and the cheating is minor, the target is likely to comply with the request. The good news is, most students "draw the line" at

test cheating as only 17% percent have been asked to help cheat on an exam. Therefore, while some decry the prevalence of cheating in schools, our data and others suggest serious test cheating is far less common. At the same time, cheating and helping others cheat, over time can create a culture in which cheating is viewed as acceptable and may be even considered a norm. When such cheating is embedded in an organization's culture, it will encourage more cheating. This expectation is consistent with results of a meta-analysis (Kish-Gephart et al. 2010) which showed that the ethical culture of an organization accounts for more variance in behavior than individual level variables.

Cheating in school is not only a concern for school administrators, but also for future employers as research has shown cheating in school is related to cheating at work (e.g. Nonis and Swift 2001; Sims 1993). More recently, a study by Stone et al. (2011) found that cheating in school was related to sabotage, production deviance, withdrawal, and theft at work, as measured by Counterproductive Work Behavior Checklist (CWB-C) developed by Spector et al. (2006). As one student said, "if you will cheat at school, you will cheat at anything." These results have implications for the criteria used to select employees. Specifically, although past cheating behavior was the strongest predictor of helping others cheat, personality was nearly as useful. Using a combination of background checks, behavior description interviews and personality tests, the number of employees likely to engage in CWBs and/or assist others in such behaviors can be reduced.

Additionally, academic integrity data and personality are useful predictors of those likely to engage in OCBs. Although only six students indicated they have reported inappropriate collaboration and none reported copying or test cheating, such reports are examples of OCBs and whistle-blowing (Stone et al. 2012). This low number of students reporting cheating suggests

that academic departments may look for ways to create cultures conducive to reporting cheating. Additionally, prior research and this study suggest academic integrity behavior, attitudes and personality offer data useful for identifying those who would support an ethical work culture.

Limitations

Our study is not without limitations. The data are from a single source, business students at one university, which can lead to same-source bias. Additionally, our sample size is not large. Also, our sample, consistent with prior research, found relatively few students reported engaging in serious cheating. This may be due to one or more factors. For example, because the survey was conducted in an academic setting, students may have been leery of honestly responding about their past cheating behavior, especially for serious test cheating. Similarly, another factor may be that since unauthorized copying and collaborating are looked upon as minor and common and not even cheating by many students, while cheating on an exam is seen as serious (McCabe and Treviño, 1993), social desirability may have led to underreporting serious cheating. At the same time, our data are consistent with the proportions reported by prior research (McCabe et al. 2012).

Future Directions

Ideally, network analysis could reveal the patterns of influence via mapping relationships among students who cheat and those who do not. It is likely, for example, those who were never asked to help others cheat have few if any contact with those who have been asked. Because the risks associated with serious cheating are higher than for minor, we might expect to see smaller networks and closer relationships. Additionally, future research should continue this line of exploration to analyze the effects of personality on academic integrity and academic dishonesty.

Conclusion

This study adds to the voluminous literature on violations of academic integrity by examining student responses to other students' requests to help them cheat. This exploratory study suggests that cheating, particularly minor cheating, is a social and personal event; students don't cheat alone and they tend to cheat with friends. As the old saying goes, "birds of a feather, flock together"; or in our case, cheat together. Although our data suggest past cheating, a personality variable, justifications for cheating, attitude towards cheating, and closeness of relationship to requester are useful predictors of helping others cheat, this study should act as a platform for future research from which these findings can be replicated in larger and more diverse samples.

References

Ajzen, I. (1985). From intentions to actions: A theory of planned behavior. In J. Kuhl & J. Beckmann (Eds.), *Action-control: From cognition to behavior* (pp. 11–39). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *50*(2), 179–211.

Anderman, A. M., & Murdock, T.B. (2007b). The psychology of academic cheating. In Anderman, A. M., & Murdock, T.B. (Eds.) *Psychology of academic cheating*. New York, NY: Elsevier.

Ariely, D. (2012). *The honest truth about dishonesty: How we lie to everyone--especially ourselves*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Aronson, E. (1969). The theory of cognitive dissonance: A current perspective. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 4, 1-34.

Bing, M. N., Davison, H. K., Vitell, S. J., Ammeter, A. P., Garner, B. L., & Novicevic, M. M. (2012). An experimental investigation of an interactive model of academic cheating among business students. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, *11*(1), 28-48.

Brimble, M., & Stevenson-Clarke, P. (2005). Perceptions of the prevalence and seriousness of academic dishonesty in Australian universities. *Australian Educational Researcher, 32*(3), 19-44.

Burton, B. K., & Near, J. P. (1995). Estimating the incidence of wrongdoing and whistle-blowing: Results of a study using randomized response technique. *Journal of Business Ethics, 14*(1), 17-30.

Chapman, K.J., Davis, R., Toy, D. & Wright, L. (2004), Academic integrity in the business school environment: I'll get by with a little help from my friends. *Journal of Marketing Education, 26*(3), 236-249.

Christensen-Hughes, J.M., & McCabe, D.L. (2006). Academic misconduct within higher education in Canada. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, *36*(2), 1-21.

Crown, D. F., & Spiller, M. S. (1998). Learning from the literature on collegiate cheating: A review of empirical research. *Journal of Business Ethics, 17*(6), 683-700.

Davis, S. F., Grover, C. A., Becker, A. H., & McGregor, L. N. (1992). Academic dishonesty: Prevalence, determinants, techniques, and punishments. *Teaching of Psychology*, *19*(1), 16–20.

Daniel, L. G., Blount, K. D., & Ferrell, C. M. (1991). Academic misconduct among teacher education students: A descriptive-correlational study. *Research in Higher Education*, *32*(6), 703-724.

Festinger, L. (1957). A theory of cognitive dissonance. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Genereux, R. L., & McLeod, B. A. (1995). Circumstances surrounding cheating: A questionnaire study of college students. *Research in Higher Education*, *36*(6), 687-704.

Gino, F., Ayal, S., & Ariely, D. (2009). Contagion and differentiation in unethical behavior the effect of one bad apple on the barrel. *Psychological Science*, *20*(3), 393-398.

Haines, V. J., Diekhoff, G. M., LaBeff, E. E., & Clark, R. E. (1986). College cheating: Immaturity, lack of commitment, and the neutralizing attitude. *Research in Higher Education*, *25*(4), 342-354.

Hogan, R. (1992). Hogan personality inventory. Tulsa, OK: Hogan Assessment Systems.

Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. (2007). *Hogan Personality Inventory manual* (3rd ed.). Tulsa, OK: Hogan Assessment Systems.

Hunter, J. E. & Hunter, R. F. (1984). Validity and utility of alternative predictors of job performance. *Psychological Bulletin*, *96*(1), 72-98.

Jones, T. M. (1991). Ethical decision making by individuals in organizations: An issue-contingent model. *Academy of Management Review*, *16*(2), 366-395.

Josephson Institute of Ethics. (2006). *The ethics of American youth*. Retrieved December 19, 2015, from http://www.josephsoninstitute.org

Josephson Institute of Ethics. (2009). *The ethics of American youth*. Retrieved December 19, 2015, from http://www.josephsoninstitute.org

Josephson Institute of Ethics. (2012). *The ethics of American youth*: 2012. Retrieved January 10, 2016, from https://charactercounts.org/programs/reportcard/2012/index.html

Kisamore, J.L., Stone, T.H., & Jawahar, I.M. (2007). Academic integrity: The relationship between individual and situational factors on misconduct contemplations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *75*(4), 381-394.

Kish-Gephart, J. J., Harrison, D. A. & Treviño, L.K. (2010). Bad apples, bad cases, and bad barrels: Meta-Analytic evidence about sources of unethical decisions at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *95*(1), 1-31.

Lim, V. K. G., & See, S. K. B. (2001). Attitudes toward, and intentions to report, academic cheating among students in Singapore. *Ethics & Behavior*, *11*(3), 261-274.

Magnus, J. R., Polterovich, V. M., Danilov, D. L., & Savvateev, A.V. (2002). Tolerance of cheating: An analysis across countries. *Journal of Economic Education*, *33*(2), 125-135.

Marsden, H., Carroll, M., & Neill, J.T. (2005). Who cheats at university? A self-report study of dishonest academic behaviours in a sample of Australian university students. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, *57*(1), 1–10.

Mazar, N., Amir, O., & Ariely, D. (2008). The dishonesty of honest people: A theory of self-concept maintenance. *Journal of Marketing Research, 45*(6), 633-644.

McCabe, D. L. (1992). The influence of situational ethics on cheating among college students. *Sociological Inquiry, 62*(3), 365-374.

McCabe, D. L. (2005). Cheating among college and university students: A North American perspective. *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 1*(1).

McCabe, D.L., Butterfield, K.D., & Treviño, L.K. (2006). Academic dishonesty in graduate business programs: Prevalence, causes and proposed action. *Academy of Management Learning and Education, 5*(3), 294-306.

McCabe, D. L., Butterfield, K. D., & Treviño, L. K. (2012). *Cheating in college: Why students do it and what educators can do about it*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

McCabe, D. L., & Treviño, L. K. (1993). Academic dishonesty: Honor codes and other contextual influences. *Journal of Higher Education, 64*(5), 522–538.

McCabe, D. L., & Treviño, L. K. (1997). Individual and contextual influences on academic dishonesty: A multi-campus investigation. *Research in Higher Education, 38*(3), 379–396.

McCabe, D. L., Treviño, L. K., & Butterfield, K. D. (2001). Cheating in academic institutions: A decade of research. *Ethics & Behavior, 11*(3), 219-232.

McCabe, D. L., Treviño, L. K., & Butterfield, K. D. (2002). Honor codes and other contextual influences on academic integrity: A replication and extension of modified honor code settings. *Research in Higher Education, 43*(3), 357-378.

Moya-Smith, S. (2013). Survey: 42 percent of Harvard incoming freshman class cheated on homework. Retrieved January 6, 2014 from http://usnews.nbcnews.com/_news/2013/09/06/20361014-survey-42-percent-of-harvards-incoming-freshman-class-cheated-on-homework?lite.

Newstead, S. E., Franklyn-Stokes, A., & Armstead, P. (1996). Individual differences in student cheating. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 88*(2), 229-241.

Nonis, S., & Swift, C. O. (2001). An examination of the relationship between academic dishonesty and workplace dishonesty: A multi-campus investigation. *Journal of Education for Business, 77*(2), 69-77.

Nuss, E.M. (1984). Academic integrity: Comparing faculty and student attitudes. *Improving College and University Teaching, 32*(3), 140-144.

Roeder, T. (2014). Air Force academy: 40 freshmen in chemistry class cheating probe. The Gazette, http://gazette.com/air-force-academy-11-freshmen-in-cheating-probe/article/1515780

Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied*, *80*(1), 1-28.

Simon, C.A., Carr, J.R., McCullough, S.M., Morgan, S.J., Oleson, T. and Ressel, M.G. (2004), Student perceptions, institutional commitments and academic dishonesty: Who reports in academic dishonesty cases?, *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, *29*(1), 75-90.

Sims, R. L. (1993). The relationship between academic dishonesty and unethical business practices. *Journal of Education for Business*, *68*(4), 207-211.

Smyth, L.M. and Davis, J.R. (2004), Perceptions of dishonesty among two-year college students: academic versus business situations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *51*(1), 62-73.

Spector, P.E., Fox, S., Penney, L.M., Bruursema, K., Goh, A., & Kessler, S. (2006). The dimensionality of counterproductivity: Are all counterproductive behaviors created equal?. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *68*(3), 446-460.

Steele, C. M. (1988). The psychology of self-affirmation: Sustaining the integrity of the self. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* 21, 261–302. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Stone, T.H., Jawahar, I.M., & Kisamore, J.L. (2009). Using the Theory of Planned Behavior and cheating justifications to predict academic misconduct. *Career Development International*, *14*(3), 221-241.

Stone, T. H., Jawahar, I. M., & Kisamore, J. L. (2010). Predicting academic misconduct intentions and behavior using the theory of planned behavior and personality. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, *32*(1), 35-45.

Stone, T.H., Jawahar, I.M., & Kisamore, J.L. (2011). Predicting workplace misconduct using personality and academic behaviors. In Ronald J. Burke, Edward C. Tomlinson and Cary L. Cooper (Eds.), *Crime and corruption in organizations – Why it occurs and what to do about it.* Gower Publishing Limited, Surrey, UK

Stone, T. H., Kisamore, J. L. & Jawahar, I.M. (2008) Predicting students' perceptions of academic misconduct on the Hogan Personality Inventory Reliability Scale. *Psychological Reports*, *102*(2), 495-508.

Stone, T. H., Kisamore, J. L., Jawahar, I. M., & Bolin, J. H. (2014). Making our measures match perceptions: Do severity and type matter when assessing academic misconduct offenses? *Journal of Academic Ethics*, *12*(4), 251-270.

Stone, T. H., Kisamore, J. L., Kluemper, D., Jawahar, I. M., (2012) Whistle-Blowing in the Classroom. *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice*, *12*(5), 11- 26.

Thau, S., Derfler-Rozin, R., Pitesa, M., Mitchell, M. S., & Pillutla, M. M. (2015). Unethical for the sake of the group: Risk of social exclusion and pro-group unethical behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *100*(1), 98-113.

Umphress, E. E., Bingham, J. B., & Mitchell, M. S. (2010). Unethical behavior in the name of the company: the moderating effect of organizational identification and positive reciprocity beliefs on unethical pro-organizational behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*(4), 769-780.

Umphress, E. E., & Bingham, J. B. (2011). When employees do bad things for good reasons: Examining unethical pro-organizational behaviors. *Organization Science, 22*(3), 621-640.

Wernimont, P. F. & Campbell, J. P. (1968). Signs, samples and criteria. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 52*(5), 372-376.

Whitley, B. E. Jr. (1998). Factors associated with cheating among college students. *Research in Higher Education, 39*(3), 235-274.

Wiltermuth, S. S., Bennett, V. M., & Pierce, L. (2013). Doing as they would do: How the perceived ethical preferences of third-party beneficiaries impact ethical decision-making. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 122*(2), 280-290.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics, Correlations, and Scale Reliabilities for Minor and Serious Cheating

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Age	24.32	4.13	--												
2. Gender	1.48	.50	.01	--											
3. Prudence	18.06	4.10	.22**	.23**	--										
4. MCB	1.59	.69	-.26**	-.15*	-.40**	**.81**									
5. SCB	1.41	.69	-.23**	-.05	-.33**	.76**	**.86**								
6. Justify- Concern	2.01	1.09	-.37**	-.03	-.31**	.57**	.59**	**.93**							
7. Reporting Cheating	3.02	.77	.28**	.02	.33**	-.28**	-.29**	-.33**	**.88**						
8. Relation to Cheater (Copy)	2.21	.51	.18	-.07	.19	-.04	-.05	-.16	.34**	--					
9. Relation to Cheater (Collab)	2.24	.58	.40**	-.05	.20*	-.18	-.19	-.21*	.36**	.52**	--				
10. Relation to Cheater (Serious)	2.21	.49	-.09	.08	.11	-.18	-.21	-.35	-.34	-.11	.09	--			
11. Response to Copying	2.25	1.32	-.19	-.07	-.37**	.47**	.49**	.49**	-.33**	-.22*	-.24*	.13*	--		
12. Response to Collaborating	1.92	1.36	-.24*	-.04	-.25*	.34**	.33**	.23**	-.39**	-.22*	-.38**	.11	.41**	--	
13. Response to Exam Cheating	2.60	1.25	-.06	.23	.19	.28	.37*	.37*	-.40*	-.15	-.45*	.03	.48**	.16	--

*** p ≤ .01, *p ≤ .05.*

Notes. N = 198 for correlations other than those involving minor and serious relationship help. Correlations with copying are based on N=106, correlations with collaborations are based on N=105, and correlations with serious cheating are based on N=30.

Cronbach alphas reliability coefficients are listed on the diagonal in bold.

Gender is coded as 1=male; 2=female

MCB = Minor cheating behavior; SCB = Serious Cheating Behavior.

For Response to minor and serious cheating means, lower values indicate stronger agreement to cheating.

Table 2
Summary Regression Results for Minor Cheating - Helping Copy Homework

Variable	β	*t*	sr^2	*R*	R^2	*Adj.* R^2	ΔR^2
Step 1				.20	.04	.02	.04
Age	-.33*	-2.00*	.04*				
Gender	-.22	-.86	.01				
Step 2				.39**	.15**	.13**	.11**
Prudence	-.12**	-3.67**	.12**				
Step 3				.55**	.31**	.28**	.15**
Justify Concern	.48**	4.74**	.15**				
Step 4				.58*	.34*	.31*	.03*
Past Cheating Behavior (Minor)	.40*	2.19*	.03*				
Step 5				.61*	.37*	.33*	.03*
Report Cheating	-.37*	-2.19*	.03*				
Step 6				.61	.37	.33	.00
Relationship to the requester	-.18	-.81	.00				

*Note. N = 106; **p <.01, * p <.05*

Table 3
Summary Regression Results for Minor Cheating – Helping Collaborating on Individual Assignments

Variable	β	*t*	sr^2	*R*	R^2	*Adj.* R^2	ΔR^2
Step 1				.25*	.06*	.04*	.06*
Age	-.38*	-2.55*	.06*				
Gender	-.13	-.50	.00				
Step 2				.32*	.10*	.07*	.04*
Prudence	-.07*	-2.10*	.04*				
Step 3				.34	.12	.08	.02
Justify Concern	.17	1.41	.02				
Step 4				.40*	.16*	.12*	.05*
Past Cheating Behavior (Minor)	.49*	2.32*	.05*				
Step 5				.50**	.25**	.21**	.09**
Reporting Cheating	-.69**	-3.40**	.09**				
Step 6				.53*	.28*	.23*	.03*
Relationship to Requester	-.49*	-2.09*	.03*				

*Note. N = 105; **p <.01, * p <.05.*

Table 4
Summary Regression Results for Major Cheating – Cheating on an Exam

Variable	β	*t*	sr^2	*R*	R^2	*Adj.* R^2	ΔR^2
Step 1				.25	.06	-.01	.06
Age	-.17	-.50	.01				
Gender	.60	1.24	.06				
Step 2				.27	.08	-.04	.02
Prudence	.05	.63	.02				
Step 3				.47*	.22*	.09*	.14*
Justify Concern	.42*	2.10*	.14*				
Step 4				.49	.24	.08	.02
Past Cheating Behavior (Serious)	.26	.84	.02				
Step 5				.63*	.40*	.23*	.16*
Reporting Cheating	-.77*	-2.39*	.16*				
Step 6				.63	.40	.20	.00
Relationship to Requester	-.05	-.09	.00				

*Note. N = 29; **p <.01, * p ≤.05.*

Table 5a.

Comparison of those who have never been asked to help copy homework (minor cheating) versus those who have been asked to help cheat.

Copying homework		N	Mean (SD)	*t*	*df*	Sig. (2-tailed)
Prudence	Never Been Asked	92	19.15 (3.93)	-3.63	196	$p < .001$
	Have Been Asked	106	17.09 (4.03)			
Sociability	Never Been Asked	92	13.41 (5.03)	2.55	176	$p = .01$
	Have Been Asked	106	15.09 (4.12)			
Minor Cheating Behavior	Never Been Asked	92	1.27 (.43)	7.05	173	$p < .001$
	Have Been Asked	106	1.87 (.74)			
Justifying Concern	Never Been Asked	91	1.56 (.85)	5.84	191	$p < .001$
	Have Been Asked	106	2.39 (1.14)			
Reporting Cheating	Never Been Asked	91	3.29 (.79)	-4.81	195	$p < .001$
	Have Been Asked	106	2.79 (.67)			

Table 5b.

Comparison of those who have never been asked to help collaborate on an assignment (minor cheating) versus those who have been asked to help cheat.

Collaborating on an assignment		**N**	**Mean (SD)**	***t***	***df***	**Sig. (2-tailed)**
Prudence	Never Been Asked	93	18.48 (4.02)	-1.40	196	$p = .16$
	Have Been Asked	105	17.67 (4.16)			
Sociability	Never Been Asked	93	13.84 (5.26)	1.34	170	$p = .18$
	Have Been Asked	105	14.73 (3.98)			
Minor Cheating Behavior	Never Been Asked	93	1.28 (.44)	6.93	171	$p < .001$
	Have Been Asked	105	1.87 (.75)			
Justifying Concern	Never Been Asked	92	1.60 (.90)	5.27	194	$p < .001$
	Have Been Asked	105	2.37 (1.13)			
Reporting Cheating	Never Been Asked	92	3.27 (.84)	-4.40	165	$p < .001$
	Have Been Asked	105	2.80 (.62)			

Table 5c.

Comparison of those who have never been asked to help cheat on an exam (serious cheating) versus those who have been asked to help cheat.

Helping cheat on an exam		**N**	**Mean (SD)**	***t***	***df***	**Sig. (2-tailed)**
Prudence	Never Been Asked	152	18.53 (3.84)	-3.04	195	$p = .003$
	Have Been Asked	45	16.44 (4.63)			
Sociability	Never Been Asked	152	14.04 (4.50)	1.51	195	$p = .13$
	Have Been Asked	45	15.22 (5.04)			
Minor Cheating Behavior	Never Been Asked	152	1.22 (.43)	5.52	49	$p < .001$
	Have Been Asked	45	2.03 (.96)			
Justifying Concern	Never Been Asked	151	1.79 (.94)	4.59	60	$p < .001$
	Have Been Asked	45	2.71 (1.24)			
Reporting Cheating	Never Been Asked	151	3.15 (.76)	-4.67	194	$p < .001$
	Have Been Asked	45	2.57 (.64)			

Appendix

Scale Content
Past Cheating Behavior
Minor
Copied a few sentences from a source but not given credit
Collaborated on assignment that was supposed to be individual work
Received substantial help on assignment without permission
Copied from another student and turned in as own
Turned in work done by others
Serious
Helped someone cheat on a test
Copied from another student on test
Used notes on test without instructor permission
Cheated on test in any way
Used unfair methods to learn about a test
Reporting cheating
It is important to report academic dishonesty by other students.
I would report cheating by a student whom I do not know.
I would report cheating by a student whom I consider to be a friend.
Reporting cheating is necessary to be fair to honest students.
Most of my friends would NOT report cheating.[a]
Under the university's Academic Integrity Policy, most students will report cheating.
My friends would support me for reporting cheating.
University policies require that I report cheating.
Justify concern
To help a friend
They were under time pressure
They were in an unusual and difficult situation
To prevent the other student from failing

Note: [a] Reverse scored