

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 431 486

JC 990 415

AUTHOR Burke, Jonathan L.
 TITLE Faculty Perceptions of and Attitudes toward Academic Dishonesty at a Two-Year College.
 PUB DATE 1997-05-27
 NOTE 190p.; Ed.D. Dissertation, University of Georgia.
 PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Doctoral Dissertations (041)
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Cheating; *College Faculty; Community Colleges; *Educational Policy; Multicampus Colleges; Part Time Faculty; Plagiarism; Policy Analysis; *Teacher Attitudes; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

This study sought to determine factors impacting faculty response to academic dishonesty at a multi-campus, two-year college. This study investigated faculty: (1) perceptions of the extent of academic honesty; (2) perceptions of, and attitudes toward Academic Dishonesty Policy and policy implementation; (3) responses to academic dishonesty; (4) attitudes concerning values education; and (5) attitudes about responsibility for reducing academic dishonesty. This study further delineated perceptions, responses, and attitudes among faculty grouped by employment status, campus, years of service, and discipline. A 25-question survey instrument was completed by 742 part- and full-time faculty members. The results indicated that faculty do not perceive academic dishonesty to be a serious problem. Faculty believed themselves to be familiar with current policy and procedure, and are not concerned with policy implementation. The faculty believe that they have a primary role in values education. Of those surveyed, 86% have suspected, and 65% have been certain of, academic dishonesty in their classrooms. The majority of the faculty do not regularly follow institutional policy and most handle incidents of cheating and plagiarism on their own. They believe that the responsibility for reducing academic dishonesty lies primarily with students and faculty. This document includes implications and recommendations for policy usage, values education, and reducing academic dishonesty at multi-campus two-year colleges. This document contains 133 references and 9 appendices. (TGO)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

Faculty Perceptions of and Attitudes Toward
Academic Dishonesty at a Two-Year College

Jonathon L. Burke

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS
BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Burke

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

911-990-415



JONATHAN L. BURKE

Faculty Perceptions of and Attitudes Toward Academic
Dishonesty at a Two-Year College.
(under the direction of D. PARKER YOUNG)

Researchers have documented the prevalence of academic dishonesty in American higher education. Missing in the literature are studies addressing two-year college faculty concerns. This study sought to determine factors impacting response to academic dishonesty among faculty at a multi-campus, two-year college.

This research investigated faculty: 1) perceptions of the extent of academic dishonesty, 2) perceptions of, and attitudes toward Academic Dishonesty Policy and policy implementation, 3) responses to academic dishonesty, 4) attitudes concerning values education, and 5) attitudes about responsibility for reducing academic dishonesty. Further, differences in perceptions, responses and attitudes among faculty grouped by 1) employment status, 2) campus, 3) years of service, and 4) discipline were considered.

Fifty three percent of instructional faculty returned usable data on a researcher-designed instrument. Data were analyzed with descriptive statistics and one-way ANOVA techniques adjusted using the Bonferroni method.

Results indicated that faculty: 1) don't perceive academic dishonesty to be a serious problem, 2) believe themselves to be familiar with current policy and procedure,

FC990415

3) are not concerned with policy implementation, but have minor concern with personal and ideological issues, 4) believe they have a primary role in values education, 5) have suspected (86%) and been certain of (65%) academic dishonesty in their classroom; 6) don't regularly follow institutional policy; most handle incidents of cheating and plagiarism alone, 7) believe that the responsibility for reducing academic dishonesty lies primarily with students and faculty, and 8) statistically significant differences emerged among subgroups (employment status, campus, years of service, discipline) in perceptions of the seriousness of academic dishonesty, and by employment status in concerns with policy implementation.

Implications and recommendations for policy usage, values education, reducing academic dishonesty, multiple campuses and part-time faculty are considered. Recommendations for addressing academic dishonesty at a two-year, multi-campus college, and suggestions for future research are offered.

INDEX WORDS: Academic Dishonesty, Cheating, Faculty, Multi-Campus, Part-Time Faculty, Plagiarism, Two-Year College

FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF AND ATTITUDES TOWARD ACADEMIC
DISHONESTY AT A TWO-YEAR COLLEGE.

by

JONATHAN L. BURKE

B.A., Armstrong State College, 1986

M.S., The Florida State University, 1987

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty
of the University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

ATHENS, GEORGIA

1997

FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF AND ATTITUDES TOWARD ACADEMIC
DISHONESTY AT A TWO-YEAR COLLEGE.

by

JONATHAN L. BURKE

Approved:

D. Parker Young

Major Professor

5-20-97

Date

Approved:

Jonathan L. Parol

Dean of the Graduate School

May 27, 1997
Date

For Patience L. Burke

mother and teacher

1934 - 1996

B.A. University of Vermont, 1956

M.A. Armstrong State College, 1981

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Journeys such as the one that culminates in the submission of the completed dissertation are rarely solitary ventures. The doctoral traveler finds himself assisted by capable faculty, supportive colleagues, understanding friends and family. My experience has followed this tradition.

I am deeply indebted to Dr. D. Parker Young who as major professor has been a constant role model. Few persons epitomize integrity as does Dr. Young; as he retires he leaves a legacy that can best be summarized with his "Golden Rule". Together with Dr. Young, committee members Dr. Cameron Fincher, Dr. Libby Morris, Dr. Ronald Simpson and Dr. Larry Jones continue the University mission of research, teaching and service. Their ability to carry out these multiple tasks while remaining readily available to students outside the classroom no doubt bolsters the solid reputation of the Institute of Higher Education. I appreciate their help in my doctoral journey.

Much gratitude is extended to Yvonne Benton. She was the first person I met on the third floor of Candler Hall, and as always, she made a favorable impression. She continues to welcome students, guide them through the registration process, manage graduate school paperwork, and perform countless other chores.

To my colleagues and friends, thanks for your support. Graduate student friends Jim Eck, Sue Elliot, Keith Roots, and others made the experience enjoyable. The journey would be much less memorable if not for my good friends Randy Swing and Vasti Torres. Thanks for all the advice, guidance and good humor. Here's hoping all your drives find the fairway!

Much appreciation to my fellow traveler Elizabeth Clow. Having a co-worker travel the road (literally...Highway 78) shortened the commute. Thanks to DeKalb College, and Presidents Marvin Cole, Martha Nesbit and Jackie Belcher for support of my educational pursuits. Thanks also to Dr. Grace Cassio-Houston who provided needed consultation on statistical methodology. A special note of appreciation to Dr. Mary Ann Morgareidge, who pushed me to seek the doctorate, and remains my advocate and friend. Much gratitude is extended to those who have worked beyond the call of duty in my absence, especially Debbie Hairston, Deborah Urquhart and Alana McComb.

Finally, thanks to my family for providing the necessary support, step-by-step, in this process. In particular, I'm indebted to my wife Tami, who remains a constant friend and life partner. Though trying at times, the journey has been an exceptional learning experience. I understand that I have not traveled alone. I have been pushed, pulled, carried, dragged, led and guided along by

those mentioned here and by countless others. Your assistance will not soon be forgotten.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	ix
LIST OF APPENDICES.....	xi
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	2
Significance of the Study.....	4
Purpose of the Research.....	5
Definition of Terms.....	6
Limitations of Study.....	8
Organization of the Research.....	9
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	10
The Extent of the Problem.....	10
Responsibility of the Faculty.....	13
Legal Issues.....	17
Faculty Attitudes.....	25
Factors of Academic Discipline, Institutional Differences and Honor Codes.....	34
Summary.....	38
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY.....	40
Research Questions.....	41
Research Population.....	43
Survey Instrument.....	47
Data Collection.....	49
Data Analysis.....	51

Summary.....	52
CHAPTER 4: PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS.....	54
Research Participants - Demographics.....	55
Faculty Perceptions of the Seriousness of Academic Dishonesty.....	60
Familiarity with Academic Dishonesty Policy and Procedure.....	64
Concerns with Policy Implementation.....	66
Personal and Ideological Concerns.....	69
Attitudes About Values Education.....	72
Responses to Academic Dishonesty.....	74
Responsibility for Reducing Academic Dishonesty.....	90
Summary.....	93
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS..	96
Summary of the Research.....	97
Conclusions.....	100
Policy Implications.....	116
Recommendations: Addressing Academic Dishonesty at a Two-Year, Multi-Campus College.....	128
Recommendations for Future Research.....	136
Summary.....	138
REFERENCES.....	139
COURT DECISIONS.....	148
APPENDICES.....	150

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 2

2.1 Faculty Non-Use of Academic Dishonesty Policy.....	29
--	----

CHAPTER 3

3.1 Research Population - Demographic Description.....	45
--	----

CHAPTER 4

4.1 Population Respondents - Demographic Description.....	56
4.2 Population Subgroups for Data Analysis	59
4.3 Scale 1 - Seriousness of the Academic Dishonesty Problem, Analysis of Variance.....	61
4.4 Familiarity with Academic Dishonesty Policy and Procedure.....	65
4.5 Scale 2 - Concerns with Policy Implementation, Analysis of Variance.....	67
4.6 Scale 3 - Personal and Ideological Concerns, Analysis of Variance.....	71
4.7 Scale 4 - Attitudes About Values Education, Analysis of Variance.....	73
4.8 Responses to Incidents of Academic Dishonesty, Research Participants.....	75
4.9 Responses to Incidents of Academic Dishonesty, Employment Status (full-time, part-time).....	84
4.10 Responses to Incidents of Academic Dishonesty, Campus (Central, North, Gwinnett/South/Rockdale).....	85
4.11 Responses to Incidents of Academic Dishonesty, Years of Service (less than 5 years, 5-11 years).....	87

4.12 Responses to Incidents of Academic Dishonesty,
Discipline (Developmental Studies,
Humanities, Mathematics/Science,
Social Science).....89

4.13 Percentage of Faculty, by Subgroups,
Assigning the Most Responsible for
Reducing Academic Dishonesty to
Categories - Students, Faculty, Academic
Administrators and Student Services
Administrators.....92

LIST OF APPENDICES

A. DeKalb College Academic Dishonesty Policy.....150
B. Survey on Academic Dishonesty.....153
C. Scales for Data Analysis.....158
D. Electronic Mail to DeKalb College Faculty.....160
E. Cover Letter to DeKalb College Faculty.....161
F. Follow-up Postcard.....163
G. Follow-up Electronic Messages.....164
H. Follow-up Cover Letter.....168
I. DeKalb College Approval of Research.....170

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Of the problems confronting contemporary colleges and universities, academic dishonesty may be among the most serious. Certainly there is relative ease in pronouncing cheating as wrong. Recent popular press accounts of widespread cheating among college students, cheating scandals, and even "how-to" guides have placed the issue squarely into public view (Berton, 1995, Brock, 1994, Caplin, 1994, Collison, 1990, Davis, 1992, Manegold, 1994, Peyser, 1992). Among scholars, academic dishonesty is commonly held to be antithetical to the educational environment. Teaching and learning, inquiry and discovery are undermined by lack of faithfulness to integrity and honest academic principles. Broad consensus has been achieved on this point (Barnett and Dalton, 1981, Fass, 1986, Hawley, 1984, Nuss, 1984, Pavela, 1993, Singhal and Johnson, 1983). Complexity arises in consideration of effective responses to academic dishonesty.

How does an institution address the problem of academic dishonesty among its students? While this question can lead to the investigation of a variety of factors, among the most significant are actual policies themselves and their implementation. Are policies effective? What are the

concerns of faculty members, who implement institutional academic dishonesty policies?

This study will investigate the issues of concern to faculty members at a single institution. It will seek to determine the effectiveness of institutional response to academic dishonesty through study of faculty members' 1) perceptions of, 2) responses to, and 3) attitudes toward academic dishonesty and academic dishonesty policy and procedures.

Statement of the Problem

The scholarly literature is replete with data suggesting student academic dishonesty rates, motivations, techniques, and student development issues (Anderson and Obeshain, 1994, Baird, 1980, Barnett and Dalton, 1981, Brown, 1995, Davis and Ludvingson, 1995, Davis, 1993, Davis, Grover, Becker, and McGregor, 1992, Haines, Diekhoff, LaBeff, and Clark, 1986, Kerkvliet, 1994, Jendrek, 1992, Kibler, 1993, McCabe and Trevino, 1993, McCabe and Bowers, 1994). In addition to student-focused studies, an emerging research area centers on faculty. Faculty perceptions of cheating rates and behaviors, faculty responses to cheating, and prevention of cheating have all received attention in the academic dishonesty arena (Aaron and Georgia, 1994, California Community Colleges, 1994, Davis, 1993, Hollander, Young, and Gehring, 1985, Jendrek, 1989, Nuss, 1984, Pavela, 1996, Rafetto, 1985, Saunders, 1993, Singhal and Johnson, 1983, Wilhoit, 1994). Interestingly, while most studies indicate

failure by faculty to follow institutional policy (Bayens and Paige, 1993, Davis, Grover, Becker, and McGregor, 1992, Fass, 1986, Jendrek, 1989, Maramark and Maline, 1993, McCabe, 1993, Pavela, 1994, Singhal, 1982, Wright and Kelly, 1974), seldom has rationale for this non-use of policy been pursued. A comprehensive monograph (Kibler, Nuss, Paterson, and Pavela, 1988), and a National Association of Student Personnel Administrators publication (Gehring and Pavela, 1994) highlight both the legal risks to faculty and the long-term risks to the educational environment resulting from faculty non-response to academic dishonesty instances. Susan Daniell (1993), in her study of graduate teaching assistant attitudes and responses to academic dishonesty, suggests further research be done to better understand faculty member responses or non-responses to cheating. Lee (1987) notes the paucity of research in this area and writes "little information is available concerning the impact of complex student disciplinary proceedings on faculty's willingness to follow up on cases of suspected academic dishonesty" (pg. 100). This research then, emerges directly from the literature on academic dishonesty and responds specifically to key questions: In general, what factors affect faculty member responses to academic dishonesty? In particular, what factors influence faculty members' decisions to follow, or to avoid, institutional policy?

Significance of the Study

Academic dishonesty has been documented as an issue to be addressed in American higher education. Increasingly, institutions have responded through policy review and revision. In the highly litigious environment pervasive in our society and in institutions of higher education, policy revision often takes a legalistic direction (Kagan, 1991, Pavela, 1990, Pavela, 1992, Pavela, 1993). Particularly in the area of student rights, a focus on due process procedures may serve to create an adversarial environment counterproductive to the collegial teaching-learning environment regarded so highly by educators (Pavela, 1989, Pavela, 1990, Travelstead, 1987). Several contemporary thinkers on academic integrity argue that the development of an environment conducive to academic honesty may serve as the greatest long-term deterrent to cheating and plagiarism (Kibler, 1993, Pavela, 1993, McCabe, 1993, McCabe and Trevino, 1993). Such an environment requires cooperative effort on the part of faculty, students and administrators. Certainly an integral part of the development of an environment supportive of academic integrity is consistent response to instances of academic dishonesty. A key to such response is the individual, classroom teacher who is on the "front line" in the effort to address cheating and plagiarism. Addressing academic dishonesty must be considered with policy implementation, by the individual teacher, in mind.

At the two-year college, where little research has been done on academic dishonesty, several characteristics exist that may emerge as critical factors in addressing cheating and plagiarism at all types of higher education institutions. The reliance on part-time faculty as a significant percentage of the corps of instruction and the common occurrence of multiple campuses, or instructional locations, may well impact institutional efforts to reduce academic dishonesty. Part-time faculty are, by obvious time constraints, limited members of the academic community and perhaps unable to fully engage in discussion of problems and development of solutions surrounding any issue. Multiple campuses, or instructional locations, may warrant multiple approaches to considering academic integrity initiatives; campus environments may differ greatly. Two and four-year colleges alike continue to develop multiple instructional locations and to rely on the services of part-time faculty members. The influence of part-time faculty and multiple campuses appears likely to continue to be a question in addressing academic dishonesty and, in fact, should become more significant as institutions adapt to changing societal demands. It is important, therefore, to gather data on these and other factors in addressing academic dishonesty, particularly at the two-year college.

Purpose of the Research

The purpose of this research is to investigate issues in academic dishonesty at a two-year, multi-campus institution,

through study of faculty members' 1) perceptions of, 2) responses to, and 3) attitudes toward academic dishonesty and academic dishonesty policy. Specific research questions to be addressed are:

A. What are DeKalb College faculty members' 1) perceptions of the extent of academic dishonesty, 2) perceptions of, and attitudes toward academic dishonesty policy and policy implementation, 3) responses to academic dishonesty, 4) attitudes about the faculty role in values education, and 5) attitudes about faculty responsibility for reducing academic dishonesty.

B. Are there differences in perceptions, responses and attitudes among faculty grouped by 1) campus, 2) employment status, or other category.

Definition of Terms

A review of the academic dishonesty literature reveals a variety of terms demanding definition. For the purposes of this research, definitions offered by Gehring and Pavela (1994) will be used for:

Cheating - Intentionally using or attempting to use unauthorized materials, information, or study aids in any academic exercise.

Fabrication - Intentional and unauthorized falsification or invention of any information or citation in an academic exercise.

Facilitating academic dishonesty - Intentionally or knowingly helping or attempting to help another to commit an act of academic dishonesty.

Plagiarism - Intentionally or knowingly representing the word of another as one's own in any academic exercise. (pg. 12, 13).

Academic Dishonesty will be defined, for the purposes of this research, as any of the above mentioned behaviors and will be used interchangeably, throughout this study with "cheating," and with "cheating and plagiarism."

Faculty - members of the Corps of Instructional Faculty of DeKalb College. The survey population included only those faculty, full and part-time whose primary responsibility is teaching. Not included, therefore, are librarians, developmental studies counselors, academic and other administrative staff who have faculty status but are not considered members of the Instructional Faculty.

Part-time - faculty members who teach 10 quarter hours or less, are contracted quarter to quarter, and paid per course taught.

Full-time - faculty whose normal teaching load is 15 hours per quarter.

Campus - also designated as "home campus," the location at which a faculty member considers the majority of his/her responsibility (courses taught) to be in the last 3 years. Campus designations are Central, Gwinnett, North, South, Rockdale, and Off-campus.

DeKalb College Academic Dishonesty Procedures - also referred to as the "DeKalb College policy" are included in the Appendix. Important highlights of the policy are:

- 1) The procedures call for involvement of the campus Dean of Students.
- 2) The procedures call for a hearing before the college court.
- 3) The procedures require due process.

Limitations of Study

The limitations of this study must be considered in order to understand the context of the findings and implications. The study was conducted at a single, unique institution, DeKalb College, in the University System of Georgia. In Georgia, DeKalb College is unique in that it is multi-campus, large, and serves a diverse student population. Two of its campuses are individually larger than any other two-year college in the system; collectively, it is the third largest higher education institution in the state. Nationally, the two-year colleges in the University System of Georgia might well be considered "junior colleges," historically serving a transfer function; they lack, in most instances, an equal mission in technical education characteristic of comprehensive community colleges in many states. Research results should be applied to other community colleges with care.

DeKalb College faculty, the focus of this research, regularly teach classes in the day and evening, often teach in any quarter at more than one campus, and move among campuses, settling at a new "home campus" on occasion. Studying faculty behaviors and attitudes at an institution

such as DeKalb College may be akin to studying faculty at several institutions in a state system.

The non-experimental research design included a researcher-developed instrument. The instrument drew heavily on previous research; many survey items were identical to allow for comparison of results. This data collection decision limited the complexity of statistical analysis.

Organization of the Research

This study is organized into five chapters, each with a title describing chapter contents. Chapter One offers an introduction to the topic of academic dishonesty and provides a rationale for the research study. The second chapter reviews available literature on the topic of academic dishonesty and demonstrates both what has been studied in this area, and that which has not received attention in research. Chapter Three describes the methodology employed in the study and offers a step-by-step account of the data collection process. The fourth chapter relates the results of the study. Chapter Five concludes the dissertation and provides implications, recommendations and suggestions for future research on academic dishonesty.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter is organized into six distinct sections, each with a proper heading. The first section describes the extent of the academic dishonesty problem in American higher education and offers some reasons for cheating behavior among students. The next section considers the responsibility of faculty members in addressing the problem. Third is a brief review of legal issues surrounding academic dishonesty, particularly 1) due process, 2) policy adherence, 3) qualified immunity, and 4) judicial restraint. The fourth section offers an overview of faculty attitudes and responses to academic dishonesty. Finally, a review of factors associated with response to academic dishonesty (academic discipline, institutional differences, and honor codes) is provided. A chapter summary follows the fifth section.

The Extent of the Problem

A cheating scandal at the US Naval Academy, involving the varsity football team and scores of other cadets, included ingredients sufficient to pique the interest of the national press (Manegold, 1994, Caplin, 1994, Brock, 1994). While the issue of academic dishonesty is no secret, it has not, until recently, generated headlines. The 1990s, however, have witnessed an increase in attention focused on cheating

in American education. Parents worry about their children cheating (Kolakowski, 1996) while a high school "academic decathlon" team cheats its way to victory in Chicago (Levine, 1995). Newspaper front-pages report rampant cheating among university business students (Berton, 1995) and reports that more than half of all university undergraduate students cheat in college raise concerns (Garred, 1991). In one report, a book entitled Cheating 101: The Benefits and Fundamentals of Earning the Easy "A" was shown to be a best-seller among college students (Peyser, 1992). Gary Pavela, a leading thinker and writer on the topic of academic dishonesty, criticizes the press for over-reliance on sensational journalism. He acknowledges, however, that the media focus provides for discussion of cheating in college and possible approaches to the problem (Pavela, 1993, Pavela, 1995, Pavela, 1994).

Recent research in the area of collegiate academic dishonesty has focused on the extent of cheating among students and reasons for the behavior. Singhal (1982) found 56 percent of the engineering students he surveyed to have cheated. Moffatt (1990) reported that 78 percent of the students at one university cheated, while Graham (1994) described research at a small college indicating that as many as 84 percent of students had engaged in at least one cheating behavior. Jendrek (1992) reported that 74 percent of students surveyed in her study had witnessed cheating occurring during an examination. In a survey of over 6,000

students at 35 colleges and universities, Davis, Grover, Becker, and McGregor (1992), found 76 percent admitted cheating in high school, college or both. McCabe and Bowers (1994) contend that reports of spiraling levels of cheating have been exaggerated. They found similar cheating rates among undergraduate men in replicating a 1963 study. While the McCabe and Bowers study discounts the notion of a rapid increase in college student cheating, it also points out the fact that over half of the students in the studies cheated in 1963 and 1991.

A number of studies have offered rationale for student cheating behavior. A common reason students report for engaging in academic dishonesty centers on pressure and competition for grades (Baird, 1980, Brown, 1995, Davis, 1992, Davis, 1993, Graham, 1994, Singhal, 1982). Barnett and Dalton (1981) encapsulated this thinking and noted that "pressure for grades is the single most important cause of academic dishonesty" (pg.5). Several authors have discovered a connection between academic dishonesty and membership in a Greek organization (Baird, 1980, Kerkvliet, 1994, Moffatt, 1990, Pavela, 1994). Peer pressure (Davis, 1992, Davis, 1993, McCabe and Trevino, 1993) and a lack of commitment to academics (Haines, Diekhoff, LaBeff, and Clark, 1986, Hanson, 1990) have also been noted as factors underlying college cheating. Baird (1980) and Forsyth, Pope, and McMillan (1985) contend that students externalize reasons for cheating, attributing their behavior to outside factors.

This "attribution theory" enables students to justify behavior without harming their self-esteem.

Many students avoid engaging in academic dishonesty for fear of being caught (Moffatt, 1990, McCabe and Trevino, 1993). This concept works in reverse as well; Brown (1995) and Wright and Kelly (1974) report that the likelihood of not being caught motivates some students to cheat. Finally, lack of knowledge of what behaviors constitute academic dishonesty leads many students to participate in behaviors defined as violations of academic integrity (Partello, 1993, McCabe and Trevino, 1993, Hawley, 1984). Jendrek (1992) reports that lack of knowledge of academic dishonesty policies and procedures are primary factors in students not reporting their peers for cheating. Whatever the actual percentage of students at any college or university involved in academic dishonesty, it is clear that cheating is a problem. The variety of possible reasons for student cheating complicate the issue and necessitate careful consideration of approaches for addressing the problem.

Responsibility of the Faculty

Perhaps no more significant a component exists in addressing academic dishonesty than the responsibility of the faculty. Faculty members encounter academic dishonesty and respond, in some way, to each incident. The extent to which the faculty accept responsibility for addressing cheating and plagiarism will ultimately determine the success of each institutional effort to combat the problem.

In The Ethics of Teaching, Keith-Spiegel, et al (1993) contend that appropriate responses to cheating behavior are clearly a faculty member's responsibility and an aspect of effective instruction. Other authors agree that confronting academic dishonesty is an ethical duty (Markie, 1994, Hollander, Young, and Gehring, 1985); in one study, Graduate Teaching Assistants believed the responsibility for reducing incidents of academic dishonesty rested with them and with their students rather than with the administration (Daniell, 1993). The Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges (1994) recently expanded policy to acknowledge faculty responsibility for developing and communicating academic dishonesty policies. The Senate noted that faculty are responsible for "maintaining honest academic conduct and clearly communicating to students strict standards against cheating, copying or other academic dishonesty" (pg.1).

Several authors argue that faculty responsibility for addressing cheating behavior is simply a part of the faculty member's role as a teacher of ethics (Davis, Grover, Becker, and McGregor, 1992, Maramark and Maline, 1993). In a law review article, DiMatteo and Wiesner (1994) point out the faculty role in academic integrity education under an honor code as "initial indoctrinator, role model for high ethical conduct and integrity, and instructor of ethics" (pg.70). The concept of faculty as role model and teacher of ethics is echoed in the research of Dowd (1992) and Georgia (1989).

If faculty have some responsibility for academic integrity in general, they have specific daily duties such as implementing classroom strategies to prevent cheating and plagiarism, reporting cheating incidents and participating in efforts to affect campus culture. Much of the literature on academic dishonesty offers practical suggestions for preventing cheating and plagiarism. Included in these suggestions are strategies such as staggered seating assignments during tests, different test forms, diligent proctoring during testing, safely securing tests (before and after testing) and requiring several drafts of papers to be submitted to reduce plagiarism (Blinn, 1994, California Community Colleges, 1994, Daniell, 1993, Kibler and Paterson, 1988, Rafetto, 1985, Wilhoit, 1994, Keith-Spiegel, et al, 1993, Hawley, 1984, Singhal and Johnson, 1983). Common agreement exists on the importance of faculty explanation and student understanding of academic dishonesty definitions.

Reporting instances of academic dishonesty according to institutional policy is imperative if the institution is to mount a consistent response to cheating behavior. Singhal and Johnson (1983) point to the necessity of faculty reporting of instances of academic dishonesty; the law requires due process protection for accused students. Markie (1994) contends that reporting academic dishonesty is an ethical duty on the part of faculty. He argues that "we must report academic dishonesty to the required

administrative authorities not because they have a compelling need to know based on the particular student's educational welfare, but because we have an 'overriding obligation to support institutional policies designed to promote academic integrity" (pg. 63). Tauber (1984) believes a policy requiring all cases to appear before a hearing panel would reduce cheating, and notes that academic freedom is not an issue in academic dishonesty cases: "The right and responsibility to 'stand alone' is necessary to preserve academic freedom for strictly academic matters. It should be neither a faculty right nor a responsibility for disciplinary matters" (pg. 16).

One of the most popular concepts in current thinking on academic dishonesty suggests that long-term solutions to the problem can be found in faculty, student and administrative engagement in discussion of issues and solutions. Kibler's, (1993) research offers the notion of an "ethos" of integrity that is developed through involvement of faculty, students and administrators. Partello (1993) and Jendrek (1992) concur and Livosky and Tauber (1994) and Dwyer and Hecht (1994) note that a reaffirmation of the value of integrity can begin with discussion. McCabe's research on honor codes has this joint action as its foundation (McCabe and Trevino, 1993, McCabe, 1993, Pavela and McCabe, 1993). Helping develop a culture in which academic integrity is valued can be a positive and lasting contribution of faculty. Many would argue it is a faculty responsibility.

Legal Issues

Comprehending the complexities of addressing academic dishonesty must include an understanding of the tenuous balance between faculty concerns and student rights. Any consistent response to academic dishonesty requires the institution to balance these interests in both policy development and implementation.

Faculty concern for legal issues has been noted in the literature. Fear of personal liability, and concomitant litigation, may result in faculty members failing to follow institutional policy (Gehring and Pavela, 1994, Kibler, Nuss, Paterson, and Pavela, 1988, Daniell, 1993). A belief in the right of faculty to remain beyond question in all issues arising in the classroom may contribute as well to a lack of adherence to policy (Tauber, 1984, Fass, 1986). In the area of student rights, the legal relationship between the college and its students has been developed and modified through case law issued from American courts. Young and Braswell (1987) note the increase in litigation involving college student rights beginning in the 1960s. In many issues affecting college students, the courts have clearly communicated to colleges and universities basic parameters in which they must operate. It thus becomes imperative that institutions of higher education promulgate regulations that meet legal requirements. A brief review of some legal concepts central to the adjudication of academic dishonesty

helps develop an understanding of the parameters in which academic dishonesty policy must rest.

A primary legal question arises when an institution considers its response to an alleged incident of academic dishonesty. College and university administrators are generally familiar with the landmark Dixon case (Dixon v. Alabama State Board of Education, 1964) in which the US Supreme Court held that a student in a public school must be afforded due process before being removed from school for disciplinary offenses. The Dixon due process requirements of (1) written notice of the charges and (2) an opportunity to present a defense to the charges in a hearing, have become the standard in public colleges and universities. It should be noted that private colleges and universities have almost universally adopted the Dixon principles in student discipline cases as well. Such procedural safeguards, however, are not necessary in cases involving academic evaluations. Thus, an important question becomes whether academic dishonesty cases are disciplinary in nature, requiring procedural due process components, or academic in nature, not requiring notice and hearing. The courts have provided some guidance.

In Board of Curators of the University of Missouri v. Horowitz, (1978), the Supreme Court offered a distinction between issues that are academic in nature and those that are disciplinary. Justice Rehnquist, writing for the majority noted that in this case, the action to dismiss the

student from her program "rested on the academic judgment of school officials that she did not have the necessary clinical ability to perform adequately as a medical doctor and was making insufficient progress toward that goal. Such a judgment is by its nature more subjective and evaluative than the typical factual questions presented in the average disciplinary decision" (pg. 90). The court held that when a student is kept fully informed of academic deficiencies and what those deficiencies will mean for continuation in an academic program and/or graduation, a hearing is not required. Thus, in instances of academic dishonesty, where factual questions do arise, the concept of academic evaluation is invalid; prohibited behavior rather than the quality of academic work is the issue. This distinction is found in a variety of cases (Mary M. v. Clark, 1984, Sofair v. State University of New York, 1978, Regents of the University of Michigan v. Ewing, 1985, Lightsey v. King, 1983) While legal scholars have debated the court decision in Horowitz, general agreement exists on the issue of factual disputes; when questions of fact arise, disciplinary procedures are necessary to preserve due process rights of students (Brenner, 1981, Bricker, 1978, Fox, 1988, Stoner and Cerminara, 1990, Swem, 1987, Miles, 1987, Pavela, 1989). Kibler, Nuss, Paterson, and Pavela (1988) point out that even in cases where the courts have defined academic dishonesty as an academic issue (Corso v. Creighton University, 1984, Napolitano v. Princeton University

Trustees, 1982), court decisions were not different; institutions did, in fact, provide due process. Rutherford and Olswang (1981) offer a summary of student due process rights in academic dishonesty cases and contend that the balancing of faculty academic freedom rights and student due process rights can be accomplished through the hearing and a faculty-imposed grade penalty. Gary Pavela (1988) provides perhaps the most reasoned perspective when he contends that academic dishonesty is both an academic issue and a disciplinary issue. The academic focus of the issue should define jurisdiction; faculty members should be assured participation on hearing panels. The offense, cheating and/or plagiarism, however, is a disciplinary issue and due process should be afforded regardless of the location and focus of the procedures.

If academic dishonesty cases require due process, the extent of these requirements must be understood. Several authors contend that the adversarial nature of many of the disciplinary procedures in American colleges and universities is both unnecessary and may be damaging to the educational environment (Travelstead, 1987, Pavela, 1989). Many colleges provide far more due process than is required in a hearing. This cumbersome and adversarial process may impact a faculty members' decision to follow institutional procedure. In a 1975 Supreme Court case (Goss v. Lopez, 1975) the court suggested that due process was flexible, and could be tailored to the severity of the offense and

possible sanctions. This reasoning was reiterated in a 1984 Appeals Court case (Corso v. Creighton University, 1984) when the severity of possible sanctions again affected the amount of due process required. In Hill v. Trustees of Indiana University (1976) the US Appeals Court reasoned that due process requirements were met even when an institution delayed the hearing process while implementing a new policy.

In academic dishonesty disciplinary proceedings the courts have consistently ruled that the due process requirements need not mirror those of the criminal courts. Attorneys need not have an active role in proceedings and rules of evidence are less strict (Hall v. Medical College of Ohio at Toledo, 1984, Henson v. Honor Committee of University of Virginia, 1983, Jaska v. Regents of University of Michigan, 1984, Mary M. v. Clark, 1984, McDonald v. Board of Trustees of University of Illinois, 1974, Nash v. Auburn University, 1987). Mawdsley and Permuth (1986) summarize the procedural due process requirements as the Dixon components (notice and hearing) and the right to appeal. These basic guarantees can take many forms as institutions develop differing methods of addressing academic dishonesty. Brown and Buttolph (1993) provide a sampling of the variety of academic dishonesty procedures in a comprehensive compendium of articles and policies. While there seem to be unlimited variation in academic dishonesty adjudication procedures, the Dixon requirements of notice and hearing remain the minimum standard.

Not only must colleges and universities provide the appropriate due process components in academic dishonesty cases, but they must abide by their own rules and support the decisions of hearing panels. Two cases clearly illustrate the institution's obligation to accept the outcome of campus hearings. In Jones v. Board of Governors of University of North Carolina (1983) university officials chose to ignore the decision of a university appeals panel in an academic dishonesty case. The US Appeals Court held that despite the fact that "the illusion was due process," reality was an arbitrary decision on the part of the university that violated the due process rights of the accused student. In Lightsey v. King (1983) a student accused of cheating, who was assigned a failing grade (a zero) on an examination, was subsequently exonerated by a college hearing panel. The faculty member involved refused to change the grade, and the college refused to force the grade change. The US District Court found this action on the part of the institution to be arbitrary and in violation of student rights. In reiterating the institutional mandate to be bound by the outcomes of its policies and procedures, the court found that ignoring due process hearing results was akin to failure to provide any due process protection at all. Subsequent authors have noted that the failure to abide by the outcomes of institutional procedures makes student due process protections "empty rights" (Young and Braswell, 1987).

Faculty fear of litigation, following an accusation of cheating leveled against a student, has been cited as a factor influencing the academic dishonesty adjudication process (Gehring and Pavela, 1994, Kibler, Nuss, Paterson, and Pavela, 1988, Nuss, 1984, Daniell, 1993). Two legal concepts, immunity and judicial restraint, address this issue. A public school case (Wood v. Strickland, 1975) serves as the foundation for legal consideration of the immunity concept. In the Wood case, the Supreme Court held that school board members enjoyed a "qualified, good faith immunity" from liability unless they "knew or reasonably should have known" that official action taken would violate a student's constitutional rights. The principle of qualified immunity has been extended into higher education by the courts to protect a Dean acting in an official capacity (Picozzi v. Sandalow, 1986) while general immunity from suit has been extended to a state college, as an arm of the state, and its employees (Hall v. Medical College of Ohio at Toledo, 1984). College and university faculty should not fear liability in addressing academic dishonesty unless faculty action is clearly malicious or if procedural due process protections are circumvented. It may be more dangerous to the individual faculty member who fails to utilize official institutional channels when confronting academic dishonesty. By serving as the prosecutor, judge and jury in an instance of alleged academic dishonesty, the faculty member risks decision-making that may be outside the

parameters of official capacity (Kibler, Nuss, Paterson, and Pavela, 1988, Tauber, 1984).

Judicial restraint, or deference, is a well-established precedent in cases involving the professional judgment of educators. As early as 1967 (Goldberg v. Regents of University of California, 1967) a California Appeals Court reasoned that an academic institution should be allowed to determine its own rules with respect to maintaining an orderly environment. The landmark case Regents of the University of Michigan v. Ewing (1985) again reiterates the courts' hesitance to make decisions of an academic nature. In this case, a dismissal for purely academic reasons, the Supreme Court noted that "when judges are asked to review the substance of a genuinely academic decision, such as this one, they should show great respect for the faculty's professional judgment. Plainly, they may not override it unless it is such a substantial departure from accepted academic norms as to demonstrate that the person or committee responsible did not actually exercise professional judgment" (pg. 513). The Horowitz case offers a solid point of reference for this concept. As one scholar notes, "Horowitz stands for the proposition that the courts will respect the judgment of the educational community in strictly academic matters" (Brock, 1979, pg. 577). In cases not considered strictly academic, courts have consistently held that judicial review should simply concern scrutiny of fundamental fairness. Particularly in academic dishonesty

cases, courts have remained reluctant to micro-manage the decisions of educators in an educational setting (Slaughter v. Brigham Young University, 1975, Clayton v. Trustees of Princeton University, 1985, Nash v. Auburn University, 1987). It is clear that courts have deferred academic evaluation to educators, and have focused primarily on ensuring that policies and procedures are fair and followed.

Important legal concepts affecting faculty members in the area of academic dishonesty then can be summarized as due process issues, policy adherence, qualified immunity from liability and judicial restraint. Due process questions begin with the proposition that academic dishonesty, by its nature, invokes the Dixon safeguards. The extent of procedural due process provided need be no more than the basic requirements of notice and hearing. Institutions should abide by their academic dishonesty policies and the decisions of their hearing panels in individual cases. Educators acting in an official capacity, who make a good faith effort and take reasonable action, enjoy a qualified immunity from liability. Finally, courts have been reluctant to substitute their judgment for that of educators in educational matters. In academic dishonesty cases, courts will review procedures to insure that students have been treated fairly.

Faculty Attitudes

Though the bulk of the research on academic dishonesty has focused on students, some research offers insight into

attitudes about cheating among faculty members. In general, faculty members hold views similar to those of students regarding cheating behaviors and reasons for cheating. Nuss (1984) and Anderson and Obeshain (1994) found agreement between faculty members and students on definitions of cheating behavior. Livosky and Tauber (1994) found similar agreement and note that students appeared stricter than faculty in defining a variety of actions as cheating. A study in New York City indicated that students held accurate perceptions of faculty attitudes, while faculty believed students to be more tolerant of cheating than was the case (Roig and Ballew, 1992). Agreement on rationale for cheating behavior was also revealed in one study of a small college. Cheating for better grades, avoiding cheating because "it is wrong," and avoiding cheating for fear of being caught were views common among both students and faculty (Graham, 1994).

Perhaps most significant in the literature on student academic dishonesty are studies related to faculty response to cheating and plagiarism instances and reasons for the responses. Authors investigating faculty response to academic dishonesty readily acknowledge the fact that faculty members regularly fail to utilize institutional policies designed to address cheating and plagiarism. Wright and Kelly (1974) found that while 65 percent of faculty surveyed had confronted a student for cheating, only 15 percent had reported the incident. Singhal (1982) found

similar rates of reporting; 65 percent of faculty had caught a student cheating and only 21 percent had reported the instance. In one study, only 5 percent of faculty who suspected instances of cheating followed-up their suspicion by reporting the case as required by university policy (Bayens and Paige, 1993) and in a study of graduate teaching assistants, only 12 percent followed university policy (Daniell, 1993). In a national study of college and university administrators, Aaron and Georgia (1994) revealed that Chief Student Affairs Officers have little confidence in faculty reporting. The study indicated agreement among Chief Student Affairs Officers (60%) in the perception that faculty members do not follow institutional policy. This failure by faculty to address academic dishonesty according to institutional policy emerges in research on the influence of honor codes (McCabe, 1993), the behavior of psychologists (Tabachnick, Keith-Spiegel, and & Pope, 1991), medical school faculty (Anderson and Obeshain, 1994), and recommendations for addressing cheating (Fass, 1986, Fishbein, 1994, Pavela, 1981, Pavela, 1994). A committee report from the National Center for Academic Integrity's 1993 conference summarizes the problem, "Many cases of exam cheating and plagiarism discovered by professors are never reported to deans or judicial boards, in spite of explicit requirements at most institutions that all such cases be reported. These cases are instead resolved privately, between the professor and student, often in ways wholly at

odds with the procedures and sanctions prescribed by their institutions" (Pavela, 1994, pg. 408).

Faculty do not use academic dishonesty policies to address cheating. Identifying factors that lead to such a response become a logical next step in investigating the issue. Table 2.1 summarizes research and thinking on reasons for non-use of institutional policy in academic dishonesty cases. Chief among reasons for non-use is faculty lack of familiarity with academic dishonesty policies and procedures. Anderson and Obeshain (1994) found 30 percent of medical school faculty to be unfamiliar with academic dishonesty policy while Aaron and Georgia (1994) indicate that 40 percent of Chief Student Affairs Officers believe faculty to be unaware of procedures for addressing academic dishonesty. In her study of graduate teaching assistants, Daniell (1993) found that while only 15 percent indicated lack of "awareness" of policy, overwhelming agreement existed that information provided to graduate teaching assistants to deal with cheating and plagiarism was inadequate. Other authors note that unfamiliarity with policy and general misinformation about policy and procedures are factors (Fass, 1986, Hardy, 1982, Bayens and Paige, 1993). In her research on faculty reactions to student cheating, Jendrek (1989) also noted this lack of familiarity with institutional policy. Further, she contended that a clear policy, by itself, may not lead to increased use; faculty remain uncertain about the

Table 2.1: Faculty Non-Use of Academic Dishonesty Policy

Reasons for Non-Use	Authors
Unfamiliarity With Policy	Aaron & Georgia, 1994 Anderson & Obeshain, 1994 Bayens & Paige, 1993 Daniell, 1993 Fass, 1986 Jendrek, 1989
Nature of Adjudication -time consuming process	Daniell, 1993 Davis, 1993 DiMatteo & Wiesner, 1994 Hardy, 1982 Keith-Speigel, et al, 1993 McCabe, 1993
-adversarial hearing	Collison, 1990 DiMatteo & Wiesner, 1994 Fass, 1986 Pavela, 1989
Fear of Liability/Litigation	Daniell, 1993 Dowd, 1992 Gehring & Pavela, 1994 Hardy, 1982 Pavela, 1988
Inappropriate Penalties -penalties too harsh	Davis, 1993 Nuss, 1984 Saunders, 1993
-penalties too lenient	Bishop, 1993 Hardy, 1982 Pavela, 1981
Academic Freedom Concerns	Daniell, 1993 Fass, 1986 Gouran, 1989 Pavela, 1995 Ritter, 1993 Rutherford & Olswang, 1981
Impact on Teaching Reputation	Hardy, 1982

implications involved in either failing to use proscribed policy or in following procedure.

The time and effort required of a faculty member involved in an academic dishonesty process and the adversarial nature of the hearing have been offered as reasons for non-use of policy. McCabe (1993) found concern by faculty members for the amount of time necessary to bring a cheating case to be a major factor in non-reporting. Davis (1993) and DiMatteo and Wiesner (1994) note faculty concern for the length of the process. The adversarial nature of a student disciplinary hearing is noted as a factor in non-reporting by a variety of authors (Collison, 1990, DiMatteo and Wiesner, 1994, Fass, 1986, Pavela, 1989). In a number of articles Gary Pavela laments the adversarial nature of disciplinary proceedings and calls for a more educational approach to addressing student conduct (Pavela, 1990, Pavela, 1992, Pavela and McCabe, 1993). Keith-Spiegel, et al (1993) writing on ethics and teaching offer that "many are concerned that professors ignore even strong evidence of cheating, perhaps because it is too onerous to deal with or perhaps because pursuing the issue is difficult if the student denies the charge" (pg. 61). This "difficulty," seen by faculty in cumbersome and adversarial procedures, may be a key to understanding faculty non-use of policy.

Fear of personal liability and potential litigation may steer many faculty members to a decision to avoid addressing cheating and plagiarism. This concern has been cited by

several authors (Daniell, 1993, Dowd, 1992, Hardy, 1982). Gehring and Pavela (1994) and Pavela (1988), however, while acknowledging this as a common issue for faculty, argue that faculty have less to fear in reporting cases than in failing to respond to academic dishonesty according to proper procedure. Faculty who make a "good-faith effort" to address academic dishonesty according to policy enjoy a qualified immunity from lawsuit. Even in the event of possible litigation, actions that follow official policy are those falling under a faculty member's official duty, and warrant legal support for the faculty member by the institution. Failure to follow policy can be considered action outside of the scope of employment, resulting in no legal support for the faculty member and grounds for possible termination for breach of a contractual obligation.

Faculty may have specific concerns with the potential outcome of a cheating case. Penalties may be viewed as inconsistent with the offense. Davis (1993) reports that faculty concern over adverse, long-term effects of penalties imposed for academic dishonesty affect use of policy. Faculty are uncomfortable with the notion that a student's career could be "ruined" as a result of a single incident. Nuss (1984) and Saunders (1993) also note the effect of penalties that seem extreme. Todd Holcomb (1992) in his study of institutions with honor codes points to the possible deterrent to reporting that a "single-sanction" institutional policy may create. When the only penalty for

a finding of guilt in an academic dishonesty case is expulsion, faculty (and students) may be reluctant to follow-up on a cheating incident, believing the penalty to be too severe. Allen and O'Bryan (1993), while not denying the validity of this claim, contend that at one single-sanction honor code institution, the University of Virginia, student self-reported cheating rates are among the lowest in the country. McCabe (1993) identified penalties that are both too harsh and penalties that are too lenient as factors affecting faculty use of academic dishonesty policy. Penalties too lenient, the bemoaned "slap on the wrist," are offered by several authors as influences on faculty response to academic dishonesty (Bishop, 1993, Hardy, 1982, Pavela, 1981).

Faculty concerns for the concept of academic freedom and the role of the teacher in the classroom may impact the decision to respond to academic dishonesty. Many faculty members believe it is their right and responsibility to handle all classroom situations; the concept of academic freedom is seen to be an overriding precedent. Even faculty-in-training, graduate teaching assistants, report a belief that they should personally "deal with" academic dishonesty (Daniell, 1993). Faculty believe being "overruled" by a hearing panel violates academic freedom (Fass, 1986). One study indicated that faculty members value their classroom autonomy more than a concerted effort to address academic dishonesty (Ritter, 1993). Pavela (1995)

however, notes that requiring faculty members to abide by institutional policy, such as academic dishonesty procedures, does not violate the tenants of academic freedom. A communications professor sees it this way; "academic freedom may be defined as the right to do that which a faculty member finds appropriate to scholarly inquiry and instruction, so long as it is not legally proscribed, does not constitute an explicit violation of institutional policy or a prior agreement to perform designated responsibilities and observe specified standards of conduct and can be defended as having demonstrable educational significance" (Gouran, 1989, abstract). Rutherford and Olswang (1981) contend that a balance should be struck between academic freedom, in the assignment of grades by the faculty member, and student due process rights, in the finding of guilt or innocence by the hearing panel.

Finally, some faculty fear that reporting cheating instances may reflect negatively on their teaching and classroom management ability. Though an interesting concept, not much has been written in this area. Hardy (1982) provides some insight; "There are countless professors who refuse to address the problem of academic dishonesty. Some professors try to minimize the problem for fear that it may reflect badly on their ability to teach. Young professors especially eschew drawing attention to cheating in the classrooms because it might reveal to their

department chairperson that they lack the requisite skills or experience to avert such infractions. Still others do not want to be branded as 'zealots' or 'trouble-makers' by their colleagues or students" (pg. 70).

**Factors of Academic Discipline, Institutional Differences
and Honor Codes**

Responses to academic dishonesty may be influenced by a variety of factors. Recent literature suggests that academic discipline, institutional differences and honor codes may help determine faculty member response to cheating. In a Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching Foundation Report (1989) faculty nationally were surveyed to describe the "condition of the professoriate." Among the findings were a decrease, over 14 years, in the percentage of faculty members who believed that "shaping students' values" was important. This concept of shaping values appeared most important among faculty in the humanities and least important among math and science faculty. In their recent book, Angelo and Cross (1993) reported results of a survey of faculty teaching goals. Again, disciplinary differences emerged. Among faculty in humanities and the arts, "student development," including the idea that it was important to "to cultivate an active commitment to honesty" emerged as an "essential" teaching goal; 24 percent of humanities faculty and 37 percent of arts faculty so reported. Math and science faculty, however, tended to view student development as less

essential. Only 7 percent of math and 3 percent of science faculty reported student development to be an essential teaching goal. Math and science faculty indicate their most essential teaching goals to center on content area facts and principles. Taken together, these two studies seem to suggest that faculty discipline affects a faculty member's view of the role of the teacher in the classroom. Humanities faculty appear more likely to accept responsibility for student development and values education, while math and science faculty appear more likely to view their roles as teachers of subject-matter content.

Institutional setting may influence faculty response to academic dishonesty. In particular, community college faculty may respond differently than faculty at four-year institutions. In a study on institutional response to academic dishonesty Aaron (1992) noted several differences in responses to cheating and plagiarism between two-year and four-year colleges. At two-year colleges the Chief Student Affairs Officer is most likely to handle academic dishonesty cases, while at four-year colleges faculty involvement is more common through shared responsibility among Chief Student Affairs Officers, Academic Affairs divisions, Academic Deans and Judicial Officers. Further, the institutional response at a two-year college was found to be much less likely to focus on the issue from an educational perspective, through student development programs. Four year institutions were also found to be more likely to have an

academic integrity code and separate procedures for handling violations. Ludeman (1988) found similar results and reported that two-year colleges are more likely to have a combined adjudication system that handles academic dishonesty and general discipline violations. In a 1994 study, Aaron and Georgia (1994) reported that while Chief Student Affairs Officers at two-year colleges believe their faculty to be more aware of procedures for handling cheating cases, they also believe little is being done to address academic dishonesty on their campuses. These results seem to indicate more faculty involvement in addressing academic dishonesty at four-year colleges than at two-year colleges. Certainly the presence of large numbers of part-time faculty at the two-year college, who are rarely included in research reports, would mitigate against involvement of the entire faculty in addressing college student cheating. One author, studying academic dishonesty at a two-year college, posited that the two-year college tradition of serving adult students has resulted in an educational community that doesn't engage in the promotion of values (Dowd, 1992). While colleges that serve more traditional age students hold to vestiges of "in loco parentis," the community college has often distanced itself from the promotion of values in its students.

A popular method for addressing academic dishonesty has become the development of an honor code. The recent focus on honor codes, and their return to several colleges, has

been documented (Collison, 1990, Pavela and McCabe, 1993). Among the reasons offered for the success of honor codes is active discussion on the issue by all members of a campus community (Kibler, 1993, May and Loyd, 1993 Hanson, 1990, Pavela, 1993). McCabe (1993) suggests that faculty involvement in discussion and dialogue on academic integrity results in more willingness by faculty to respond to cheating and plagiarism by following institutional policy. While honor codes seem to encourage addressing of academic dishonesty and result in less student cheating, several authors caution against simple acceptance of the honor code as a single solution to the problem. Meade (1992) contends that honor codes are less effective at larger, diverse institutions. McCabe and Trevino (1993) perhaps best summarize this note of caution in their research on honor codes: "any movement to adopt honor codes is ill conceived if it is undertaken as the sole solution to the academic dishonesty problem. Academic dishonesty is a complex behavior influenced by multiple variables beyond the mere existence of an honor code" (pg. 533). It might be added that responding to academic dishonesty in general, and faculty classroom response in particular, may be an equally complex issue, influenced by multiple variables. Among these variables are academic discipline, and institutional setting.

Summary

In summary, a review of the problem of academic dishonesty in American colleges and universities yields a variety of complex issues. Reports of widespread cheating cause alarm and investigation. Research indicates multiple reasons for student cheating and reveals characteristics that may be associated with students who violate academic dishonesty policies. Faculty share responsibility for addressing academic dishonesty as teachers of ethics and as role models. Faculty certainly assume the primary role for instituting techniques to prevent cheating in the classroom, and their response to cheating behavior can set the tone for an institution. The law clearly defines academic dishonesty as a disciplinary offense requiring due process protections for students. The most appropriate advice for faculty members may be to simply follow institutional policy. This advice is clearly not heeded in American higher education as faculty consistently handle academic dishonesty on their own. Reasons for failure by faculty to utilize institutional policy are unfamiliarity with policy, the nature of the adjudication process, fear of litigation, concern for inappropriate penalties, concern for academic freedom and impact on teaching reputation. Additional factors that may affect faculty response to academic dishonesty are academic discipline and institutional setting. Honor codes, effective at many institutions, may

not easily be imposed on every college environment, and shouldn't be viewed as a panacea.

A review of pertinent research also reveals areas in which little or no information is available. All but a few of the studies on academic dishonesty focus on four-year colleges and universities. The existent two-year college studies fail to address multi-campus institutional issues. Further, the influence of large numbers of part-time faculty, a common characteristic of many two-year colleges, receives no attention in the literature on cheating and plagiarism. There are concepts and theories, therefore, upon which research can build, as well as concepts and theories yet to be developed.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The purposes of this research can be summarized as seeking to determine the effectiveness of institutional response to academic dishonesty through study of faculty members' 1) perceptions of, 2) responses to, and 3) attitudes toward academic dishonesty and academic dishonesty policy and procedure. Description of the research population was accomplished through the employment of basic descriptive techniques. The use of means, standard deviations and frequency distributions allowed both for a snapshot of the attitudes, opinions and responses of DeKalb College faculty members and for comparison to other research samples. In order to assess differences between subgroups of the population, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) tests were conducted where appropriate; ANOVA test results were adjusted using the Bonferroni method. Conclusions are expected to better inform policy making; differences in faculty subgroups may have specific implications in policy revision and implementation. Results should allow for a more complete understanding of faculty members' responses to academic dishonesty, attitudes toward institutional policy and factors affecting both at a multi-campus, two-year college.

While the literature on academic dishonesty covers a broad array of topics, faculty member rationale for response to incidents of cheating and plagiarism receive minor attention. Much of what has been written on faculty member response rationale has been author opinion. In particular, very little is known of two-year college faculty responses, rationale, and factors that might influence attitude and behavior. The influence of multiple campuses and part-time instructors, for example, are noticeably absent from the research on academic dishonesty. This study, therefore, considers issues in addressing academic dishonesty heretofore unexamined. This chapter reviews primary and secondary research questions, the population selected for research, the development and use of the survey instrument, data collection, and analysis techniques.

Research Questions

This research, conducted to describe faculty perceptions of, responses to, and attitudes toward academic dishonesty and academic dishonesty policy employed research questions that can be grouped into two categories. A primary set of research questions was designed to allow for a description of the research population. Basic descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, frequency distributions) were utilized for analysis. Specific questions were:

1. What are the perceptions of DeKalb College faculty members of the extent of the academic dishonesty problem at DeKalb College?

2. What are DeKalb College faculty members' perceptions of, and attitudes toward the Academic Dishonesty Policy and policy implementation issues?
3. What are the responses to academic dishonesty by DeKalb College faculty members?
4. What are the attitudes of DeKalb College faculty members concerning values education?
5. What are the attitudes of DeKalb College faculty members about the responsibility for reducing academic dishonesty?

A secondary set of research questions was designed to determine if differences exist in the perceptions of, responses to, and attitude toward academic dishonesty and academic dishonesty policy in faculty subgroups. Key faculty subgrouping were identified as 1) campus, 2) employment status, and 3) discipline. Other categories of faculty would be considered if data allow. Specific research questions were:

1. Are there differences among faculty subgroups in the perceptions of the extent of the academic dishonesty problem at DeKalb College?
2. Are there differences among faculty subgroups in the perceptions of, and attitudes toward the Academic Dishonesty Policy and policy implementation issues?
3. Are there differences among faculty subgroups in responses to academic dishonesty?

4. Are there differences among faculty subgroups in attitudes concerning values education?
5. Are there differences among faculty subgroups in attitude about the responsibility for reducing academic dishonesty?

The first, second and fourth secondary research questions utilized one-way analysis of variance tests to seek statistically significant differences in group means; null hypotheses (there are no differences in faculty subgroups) were tested in each instance. For the third and fifth secondary research questions, descriptive statistics alone were employed to judge differences among groups.

Research Population

The research population for this study consisted of the full-time and part-time instructional faculty of DeKalb College during the winter quarter of the 1996-97 academic year. DeKalb College is a two-year, multi-campus, multi-purpose institution in the University System of Georgia. Its five campuses are located in the metropolitan Atlanta area and together enroll approximately 16,000 students (1996, fall quarter headcount figure). Consultation with the DeKalb College Office of Institutional Research and Planning resulted in a decision to include in the research population only those Instructional Faculty, part-time or full-time, teaching at least one Collegiate, Developmental Studies, or English as a Second Language course or lab, during the 1997 winter quarter. The total number of faculty

included in the population was 742. Excluded from the population were persons teaching exclusively in the Continuing Education Division, Librarians, Developmental Studies Counselors, and Administrative personnel who are not considered members of the Instructional Faculty. The research population is summarized in Table 3.1.

More than half of the Instructional Faculty at DeKalb College are employed part-time (58%, 430) while 42 percent (312) are full-time. Twenty-one percent (156) are tenured, 17 percent are on track (125), 2 percent are not tenure track (18) and 2 percent are employed quarter to quarter (13). Two percent of the faculty hold the rank of Professor (18) while 12 percent (89) are Associate Professor. Nineteen percent (13) of the faculty hold Assistant Professor rank, 8 percent (59) are Instructor, and 1 percent (8) are unranked.

Institutional data identify 313 faculty (42%) at Central campus, 213 (29%) at North, 110 (15%) at Gwinnett, 60 (8%) at South, 34 (5%) at Rockdale and 12 (1%) teaching at an off-campus location. Twenty-one percent (156) of the instructional faculty teach in humanities, 15 percent (109) in Developmental Studies, 13 percent (97) in Social Science, 11 percent (85) in Science and 10 percent (77) in Mathematics. Smaller numbers of faculty teach in Fine Arts (7%, 50), Business (6%, 48), Physical Education (6%, 42), Foreign Languages (3%, 25), Health Sciences (3%, 25),

Table 3.1: Research Population - Demographic Description

Category	Subgroup	n	%
Employment	full-time	312	42%
	part-time	430	58%
Teaching Time	day	*	
	evening and weekend	*	
Tenure Status	tenured	156	21%
	non-tenured (tenure track)	125	17%
	non-tenured (not tenure track)	18	2%
	part-time faculty	430	58%
	quarter to quarter (full-time)	13	2%
Rank	Professor	18	2%
	Associate Professor	89	12%
	Assistant Professor	138	19%
	Instructor	59	8%
	Part-time Faculty	430	58%
	unranked	8	1%
Campus	Central	313	42%
	North	213	29%
	Gwinnett	110	15%
	South	60	8%
	Rockdale	34	5%
	Off-campus	12	1%
Years of Service	less than 1 year	*	
	1-2 years	*	
	3-4 years	*	
	5-11 years	*	
	more than 11 years	*	
Discipline	Business Administration	48	6%
	Developmental Studies	109	15%
	English as a Second Language	18	2%
	Fine Arts	50	7%
	Foreign Languages	25	3%
	Health Sciences	25	3%
	Humanities	156	21%
	Interpreter Training	10	1%
	Mathematics	77	10%
	Physical Education	42	6%
	Science	85	11%
Social Science	97	13%	

* information unavailable

English as a Second Language (2%, 18) and Interpreter Training (1%, 10).

Sound data on teaching time is unavailable as many faculty teach both day and evening classes. Information on years of service lacks meaning as part-time faculty often don't teach an entire year, and might be viewed much like community college students who "stop-out." Teaching time and years of service data are therefore not reported.

Caution should accompany consideration of demographic information on DeKalb College faculty. Information provided in Table 3.1 describes faculty as categorized by the college. Faculty may not in reality view themselves in the same categories. In the campus category, for example, a faculty member may have taught for years at a particular campus and have been recently transferred to another. The faculty member may view himself as a member of the faculty of his previous campus. Further, many part-time faculty teach at several campuses and may teach in different disciplines. Meaningful information on years of service and teaching time, as indicated, is unavailable. Nevertheless, the demographic description of the DeKalb College faculty can provide a reasonable snapshot for purposes of comparison.

With a functional college mail system and increasing use of electronic mail among faculty, the decision to survey the entire population was made. Anticipated return rate was 50 percent with highest rates of return expected from full-time

faculty at Central Campus (the researcher's campus) and lowest rates of return expected from part-time faculty on other campuses.

Survey Instrument

A researcher-designed instrument was developed to obtain data from the research population; no existing instrument was readily available or appropriate. The instrument design was influenced by previous research on faculty attitudes and responses to academic dishonesty (Jendrek, 1989, Nuss, 1984, Dowd, 1992) and research on attitudes concerning values education (Angelo and Cross, 1993, Carnegie Foundation, 1989). Input was requested, advice given and permission granted to use specific survey items from two researchers (Daniell, 1993, Bayens & Paige, 1993).

A focus group of key DeKalb College faculty members not included in the research sample pilot-tested the initial survey instrument and assisted with advice on question format, demographic category formation and instrument administration. Others with collegiate teaching experience (University of Georgia graduate students, DeKalb College Administrative staff) offered useful input as well. The researcher's advisory committee also assisted in the conceptualization and design of the survey instrument. Careful review of the literature, reliance on specific previous research and expert opinion from the aforementioned sources helped establish instrument validity and reliability. Internal reliability checks were sacrificed in

part to assure a short instrument that would be readily completed by a large percentage of the population.

Testing and modification resulted in a survey instrument divided into five areas. The first area sought information on faculty member perceptions of the extent of the academic dishonesty problem at DeKalb College and included questions intended to gauge respondent's beliefs about the seriousness and frequency of academic dishonesty. Item responses for "seriousness of problem" followed a five-point Likert Scale format that included the range (1) not serious, (2) somewhat serious, (3) moderately serious, (4) quite serious, and (5) very serious. Item responses for "frequency of occurrence" also followed a five-point Likert Scale with the range (1) never, (2) seldom, (3) occasionally, (4) often, and (5) frequently. The second area sought information on DeKalb College faculty member responses to encounters with academic dishonesty. Specific responses to academic dishonesty were solicited using an item checklist similar to those employed by Daniell (1993) and Bayens & Paige (1993). An open-ended question allowed respondents to describe their response in greater detail. Area three was intended to seek information on faculty attitudes about, and perceptions of, academic dishonesty policy and procedures at DeKalb College. Again, a five-point Likert Scale was used to solicit responses in the range (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) neutral, (4) disagree, and (5) strongly disagree. The fourth survey area sought to determine faculty member attitudes concerning

responsibility for reducing academic dishonesty. Again, an instrument item employed by Daniell (1993) was used to assess attitude. The item allowed faculty members to rank order the groups they believed most responsible for reducing academic dishonesty, second most responsible, third and fourth most responsible; students, faculty, academic administrators and student services administrators served as the group choices. The fifth area sought demographic information including (1) home campus (Central, North, Gwinnett, South, Rockdale, Off-campus location) (2) employment status (full-time or part-time), (3) normal teaching time (day or evening/weekend), (4) tenure status (tenured, non-tenured tenure-track, non-tenured not tenure-track, part-time faculty, quarter to quarter faculty) (5) rank (professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor, part-time faculty, other), (6) academic discipline (Business Administration, Developmental Studies, English as a Second Language, Fine Arts, Foreign Languages, Health Sciences, Humanities, Interpreter Training, Mathematics, Physical Education, Science, Social Science, Other), and (7) length of service at DeKalb College (less than one year, one to two years, three to four years, five to eleven years, more than eleven years).

Data Collection

Throughout the development, design and administration of the survey instrument, recommendations from a small cadre of survey research experts were heeded (Berdie, Anderson, and

Niebuhr, 1986, Erdos, 1983, Kingery, Bryant, and Araghi, 1989, Rea & Parker, 1992, Suskie, 1992). In particular, careful planning preceded the administration of the survey.

Since the research was conducted at DeKalb College by a DeKalb College employee, official institutional support was sought and secured. Proper protocol, personal contact and the perceived value of the research resulted in project approval by the college. Input, advice and cooperation was obtained from the Office of Institutional Research and Planning through the President's Office. The Provost on each campus agreed to provide a joint cover letter for the survey and to encourage participation from faculty members on their campuses.

Several weeks before initial survey administration, a brief note explaining the research was sent via e-mail to all full-time faculty and through each department to part-time faculty. Concurrently, two sets of mailing labels were secured from the Payroll Department for full-time and part-time faculty teaching during winter quarter, 1997. The survey was hand-delivered to each faculty mailbox ($n=742$) on each of the five campuses. Approximately one week later a reminder card was hand-delivered to each mailbox. The initial survey administration and follow-up card yielded a 38 percent return rate. Two weeks after the initial mailing a second survey went to those who had not responded. This survey was preceded by an electronic mail message sent to full-time faculty at North, Gwinnett and South Campuses by

the Provost on each campus, encouraging response. Full-time faculty members once again received a survey in their mailboxes. Part-time faculty members at Central campus were handed their survey when they secured their paychecks in the Office of the Provost. Part-time faculty members at North, Gwinnett and Rockdale were mailed a second survey via first class US mail. Combined administration efforts resulted in a total response rate of 70 percent.

Data Analysis

This non-experimental study was designed primarily to yield descriptive data. The survey data, therefore, were analyzed for item frequency distribution, mean, and standard deviation. In addition, one-way analysis of variance tests were conducted on Likert Scale data to determine differences among faculty subgroups. This data analysis utilized scale scores developed expressly for analysis purposes.

Two sections of the survey instrument were used to develop research scales. The first section of the instrument, containing five questions, was designed to measure perceptions of the extent of the academic dishonesty problem. Individual Likert Scale items were thus combined to produce one score of wider range. The third section of the research instrument, designed generally to yield information on faculty attitudes and perceptions of academic dishonesty policy and procedure measured opinion in three distinct areas. Research scales were developed to analyze perceptions of, and attitudes toward policy implementation;

four questions defined this scale. Three Likert Scale items were joined to develop the scale for attitudes toward personal and ideological issues. Faculty member attitudes toward values education, the final research scale, utilized two survey items to measure opinion. Individual instrument items were purposely grouped during the development of the survey to allow for more precise measurement and data analysis possible with scale scores. Appendix C summarizes these data analysis scales.

ANOVA testing was employed on the scales to test for statistically significant differences in faculty subgroup means; results were adjusted using the Bonferroni method. This Bonferroni adjustment resulted in the researcher selected alpha level of .05 modified to a more conservative level ($p < .01$) (Pedhazur and Schmelkin, 1991). The null hypothesis, that there would be no differences between faculty subgroups, was tested on perceptions of, and attitudes toward academic dishonesty and academic dishonesty policy. Results of data analysis will be presented in narrative and graphic form in Chapter Four.

Summary

The purpose of this research study was to determine faculty member perceptions of, responses to, and attitudes toward academic dishonesty and academic dishonesty policy and procedures. A review of the literature reveals minimal coverage of factors impacting faculty responses and attitudes toward academic dishonesty. Especially apparent

is a lack of attention to two-year college faculty, part-time faculty and multi-campus institutions. A survey instrument was developed, tested and administered to the faculty at DeKalb College. Careful planning was designed to produce usable data and an acceptable response rate. Data were analyzed for descriptive purposes and to determine differences among faculty subgroups.

CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS

This research sought to assess the effectiveness of institutional response to academic dishonesty through study of faculty members' 1) perceptions of, 2) responses to, and 3) attitudes toward academic dishonesty and academic dishonesty policy and procedures at a multi-campus, two-year college. Any institutional effort to address academic dishonesty must consider the views of instructional faculty. Faculty member opinion on the topic, and particularly group differences in faculty member opinion, should be heeded in developing effective responses to the academic dishonesty problem. Chapter Four presents results of data analysis and provides the foundation for the implications and recommendations in Chapter Five.

The chapter is organized into eight sections: a demographic description of the population respondents, seriousness of academic dishonesty, policy implementation concerns, personal and ideological issues, values education, responses to academic dishonesty, responsibility for reducing academic dishonesty, and a summary of major findings. Tables are included throughout the text and responses to open-ended questions from participants are included where appropriate.

Research Participants - Demographics

The research population studied comprised DeKalb College full-time and part-time instructional faculty employed during winter quarter, 1997. Removal of persons with faculty status, but not teaching at least one winter quarter class or lab (academic administrators, librarians, developmental studies counselors) yielded a population of 742. Primary faculty subgroups identified for comparison were categorized by 1) campus 2) employment status, and 3) discipline. Response rate allowed for consideration of additional faculty subgroupings.

The total number of faculty members in the population returning a survey was 523, representing 70 percent of the faculty at DeKalb College. A researcher decision to consider only those instruments which were 100 percent complete (no blanks and/or unusable data items) resulted in 394 respondents included in the analysis of data (53%). This analysis decision allowed for a clean set of data and conservative analysis and recommendations. Table 4.1 offers a description of these respondents.

More than half of the respondents are part-time faculty members (219 or 56%) while 44 percent (175) are employed full-time. The majority teach during the day (247 or 63%), while 35 percent (138) indicate teaching their courses in the evening or on weekends. A very small number (9 or 2%) indicated teaching both day and evening/weekend classes.

Table 4.1: Population Respondents - Demographic Description

Category	Subgroup	<u>n</u>	%
Employment	full-time	175	44%
	part-time	219	56%
Teaching Time	day	247	63%
	evening and weekend	138	35%
	both	9	2%
Tenure Status	tenured	96	24%
	non-tenured (tenure track)	63	16%
	non-tenured (not tenure track)	11	3%
	part-time faculty	219	56%
	quarter to quarter (full-time)	5	1%
Rank	Professor	12	3%
	Associate Professor	47	12%
	Assistant Professor	87	22%
	Instructor	29	7%
	Part-time Faculty	219	56%
Campus	Central	154	39%
	North	116	29%
	Gwinnett	66	17%
	South	35	9%
	Rockdale	20	5%
	Off-campus	3	1%
Years of Service	less than 1 year	46	12%
	1-2 years	63	16%
	3-4 years	60	15%
	5-11 years	160	40%
	more than 11 years	65	16%
Discipline	Business Administration	26	6%
	Developmental Studies	65	16%
	English as a Second Language	10	2%
	Fine Arts	15	4%
	Foreign Languages	16	4%
	Health Sciences	19	5%
	Humanities	80	20%
	Interpreter Training	3	15%
	Mathematics	50	13%
	Physical Education	14	3%
	Science	46	12%
Social Science	50	13%	

A majority of the respondents' tenure status is part-time (219 or 56%), while tenured faculty comprise 24 percent (96) of the group. Non-tenured faculty, on a tenure track are 16 percent (63) of the population respondents. Non-tenured, not tenured track faculty, and quarter to quarter contracted faculty are small percentages of the group, 3 percent (11) and 1 percent (5) respectively.

In faculty rank, part-time faculty, as noted, are 56 percent (219) of the respondents. Of the full-time faculty in the group, 22 percent (87) hold the rank of Assistant Professor, 12 percent (47) Associate Professor, 7 percent (29) Instructor and 3 percent (12) Professor.

Faculty respondents who claim Central Campus as their "home campus" are 39 percent (154) of the group, while those claiming North Campus as home campus are 29 percent (116). Faculty claiming Gwinnett Campus as home campus are 17 percent (66), South Campus 9 percent (35) and Rockdale Center 5 percent (20). A very small number claim no campus as home campus, but an off-campus location (1% or 3).

The largest group of respondents has worked for DeKalb College from 5-11 years (40% or 160). Those who have worked at the college more than 11 years are 16 percent (65) of the group, as are those in the 1-2 years category (16% or 63). Respondents who have been employed by DeKalb College 3-4 years comprise 15 percent (60) and those employed less than one year are 12 percent (46) of the research group.

The largest disciplinary group is humanities (20% or 80) and the second largest is developmental studies (16% or 65). The remaining disciplines represented in the research group are Mathematics (13% or 50), Social Science (13% or 50), Science (12% or 46), Business Administration (6% or 26), Health Sciences (5% or 19), Foreign Languages (4% or 16), Fine Arts (4% or 15), Physical Education (3% or 14), English as a Second Language (2% or 10) and Interpreter Training (1% or 3).

The amount of data collected allowed for consideration of additional faculty subgroups for comparison. The large number of part-time faculty participating in the study resulted in a clear faculty dispersion by employment type. For purposes of statistical analysis, a decision was made to determine the extent to which the distinction in faculty by employment type (part-time or full-time) was similar to other faculty subgroup distinctions. Those subgroups in which over half the respondents are part-time faculty were found to be highly correlated with employment type. In addition, for data analysis, subgroups were consolidated in campus, discipline and years of service. Table 4.2 shows the resultant research categories. Data was then analyzed in four subgroups, 1) employment (full-time and part-time), 2) discipline (Developmental Studies, Humanities, Mathematics and Science, and Social Science), 3) Years of Service (less than 5 years, and 5-11 years), and 4) campus

Table 4.2: Population Subgroups for Data Analysis

Category	Subgroup	<u>n</u>	Total	%
Employment	full-time	175		44%
	part-time	219		56%
			394	
Campus	Central	154		39%
	North	116		30%
	Gwinnett, South, Rockdale	121		31%
			391	
Years of Service	less than 5 years	169		51%
	5-11 years	160		49%
			329	
Discipline	Developmental Studies	65		22%
	Humanities	80		28%
	Mathematics and Science	96		33%
	Social Science	50		17%
			291	

(Central, North, and a small campus group consisting of Gwinnett, South and Rockdale).

DeKalb College faculty clearly find issues surrounding academic dishonesty and policy implementation significant enough to warrant participation in the study. The high response rate and the large amount of data are sufficient to allow for analysis and recommendations.

Faculty Perceptions of the Seriousness of Academic Dishonesty

Research participants responded to a series of questions designed to reveal faculty perceptions of the seriousness of the academic dishonesty problem at DeKalb College. Five questions together comprised Scale 1 and measured faculty perceptions utilizing a 5-point Likert scale for each question. Specific items measured seriousness of academic dishonesty at DeKalb College, at a faculty member's home campus, and in individual classes together with suspected and certain frequency of classroom occurrence. The Likert scale ranged from one (1) "not serious" or "never" to five (5) "very serious" or "frequently." Scale 1, with combined scores, ranged from 5 to 25. Table 4.3 displays a summary of the data, with ANOVA test results, from this scale for research participants and faculty subgroups.

Respondents exhibit the perception that academic dishonesty is not an overly serious problem at DeKalb College. With a mean of 10.16 ($N=394$) academic dishonesty appears to occur infrequently and not be a pressing concern

**Table 4.3: Scale 1 - Seriousness of the Academic Dishonesty Problem
Analysis of Variance**

Group	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Respondents (N=394)		10.16	3.90			
Employment Status		10.16	3.90	1	729.93	54.58 *
full-time	175	11.68	3.80			
part-time	219	8.94	3.54			
Campus		10.14	3.91	2	82.21	5.51 *
Central	154	10.93	4.51			
North	116	9.76	3.31			
Gwinnett, South, Rockdale	121	9.50	3.44			
Years of Service		10.05	3.91	1	145.14	9.75 *
less than 5 years	169	9.40	3.84			
5-11 years	160	10.73	3.88			
Discipline		10.14	3.96	3	71.46	4.72 *
Developmental Studies	65	9.03	3.38			
Humanities	80	10.90	4.29			
Mathematics and Science	96	10.77	4.07			
Social Science	50	9.14	3.46			

* $p < .01$

Means of all groups fall below the scale midpoint of 15 (moderately serious/occasional occurrence) and in the somewhat serious/seldom occurring area.

Analysis of variance testing for each of the four subgroups showed statistically significant differences in group means for Scale 1. Full-time faculty display a mean of 11.68 ($n=175$) while part-time faculty show a mean of 8.94 ($n=219$) suggesting that full-time faculty perceive the problem to be more serious than do their part-time colleagues. ANOVA testing confirmed that full-time and part-time faculty means differ ($F=54.58$, $df=1$, $p<.01$). Among the four subgroups, full-time and part-time faculty differ most in their perceptions of the seriousness of academic dishonesty at DeKalb College.

In the years of service subgroup, ANOVA testing indicated that group means differed significantly ($F=9.75$, $df=1$, $p<.01$). Faculty who have worked for DeKalb College 5-11 years appear to perceive academic dishonesty as a more serious problem than newer faculty in the "less than 5 years" group. The mean for faculty in the 5-11 years category is 10.73, while for faculty who have been employed at the college less than 5 years, the mean is 9.40.

Faculty grouped by campus show differing perceptions about the seriousness of the academic dishonesty problem as well. Central Campus faculty ($M=10.93$) report academic dishonesty to occur more frequently and to be a more serious concern than faculty at the other campuses. North Campus

faculty ($M=9.76$) and the small campus group of Gwinnett, South and Rockdale ($M=9.50$) indicate less frequent incidence and seriousness. ANOVA results show a statistically significant difference in the scale 1 means among campus groups ($F=5.51$, $df=2$, $p<.01$).

Disciplinary differences followed the same pattern. Observable differences and statistically significant differences appeared between means of faculty grouped in the four discipline categories. Humanities faculty ($M=10.90$) and Mathematics and Science faculty ($M=10.77$) report greater concern for the seriousness of the academic dishonesty problem, and more frequent occurrence than do faculty in Social Science ($M=9.14$) and Developmental Studies ($M=9.03$). Statistically significant differences emerged from ANOVA testing ($F=4.72$, $df=3$, $p<.01$).

Overall, DeKalb College faculty do not perceive the academic dishonesty problem to be very serious at the college, on their campuses, in their classes, or by frequency of reported occurrence. Among faculty subgroups these perceptions vary. Differences appear in each faculty subgroup tested; ANOVA testing resulted in rejection of the null hypothesis that group means are equal. Statistically significant differences emerging from data analysis among faculty grouped by employment type, campus, years of service and discipline show there to be some variance in perceptions of the seriousness of the academic dishonesty problem at DeKalb College.

Familiarity with Academic Dishonesty Policy and Procedure

Participants responded to a question allowing them to assess their level of knowledge of current institutional policy and procedure. A five-point Likert scale ranging from one (1), "strongly agree" to five (5) "strongly disagree" measured faculty agreement with the statement "I am familiar with the college academic dishonesty policies and procedures." Table 4.4 offers a picture of participant responses and responses categorized by subgroup.

Respondents clearly believe they are familiar with academic dishonesty policy and procedure. An overall mean of 1.95 ($N=394$) shows agreement with the statement on familiarity. In each of the subgroups this agreement proves similar. In the years of service subgroup, means appear nearly identical (faculty employed less than 5 years, 1.97 and faculty employed 5-11 years, 1.93). By employment status the full-time faculty mean is 2.04 while the part-time faculty mean is just less at 1.88. In the discipline subgroup Developmental Studies faculty and faculty in Humanities each have means of 1.85. Faculty in Mathematics/Science show a slightly higher mean (1.90) as do faculty in the Social Science (1.98). The largest difference in means among faculty appear by campus. Central campus faculty means (2.04) emerge slightly higher than those for North campus faculty (1.93) and the Gwinnett/South/Rockdale group (1.83). Only small differences in perceived familiarity with academic

Table 4.4: Familiarity with Academic Policy and Procedure

Category	Subgroup	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Respondents - Total		394	1.95	.90
Employment	full-time	175	2.04	.92
	part-time	219	1.88	.88
Campus	Central	154	2.04	1.07
	North	116	1.93	.80
	Gwinnett, South, Rockdale	121	1.83	.72
Years of Service	less than 5 years	169	1.97	.95
	5-11 years	160	1.93	.82
Discipline	Developmental Studies	65	1.85	.87
	Humanities	80	1.85	.62
	Mathematics and Science	96	1.90	.90
	Social Science	50	1.98	.91

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

80

dishonesty policy and procedure become apparent when comparing means of faculty subgroups.

The total of faculty participants, as well as faculty grouped by employment status, campus, years of service and discipline believe themselves familiar with college policy and procedure. All means for this question represent the response "agree" to the statement concerning familiarity.

Concerns with Policy Implementation

Faculty participants responded to a series of questions designed to measure perceptions of problems in academic dishonesty policy implementation. Utilizing a five-point Likert scale (1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=neutral, 4=disagree, 5=strongly disagree) questions sought opinion on statements indicating academic dishonesty procedures to be time consuming, adversarial, and penalties to be too lenient and too severe. These four questions comprised Scale 2, with a resultant range of 4 to 20. Table 4.5 displays a summary of the data along with ANOVA test results.

Faculty participants do not appear overly concerned with problems in implementation of the academic dishonesty policy. Respondent means, both group and subgroup, indicate lack of agreement with the implementation problem statements. The mean for the research group ($N=394$) is 12.71, a score in the neutral range, approaching disagreement. Statistical analysis resulted in rejection of the null hypothesis in only one faculty category.

Table 4.5: Scale 2 - Concerns with Policy Implementation, Analysis of Variance

Group	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Respondents (N=394)		12.71	2.23			
Employment Status		12.71	2.23	1	33.18	6.79 *
full-time	175	12.39	2.28			
part-time	219	12.97	2.16			
Campus		12.72	2.23	2	3.00	.60
Central	154	12.70	2.34			
North	116	12.58	2.10			
Gwinnett, South, Rockdale	121	12.89	2.21			
Years of Service		12.68	2.17	1	2.53	.54
less than 5 years	169	12.77	2.15			
5-11 years	160	12.59	2.19			
Discipline		12.78	2.20	3	6.37	1.33
Developmental Studies	65	13.23	2.25			
Humanities	80	12.74	2.20			
Mathematics and Science	96	12.54	2.04			
Social Science	50	12.70	2.38			

* $p < .01$

Full-time faculty display a mean of 12.39, indicating less disagreement that implementation problems exist than do part-time faculty (12.97). This observable difference was confirmed through analysis. An analysis of variance conducted for Scale 2 revealed a statistically significant difference between the means of the two groups ($F=6.79$, $df=1$, $p<.01$). Employment status appears to impact faculty perceptions of problems with policy implementation.

ANOVAs were also conducted for scale 2 to determine differences in means of faculty subgroups by campus, years of service, and discipline. Very slight differences are observable in the means of faculty subgroups by campus (Central, 12.70, North, 12.58, Gwinnett/South/Rockdale, 12.89). ANOVA results reveal no statistically significant differences. Nearly identical are the results of comparison between faculty by years of service (less than 5 years, 12.77, 5-11 years 12.59); no statistically significant difference emerged from the ANOVA. Among faculty grouped by discipline, Developmental Studies faculty were most inclined to disagree with statements about implementation problems ($M=13.23$). Humanities faculty (12.74), Social Science faculty (12.70) and faculty in Mathematics/Science (12.54) showed less disagreement. ANOVA results of Scale 2 scores by discipline, however, failed to identify any statistically significant differences in the means of the groups.

Research participants do not perceive policy implementation as time-consuming, adversarial or penalties

as inappropriate. This perception appears consistent across subgroups of faculty. All means fall in the neutral (12) to disagree (16) range, though much closer to neutral. Statistically significant differences among groups appeared only in employment status. Only minimal differences between group means are apparent in the other faculty categories. It is clear that faculty do not perceive policy implementation problems with current academic dishonesty policy.

Personal and Ideological Concerns

A separate component of faculty concern with policy implementation was considered. Attitudes related to personal and ideological concerns were measured with Scale 3. A five-point Likert scale (1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=neutral, 4=disagree, 5=strongly disagree) was employed to seek agreement or disagreement with statements that 1) individual faculty adjudication of academic dishonesty instances is an academic freedom issue, 2) personal liability concerns arise in academic dishonesty accusations, and 3) reporting academic dishonesty may indicate a lack of teaching skill. Scale 3, thus, ranged from 3 to 15.

As a group, faculty respondents show only slight agreement that academic freedom, personal liability and teaching reputation are concerns. The group mean for Scale 3 is 8.56. Means for each of the subgroups show great similarity, none straying far from the scale midpoint of 9 (neutral). ANOVA testing revealed no statistically

significant differences between group means. Table 4.6 displays the Scale 3 data.

In the years of service faculty subgroup, scale 3 means appear nearly identical, with the mean for faculty employed less than 5 years at 8.55 and the mean for faculty in the 5-11 year category at 8.61. By employment type a similar picture emerges; full-time faculty display a mean of 8.42 while the part-time faculty mean is 8.67. In the campus subgroup, again the means do not differ much, with the Central campus mean at 8.63, North campus, 8.47 and Gwinnett/South/Rockdale at 8.54. In the discipline subgroup, only a bit more difference is evident in mean scores. Developmental Studies faculty are less inclined to agree with the personal and ideological statements ($\underline{M}=8.98$) than are Humanities faculty ($\underline{M}=8.61$), faculty in Social Science ($\underline{M}=8.42$) or Mathematics/Science faculty ($\underline{M}=8.37$). As indicated, analysis of variance tests further document the lack of difference among faculty subgroups. ANOVAs resulted in no statistically significant differences on Scale 3 means.

Faculty categorized in subgroups do not differ significantly in their attitudes about academic freedom, personal liability and teaching reputation issues involved in academic dishonesty. The total faculty response indicates no strong opinion on personal and ideological issues. Faculty appear, only very slightly, to have concerns in this area.

Table 4.6: Scale 3 - Personal and Ideological Concerns, Analysis of Variance

Group	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Respondents (N=394)		8.56	2.07			
Employment Status		8.56	2.07	1	6.06	1.41
full-time	175	8.42	2.13			
part-time	219	8.67	2.02			
Campus		8.55	2.07	2	.91	.21
Central	154	8.63	2.07			
North	116	8.47	2.33			
Gwinnett, South, Rockdale	121	8.54	1.82			
Years of Service		8.58	2.12	1	.32	.07
less than 5 years	169	8.55	2.06			
5-11 years	160	8.61	2.18			
Discipline		8.58	2.02	3	5.35	1.31
Developmental Studies	65	8.98	1.82			
Humanities	80	8.61	2.17			
Mathematics and Science	96	8.37	1.83			
Social Science	50	8.42	2.31			

Attitudes about Values Education

Scale 4 measured faculty attitudes about their role in teaching values and teaching the importance of academic integrity. A five-point Likert scale (1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=neutral, 4=disagree, 5=strongly disagree) was employed to assess agreement with statements that a primary role of DeKalb College faculty is to teach values and that faculty should teach the importance of academic integrity. The Scale 4 range was 2-10.

The faculty participants display the attitude that values education is a faculty role. The total mean for respondents is 4.59. Subgroup means also show agreement with the statements on values education. All means for Scale 4 fall in the 4-5 range, indicating agreement. Little difference emerges from statistical comparison of group means. Table 4.7 reports the data for Scale 4. Among faculty grouped by employment type means are similar (full-time \bar{M} =4.48, part-time \bar{M} =4.67). For faculty grouped by years of service, the same result emerges; faculty who have been employed less than 5 years display a mean of 4.59, those employed 5-11 years display a mean of 4.70. A small difference is evident in the means of faculty grouped by campus. The North campus faculty mean is 4.44, while Central campus (4.56) and Gwinnett/South/Rockdale (4.75) show higher means. The most obvious differences in means among subgroups appear in faculty categorized by discipline. Faculty in the Humanities show a mean of 4.45, Social

Table 4.7: Scale 4 - Attitudes About Values Education, Analysis of Variance

Group	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Respondents (N=394)		4.59	1.63			
Employment Status		4.59	1.63	1	3.56	1.33
full-time	175	4.48	1.57			
part-time	219	4.67	1.68			
Campus		4.59	1.64	2	2.94	1.10
Central	154	4.56	1.67			
North	116	4.44	1.64			
Gwinnett, South, Rockdale	121	4.75	1.59			
Years of Service		4.65	1.63	1	1.08	.40
less than 5 years	169	4.59	1.66			
5-11 years	160	4.70	1.61			
Discipline		4.69	1.61	3	5.44	2.12
Developmental Studies	65	4.61	1.69			
Humanities	80	4.45	1.41			
Mathematics and Science	96	5.02	1.68			
Social Science	50	4.56	1.61			

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Science 4.56, and Developmental Studies 4.61. Mathematics/Science faculty are the least likely to agree with the values education statement ($M=5.02$). ANOVAs conducted on Scale 4 for subgroups reveal no statistically significant differences in the means.

Faculty in the research group agree that values education is an important faculty role. Data for faculty in each of the subgroups support this finding. Although no statistically significant differences among group means emerge from data analysis, observable differences exist. The means of faculty by campus differ slightly while means by discipline differ most.

Responses to Academic Dishonesty

Research participants answered two questions designed to provide insight into faculty members' latest responses to suspected incidents of academic dishonesty and to incidents of academic dishonesty which faculty members were certain occurred. On each question participants chose any of a number of responses from a checklist. An open-ended item allowed for response in addition to checklist items. Table 4.8 reports faculty responses to academic dishonesty.

Twenty percent of faculty in the research group have not suspected academic dishonesty in their classrooms, while 35 percent have not encountered certain academic dishonesty. Small numbers of faculty ignored academic dishonesty (suspected, 7%, certain, 2%) and did nothing when last confronted with cheating or plagiarism. When suspecting

Table 4.8: Responses to Incidents of Academic Dishonesty, Research Participants

How did you respond the last time you <u>suspected</u> academic dishonesty in your class?	Research Participants	
	<u>n</u>	%
Did not encounter academic dishonesty	80	20%
Did nothing	29	7%
Confronted student; didn't pursue matter	72	18%
Dealt with the student one-on-one	188	48%
Gave the student a warning	122	31%
Lowered grade on the item in question	54	14%
Assigned an "F" for the course	7	2%
Reported incident to Department Chair	41	10%
Reported incident to Dean of Students	10	2%
Other *	72	18%

How did you respond the last time you were <u>certain</u> academic dishonesty occurred in your class?	Research Participants	
	<u>n</u>	%
Did not encounter academic dishonesty	139	35%
Did nothing	9	2%
Confronted student; didn't pursue matter	35	9%
Dealt with the student one-on-one	146	37%
Gave the student a warning	68	17%
Lowered grade on the item in question	99	25%
Assigned an "F" for the course	30	8%
Reported incident to Department Chair	62	16%
Reported incident to Dean of Students	27	7%
Other *	48	12%

(N=394)

*responses to "other" described in Chapter 4 text.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

academic dishonesty, 18 percent of faculty confronted the student but didn't pursue the matter any further, while only 9 percent confronted the student without pursuing the matter when certain of academic dishonesty.

The most common response among faculty participants is to handle the incident with the student one-on-one (suspected, 48%, certain, 37%). Suspected academic dishonesty led to 31 percent of faculty giving the student a warning and 14 percent lowering the grade on the item in question. When faculty are certain of the occurrence of academic dishonesty fewer choose a warning to the student (17%) and more choose to lower the item grade (25%). An "F" was assigned for the course by 2 percent of faculty who suspected academic dishonesty while 8 percent chose this response when certain. It appears that when faculty suspect that cheating or plagiarism has occurred, they are more likely to take informal, non-punitive measures such as confronting the student or giving a warning. When suspicion becomes certainty, however, faculty become more willing to lower grades.

Reporting incidents of academic dishonesty does not often occur among faculty participants. Ten percent report suspected academic dishonesty to the Department Chair while 16 percent report to the Department Chair when confronted with certain cheating or plagiarism. Even less likely is the chance that faculty report academic dishonesty to the Dean of Students (2%, suspected, 7%, certain). Though the

college policy indicates this response as a procedural matter, it is not common among the faculty respondents.

Faculty Comments - Suspected Academic Dishonesty

Many faculty indicated an "other" response and took the opportunity to offer additional information about their method for addressing academic dishonesty in the classroom. Several common themes appeared in these comments from faculty. When suspecting cheating or plagiarism, faculty often take preventative measures to mitigate against future opportunities in their classrooms. Faculty comments included:

- I changed my method of monitoring tests.
- I instituted preventative measures.
- I did nothing with respect to the particular student, but I did alter the assignment to discourage future dishonesty.
- Distributed 2 versions for the next test (same questions but in a different order).
- Arranged students differently for exams, had different versions made for each exam.
- I keep tight control and separate students during testing. It's almost impossible to cheat in my class.
- Academic dishonesty can be prevented by 1) moving students during tests 2) changing tests 3) requiring proper documentation of references, 4) using assignments which require creative approaches and, 5) giving essay tests and providing colored paper.

Many faculty members take preventative measures with the student; their response directly focuses on the suspect student. These actions appear designed to both address the incident and keep it from recurring. Common actions taken

are to watch the individual student more closely and to alter student seating. Comments included:

-I stood up, walked toward the student who appeared to be turning to see another's test paper, and kept my eyes on him to let him know I was aware that he was trying to cheat.

-Confronted the student, asked student to sit on the front row for all future exams.

-Told student not to look at other's papers and made her sit on front row for other exams.

-Moved student to another seat in the classroom.

-I watched the student closely on all tests after I suspected her of cheating. As a result, she did not have another opportunity.

-Moved student in the test setting. Actually, classes are very crowded for test purposes.

-Watched student more carefully during testing.

-Monitored the student more closely.

-Moved student and made them sit by me during exams.

-Watched closely so that the student knew I was watching.

-Simply watched student, she got the idea.

A number of faculty members indicated taking action, when suspecting academic dishonesty, that did not single out a student, but rather reiterated expectations to the entire class. This non-confrontational approach appears as a general warning to all students in a class. Faculty comments included:

-Made general announcement in class regarding talking during exam, keeping eyes on own paper during exam, how to avoid plagiarism in written assignments.

-Made a general statement at the time to keep eyes on own paper and no talking.

-Spoke to entire class about the importance of doing their own work.

-Placed the students on notice that dishonesty was a violation of school policy.

-Warn all students (spoken and written) that, if caught, student will receive an F and be removed from the course.

-Announce to class that dishonesty is in our midst so as to create group pressure and solidarity against practice. The dishonest usually feel the pressure and stop. Those that do not I confront them personally.

-Without directly challenging an individual student, I made a public remark that such behavior is contrary to DeKalb policy and my syllabus and will be dealt with sternly if it continued. Usually this has been enough.

Several faculty members commented that students who cheat, often fail anyway, or when confronted chose to withdraw from the course. Thus, the academic dishonesty problem in their class is solved. These faculty members appear likely to view a grade penalty or withdrawal from the course as appropriate responses. Comments included:

-Multiple versions of exam were given - designed to look similar so that when student cheats, he/she gets wrong answers. Many students have been caught this way. The beauty is I don't have to accuse or prove they cheated to punish them. Their low scores speak for themselves.

-Assigned a grade of zero for that test item. I find that students that cheat fall behind academically and are unable to compete in class. They almost always withdraw from the course or receive a failing grade. My experience has been that the problem takes care of itself and the student ultimately gets the grade deserved.

-The student was failing the course and turned in a paper he had copied from someone else. We discussed the

matter. He admitted it and dropped the course with a w/f grade.

-Told student I did not want him in my class. He was told to withdraw from the course. I made it clear to him that I knew he had plagiarized but there was no way for me to prove it. He got the message and was never seen by me again.

A few faculty members noted that the lack of proof, or evidence of academic dishonesty effected their response to incidents in which they had suspicion. Suspicion alone seems insufficient cause to warrant any action on the part of these faculty. Faculty comments included:

-Will wait for proof.

-No proof. Discussed in class without specifics, sometimes a student doesn't realize the behavior is dishonest.

-I had a slight suspicion but not enough to confront student.

-Had nothing to go on other than hunch. No evidence.

-Without proof and only word of mouth, nothing could be done; it involved allowing a student to take an exam early. I have never put myself in this position again, nor will I ever.

-Did nothing because I was not certain.

Faculty Comments - Certain Academic Dishonesty

Among faculty who offered comments on their response to instances of academic dishonesty that they were certain had occurred, similar themes emerged. Faculty seek to correct behavior through direct interaction with individual students while many believe that students who cheat are likely to fail the class regardless of faculty grade penalty. A feeling among some faculty members that certainty is

unreachable appears in comments as well. A few faculty members seem to follow institutional policy when certain of academic dishonesty incidents.

Many faculty respond directly to the student, to both address the incident, and to keep cheating or plagiarism from recurring. Comments included:

-In a case of plagiarism, I have assigned F's on papers and then gave the students an individual tutorial on how to document correctly.

-Documented the incident "objectively" in the students records and warned that if it happened again, she would receive a "WF" for the course.

-My certainty was reported by other students (who did not want to get involved). During the next test I humorously took care of isolating that person (without bringing attention to who or why). The person failed that 2nd test and withdrew.

-Documented incidence and kept on file.

-Conference one on one and lowered course grade 1 letter; second offense would be an F in the course and report to department chair and dean.

-I did not assign a grade to the students' paper. He must do the assignment over or receive an F for a final grade.

As with suspected academic dishonesty several faculty members who were certain of an incident of academic dishonesty noted that the students involved either are likely to fail the course or withdraw when confronted. The academic dishonesty problem in their class is therefore addressed and resolved. The common penalty is a lower grade. Faculty comments included:

-Two students sitting near each other had very similar answers (right and wrong) on the objective part of a

test. I reported the incident to the Department Chair. I also made an announcement to the class stating the reason I suspected academic dishonesty and stating that additional evidence would confirm my suspicions. One of the students withdrew from the class.

-Student received a zero for that part of the coursework. In most cases the resulting grade was a "D" or "F" both of which required retaking the course.

-I felt the student had cheated because he knew he was failing and was trying a last ditch effort. Having been caught cheating merely solidified the "F." I don't know if I would have failed him based on one incident to which he admitted. Another important factor was that he was an athlete and was under pressure from the coach. He had been a "star" in high school and was accustomed to "special circumstances."

-The student failed the course due to poor grades.

-The students were going to fail regardless of the grade I gave them on their plagiarized paper.

Again, faculty noted a lack of evidence as impacting their response, this time to certain academic dishonesty in the classroom. They appear not ready to take action unless they possess absolute certainty. Comments included:

-Was not certain about academic dishonesty.

-Was never certain.

-Was not 100 percent sure it had occurred.

-I have never pursued a case of "suspected" dishonesty to make it "certain."

-Was not able to prove plagiarism.

-Could never be certain.

A few faculty report addressing certain academic dishonesty by following college procedures. This adherence to policy involved a report to the campus Dean of Students and a hearing. Their comments include:

-Went to review board - (preceded college court)

-Student court dealt with case.

-Confronted students (3 cases in one class) individually with Department chair as witness. Before confronting students I thoroughly documented that academic dishonesty had occurred and had copies for myself, students, and the Dean of Student Affairs.

Responses to Academic Dishonesty - Faculty Subgroups

Responses to incidents of academic dishonesty were also compared by faculty subgroups. In the employment category full-time and part-time faculty members differ in several response areas. Table 4.9 documents the differences. Part-time faculty members indicate fewer encounters with academic dishonesty incidents with 28 percent reporting no suspected academic dishonesty and 48 percent reporting no incidents of academic dishonesty of which they were certain. Eleven percent of full-time faculty indicate not suspecting academic dishonesty incidents and 19 percent report no encounters with certain incidents. This data coincides with the significant difference in the perception among faculty of the seriousness of academic dishonesty at DeKalb College.

Among faculty responses by campus subgroup, Central Campus faculty report incidences of academic dishonesty to department Chairs and to the Dean of Students at higher percentages than do faculty at North campus or faculty in the Gwinnett/South/Rockdale group. Table 4.10 documents the differences in response to academic dishonesty by campus. Twenty-one percent of Central campus faculty participants reported certain academic dishonesty to their Department

Table 4.9: Responses to Incidents of Academic Dishonesty, Employment Status (full-time, part-time)

How did you respond the last time you <u>suspected</u> academic dishonesty in your class?	Employment Status		Employment Status	
	full-time <u>n</u>	%	part-time <u>n</u>	%
Did not encounter academic dishonesty	19	11%	61	28%
Did nothing	14	8%	15	7%
Confronted student; didn't pursue matter	35	20%	37	17%
Dealt with the student one-on-one	99	57%	89	41%
Gave the student a warning	63	36%	59	27%
Lowered grade on the item in question	30	17%	24	11%
Assigned an "F" for the course	4	2%	3	1%
Reported incident to Department Chair	29	17%	12	6%
Reported incident to Dean of Students	6	3%	4	2%
Other	38	22%	34	16%

How did you respond the last time you were <u>certain</u> academic dishonesty occurred in your class?	Employment Status		Employment Status	
	full-time <u>n</u>	%	part-time <u>n</u>	%
Did not encounter academic dishonesty	34	19%	105	48%
Did nothing	5	3%	5	2%
Confronted student; didn't pursue matter	21	12%	15	7%
Dealt with the student one-on-one	92	53%	55	25%
Gave the student a warning	37	21%	32	15%
Lowered grade on the item in question	59	34%	41	19%
Assigned an "F" for the course	20	11%	11	5%
Reported incident to Department Chair	42	24%	21	10%
Reported incident to Dean of Students	17	10%	11	5%
Other	30	17%	19	9%

(n=394)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

**Table 4.10: Responses to Incidents of Academic Dishonesty, Campus
(Central, North, Gwinnett/South/Rockdale)**

How did you respond the last time you <u>suspected</u> academic dishonesty in your class?	Central		Campus North		G/S/R	
	<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%
Did not encounter academic dishonesty	34	22%	20	17%	26	22%
Did nothing	11	7%	8	7%	9	7%
Confronted student; didn't pursue matter	22	14%	24	21%	25	21%
Dealt with the student one-on-one	74	48%	55	47%	57	47%
Gave the student a warning	51	33%	41	35%	29	24%
Lowered grade on the item in question	21	14%	16	14%	15	12%
Assigned an "F" for the course	5	3%	0	0%	2	2%
Reported incident to Department Chair	21	14%	12	10%	8	7%
Reported incident to Dean of Students	7	5%	2	2%	1	1%
Other	28	18%	23	20%	21	17%

How did you respond the last time you were <u>certain</u> academic dishonesty occurred in your class?	Central		Campus North		G/S/R	
	<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%
Did not encounter academic dishonesty	54	35%	41	35%	44	36%
Did nothing	3	2%	4	3%	2	2%
Confronted student; didn't pursue matter	11	7%	11	10%	14	12%
Dealt with the student one-on-one	56	36%	40	35%	49	41%
Gave the student a warning	29	19%	22	19%	17	14%
Lowered grade on the item in question	37	24%	32	28%	30	25%
Assigned an "F" for the course	19	12%	4	3%	7	6%
Reported incident to Department Chair	32	21%	16	14%	15	12%
Reported incident to Dean of Students	19	12%	6	5%	3	3%
Other	20	13%	13	11%	15	12%

(n=391)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Chair and 12 percent reported certain incidents of academic dishonesty to the Dean of Students. Academic dishonesty reporting rates, for incidents in which a faculty member is certain, are lower for North campus faculty (14%, Department Chair, 5%, Dean of Students) and for Gwinnett/South/Rockdale faculty (12% Department Chair, 3% Dean of Students).

Faculty at Central campus also report much higher rates of assigning an "F" for the course to certain academic dishonesty (12%) than do their colleagues at North (3%) or Gwinnett/South/Rockdale (6%). Though statistically significant differences appear in faculty perceptions of the seriousness of academic dishonesty, the percentage of faculty encountering incidents are almost identical. Responses to these encounters, however, differ.

Comparison of faculty responses to incidents of academic dishonesty by the years of service subgroup yield results similar to those of the employment subgroup. Table 4.11 offers an overview of responses by years of service. Twenty-eight percent of faculty who have worked at DeKalb College less than 5 years have not suspected academic dishonesty and 47 percent have not encountered instances of academic dishonesty of which they were certain. Faculty who have worked at the college from 5-11 years report lower rates; only 16 percent have never suspected academic dishonesty and 30 percent have never been certain of instances of academic dishonesty. Reported responses by years of service mirror those of faculty grouped by

Table 4.11: Responses to Incidents of Academic Dishonesty, Years of Service (less than 5 years, 5-11 years)

How did you respond the last time you <u>suspected</u> academic dishonesty in your class?	Years of Service			
	<5 years		5-11 years	
	<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%
Did not encounter academic dishonesty	48	28%	25	16%
Did nothing	14	8%	14	9%
Confronted student; didn't pursue matter	28	17%	33	21%
Dealt with the student one-on-one	61	36%	85	53%
Gave the student a warning	38	23%	59	37%
Lowered grade on the item in question	14	8%	24	15%
Assigned an "F" for the course	1	1%	5	3%
Reported incident to Department Chair	15	9%	17	11%
Reported incident to Dean of Students	4	2%	3	2%
Other	30	18%	27	17%

How did you respond the last time you were <u>certain</u> academic dishonesty occurred in your class?	Years of Service			
	<5 years		5-11 years	
	<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%
Did not encounter academic dishonesty	80	47%	47	30%
Did nothing	4	2%	5	3%
Confronted student; didn't pursue matter	14	8%	18	11%
Dealt with the student one-on-one	44	26%	68	42%
Gave the student a warning	26	15%	32	20%
Lowered grade on the item in question	25	15%	51	32%
Assigned an "F" for the course	8	5%	17	11%
Reported incident to Department Chair	15	9%	29	18%
Reported incident to Dean of Students	6	4%	10	6%
Other	21	12%	19	12%

(n=329)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

employment status. This result also supports the statistically significant difference in perceptions of the seriousness of academic dishonesty between faculty by years of service.

In the discipline subgroup, responses to academic dishonesty incidents clearly differed, most notably as reported by faculty in the Humanities. Table 4.12 documents these differences. Faculty in the Humanities report smaller percentages of no encounters with academic dishonesty (12%, suspected, 25%, certain) than do faculty in Developmental Studies (29%, suspected, 43%, certain), Mathematics/Science (18%, suspected, 34%, certain) or Social Science (18% suspected, 40% certain). Confronting certain cases of academic dishonesty but not pursuing the matter was reported by only 1 percent of Humanities faculty but by 14 percent of Developmental Studies, 17 percent of Mathematics/Science and 12 percent of Social Science faculty. Humanities faculty are more likely to take action with regard to grades. Forty-one percent of Humanities faculty indicate lowering the grade on the item in question and 16 percent assigned an "F" for the course when certain that cheating or plagiarism had occurred. Percentages of Developmental Studies, Mathematics/Science and Social Science faculty reporting such a response were much lower (lowered grade, Developmental Studies 21%, Mathematics/Science 21%, Social Science 28%; and assigned an "F," Developmental Studies 5%, Mathematics/Science 6%, Social Science 4%). Differences in

Table 4.12: Responses to Incidents of Academic Dishonesty, Discipline (Developmental Studies, Humanities, Mathematics/Science, Social Science)

How did you respond the last time you <u>suspected</u> academic dishonesty in your class?	Dev.St.		Discipline				Soc.S.	
			Hum.		Math/Sci.			
	<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%
Did not encounter	19	29%	10	12%	17	18%	9	18%
Did nothing	2	3%	8	10%	14	15%	2	4%
Confronted student	14	21%	10	12%	22	23%	9	18%
Dealt with student one-on-one	31	48%	47	59%	42	44%	24	48%
Gave the student a warning	23	35%	17	21%	30	31%	16	32%
Lowered grade on the item	5	8%	18	22%	10	10%	8	16%
Assigned an "F" for course	0	0%	4	5%	2	2%	0	0%
Reported to Department Chair	1	1%	11	14%	8	8%	5	10%
Reported to Dean of Students	0	0%	4	5%	1	1%	0	0%
Other	5	8%	21	26%	16	17%	11	22%

How did you respond the last time you were <u>certain</u> academic dishonesty occurred in your class?	Dev.St.		Discipline				Soc.S.	
			Hum.		Math/Sci.			
	<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%
Did not encounter	28	43%	20	25%	33	34%	20	40%
Did nothing	0	0%	2	2%	3	3%	1	2%
Confronted student	9	14%	1	1%	16	17%	6	12%
Dealt with student one-on-one	23	35%	37	46%	33	34%	22	44%
Gave the student a warning	14	21%	11	14%	18	18%	5	10%
Lowered grade on the item	14	21%	33	41%	20	21%	14	28%
Assigned an "F" for course	3	5%	13	16%	6	6%	2	4%
Reported to Department Chair	5	8%	17	21%	16	17%	5	10%
Reported to Dean of Students	1	1%	8	10%	7	7%	3	6%
Other	5	8%	14	17%	11	11%	3	6%

(n=291)

response to incidents of academic dishonesty, particularly in encounters with cheating and plagiarism, support statistically significant differences found in perceptions of the seriousness of academic dishonesty by discipline.

Details provided by participants about their responses to suspected academic dishonesty and incidences in which they were certain academic dishonesty occurred offer a glimpse into what actually transpires in DeKalb College classrooms. Not surprisingly faculty suspect academic dishonesty more often than they are certain of its occurrence. They more often take non-punitive action (confrontation or warning only) when they are not certain that a student has cheated or plagiarized. When faculty are certain of academic dishonesty, responses that impose a grade penalty increase and non-punitive measures decrease. In general, faculty handle academic dishonesty incidents themselves and do not report cheating and plagiarism to their Department Chairs or the Dean of Students. Institutional policy, which requires notification of the Dean of Students is followed by less than 10 percent of faculty participating in this research.

Responsibility for Reducing Academic Dishonesty

Finally, a survey item sought to determine faculty attitudes concerning responsibility for reducing academic dishonesty. Participants were asked to rank order four groups (students, faculty, academic administrators, student services administrators) according to the level of responsibility for

reducing academic dishonesty at DeKalb College. The group viewed as most responsible would receive a "1"; the group viewed as least responsible would receive a "4."

Research participants clearly indicate that students are primarily responsible for reducing academic dishonesty. Table 4.13 highlights percentages of respondents assigning "primary responsibility" to each of the four groups. Fifty-nine percent of participants believe students have primary responsibility for reducing academic dishonesty. Data also show that faculty perceive themselves to share responsibility as well; 30 percent believe faculty to be primarily responsible.

Utilizing a method employed by Daniell (1993) score rankings were calculated. Each most important score was multiplied by one, each second-place score by two, each third-place score by three, and each fourth-place score by four. With the lowest score indicating most responsibility, total point scores, and thus a grand ranking, revealed the following:

students	633
faculty	744
academic administrators	1182
student services administrators	1336

Differences among subgroups appear minimal. By years of service, faculty who have been with DeKalb College less than 5 years believe faculty and administrators to have more responsibility for reducing academic dishonesty than do

Table 4.13: Percentage of Faculty, by Subgroups, Assigning the Most Responsible for Reducing Academic Dishonesty to Categories - Students, Faculty, Academic Administrators and Student Services Administrators

Category	Subgroup	Most Responsibility			
		Stu.	Fac.	Academic Admin.	Student Services Admin.
Respondents		59%	30%	9%	2%
Employment	full-time	58%	32%	9%	1%
	part-time	59%	29%	9%	3%
Campus	Central	59%	31%	8%	2%
	North	58%	28%	13%	1%
	Gwinnett, So. & Rock.	60%	31%	7%	2%
Years	less than 5 years	53%	32%	11%	4%
	5-11 years	62%	30%	8%	0%
Discipline	Developmental Studies	59%	26%	15%	0%
	Humanities	54%	38%	6%	3%
	Mathematics & Science	63%	29%	7%	2%
	Social Science	52%	36%	6%	6%

faculty who have been employed by the college from 5-11 years. In the discipline subgroup Mathematics and Science faculty assign more responsibility to students, Humanities and Social Science assign more responsibility to faculty, and Developmental Studies assign more responsibility to academic administrators than do their colleagues in the other discipline groupings.

As a group, the participants believe that students and faculty share the bulk of the responsibility for reducing academic dishonesty. They also indicate that academic administrators and student services administrators share the least responsibility. This data closely matches Daniell's (1993) results on attitudes of graduate teaching assistants.

Summary

This chapter reported the results of a study designed to assess the effectiveness of institutional response to academic dishonesty through the study of faculty members' perceptions of, responses to, and attitudes toward academic dishonesty and academic dishonesty policy. Data from over 50 percent of the population was collected and analyzed using descriptive methods and analysis of variance testing. Results are varied and generally supportive of previous research on faculty attitudes and actions regarding academic dishonesty. Major findings include:

1. Faculty do not perceive academic dishonesty to be a serious problem.

2. Faculty believe themselves to be familiar with current policy and procedure.
3. Faculty are not concerned with policy implementation, but have minor concern with personal and ideological issues that may impact response.
4. Faculty believe they have a primary role in values education.
5. Eighty percent of faculty have suspected academic dishonesty and 65 percent have been certain academic dishonesty has occurred in their classroom.
6. Faculty do not regularly follow institutional policy; most handle incidents of cheating and plagiarism on their own.
7. Faculty believe that the responsibility for reducing academic dishonesty lies primarily with students, but also with faculty.
8. Statistically significant differences among faculty subgroups (employment status, campus, years of service, discipline) appear in perceptions of the seriousness of academic dishonesty, and by employment status in concerns with policy implementation. Smaller differences are observable in familiarity with policy, response to academic dishonesty, and attitude about values education.

Chapter Five will examine conclusions and implications of research findings. Recommendations for effective response

to academic dishonesty will be offered as will
recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Popular press, in the 1990's, has been replete with stories of cheating in all levels of formal education. Research on academic dishonesty in higher education confirms popular press accounts. Cheating and plagiarism, it seems, has existed as a disturbing constant in American colleges and universities for decades. Clearly, the continuing presence of academic dishonesty strikes at the foundation of higher education; honest inquiry and the integrity of scholarship are jeopardized.

Most of the literature in the area of academic dishonesty focuses on student cheating rates, motivations and behaviors. A few studies have centered on faculty; most have indicated that faculty fail to utilize institutional policy in addressing cheating and plagiarism incidents. Very little research investigates reasons for this lack of adherence to policy. Research on faculty non-response and rationale is almost non-existent in the community college literature. This study then, was designed to address response to academic dishonesty at a two-year college, particularly the response by faculty to incidents of cheating and plagiarism as well as rationale for response.

This chapter will review research results and offer conclusions through a focus on each research question. Resultant policy implications include the issues of policy usage, values education, reducing academic dishonesty, and multiple campuses and part-time faculty. Recommendations for addressing academic dishonesty at a two-year, multi-campus college, as well as suggestions for future research are included.

Summary of the Research

This research sought to determine the effectiveness of institutional response to academic dishonesty at a multi-campus, two-year college through investigation of faculty perceptions of, responses to, and attitudes toward academic dishonesty and academic dishonesty policy at a single institution. Primary research questions were:

1. What are the perceptions of DeKalb College faculty members of the extent of the academic dishonesty problem at DeKalb College?
2. What are DeKalb College faculty members' perceptions of, and attitudes toward the Academic Dishonesty Policy and policy implementation issues?
3. What are the responses to academic dishonesty by DeKalb College faculty members?
4. What are the attitudes of DeKalb College faculty members concerning values education?

5. What are the attitudes of DeKalb College faculty members about the responsibility for reducing academic dishonesty?

Similar questions also sought to determine if differences exist in faculty subgroups. Key faculty subgroupings were identified as 1) employment status (full-time, part-time), 2) campus (Central, North, and Gwinnett/South/Rockdale), years of college service (less than 5 years, 5-11 years) 4) discipline (Developmental Studies, Humanities, Mathematics and Science, and Social Science). Secondary research questions were:

1. Are there differences among faculty subgroups in the perceptions of the extent of the academic dishonesty problem at DeKalb College?
2. Are there differences among faculty subgroups in the perceptions of, and attitudes toward the Academic Dishonesty Policy and policy implementation issues?
3. Are there differences among faculty subgroups in responses to academic dishonesty?
4. Are there differences among faculty subgroups in attitudes concerning values education?
5. Are there differences among faculty subgroups in attitude about the responsibility for reducing academic dishonesty?

The faculty population identified for the study included all full-time and part-time instructional faculty at DeKalb College during a single academic term. A total of

742 faculty comprised the population; 523 (70%) responded by returning a brief survey. Fifty-three percent ($N=394$) of respondents completed surveys deemed by the researcher to be usable for purposes of data analysis. The response rate exceeded expectation and provided more confidence in research results.

A survey was developed, drawing heavily from previous research, pilot-tested, modified and administered. Data were analyzed using ANOVA techniques, and Bonferroni adjustments, where appropriate. Basic descriptive results, along with participant responses to open-ended items provided answers to research questions.

Chief results, as indicated in Chapter Four follow:

1. Faculty do not perceive academic dishonesty to be a serious problem.
2. Faculty believe themselves to be familiar with current policy and procedure.
3. Faculty are not concerned with policy implementation, but have minor concern with personal and ideological issues that may impact response.
4. Faculty believe they have a primary role in values education.
5. Eighty percent of faculty have suspected academic dishonesty and 65 percent have been certain academic dishonesty has occurred in their classroom.

6. Faculty do not regularly follow institutional policy; most handle incidents of cheating and plagiarism on their own.
7. Faculty believe that the responsibility for reducing academic dishonesty lies primarily with students, but also with faculty.
8. Statistically significant differences among faculty subgroups (employment status, campus, years of service, discipline) appear in perceptions of the seriousness of academic dishonesty, and by employment status in concerns with policy implementation. Smaller differences are observable in familiarity with policy, response to academic dishonesty, and attitude about values education.

Conclusions

The large number of faculty participating in the study allow for confidence in findings and conclusions. With data from more than 50 percent of DeKalb College faculty, research questions can be adequately addressed. The response rate included significant numbers of faculty in key subgroups designed for comparison. In particular, participation of part-time faculty and faculty from the various campuses allowed for the investigation of key issues.

Primary Research Questions

The primary set of research questions, designed to describe the perceptions of, responses to, and attitudes toward academic dishonesty and academic dishonesty policy yield

substantial information. A clear picture of the DeKalb College faculty emerges from investigation. DeKalb College faculty do not appear to differ significantly in perceptions, responses, and attitudes from faculty involved in previous research on academic dishonesty.

What are the perceptions of DeKalb College faculty members of the extent of the academic dishonesty problem at DeKalb College? DeKalb College faculty do not perceive academic dishonesty to be a major concern. On a scale of 5-25 (5=not serious/never, 25=very serious/frequently) the faculty mean of 10.16 indicates that the academic dishonesty problem is viewed as "somewhat serious" and "seldom" occurring. Thus, cheating and plagiarism are not viewed by instructional faculty as pressing issues at DeKalb College, on individual campuses, in classes, or by frequency of incident. These results, when viewed together with reports of actual incidents of academic dishonesty seem unusual. Sixty-five percent of faculty indicate encountering cheating and plagiarism which they were certain occurred, yet they do not find the problem to be very serious. Research on academic dishonesty consistently finds cheating rates among students to exceed 50 percent (Singhal, 1982, Moffatt, 1990, Graham, 1994, Jendrek, 1992, Davis et al, 1992). McCabe and Bowers (1994) found more than half of students in studies conducted in 1963 and in 1991 reporting cheating behavior. While no data was collected from students in this study, it is likely that cheating rates among students at DeKalb College are

similar to those found in numerous studies. Therefore, there may be a perception that student cheating occurs and is expected, at some level, by faculty.

What are the perceptions of DeKalb College faculty members of the Academic Dishonesty Policy and policy implementation issues? DeKalb College faculty report that they are familiar with the academic dishonesty policies and procedures. On a scale of 1 to 5 (1=strongly agree, 5=strongly disagree) faculty display a mean of 1.95, agreeing with a statement that they are familiar with policy and procedure. Susan Daniell (1993) found similar self-reported familiarity with academic dishonesty policy among graduate teaching assistants, but also the opinion that information to assist in responding to cheating and plagiarism to be inadequate. Though they report familiarity with the policy and procedures, DeKalb College faculty do not utilize them. This finding reiterates Jendrek's (1989) contention that a clear policy doesn't necessarily lead to increased use by faculty.

Faculty also report their perceptions of problems with policy implementation. They did not agree with statements that procedure was adversarial, time-consuming or that penalties were inappropriate. On a scale of 4 to 20 (4=strongly agree, 20=strongly disagree) the faculty mean was 12.71, indicating slight disagreement with problems in policy implementation. This finding may lack significant meaning. If fewer than 10 percent of faculty utilize

existing policy, perceptions of problems with policy implementation are suspect. Further evidence emerged from written comments by many faculty members who returned a survey. Comments such as, "how would I know" and "I don't have any idea" accompanied lack of response to questions on policy implementation. Eight percent of those returning a survey instrument failed to respond to these items.

Faculty perceptions of personal and ideological issues indicate some concern with academic freedom, liability and teaching reputation. Faculty indicate agreement with statements that 1) faculty handling of academic dishonesty instances in their classroom is an academic freedom issue, 2) personal liability is a concern in accusing a student of cheating or plagiarism, and 3) reporting academic dishonesty may reflect a lack of teaching skill. Using a scale of 3 (strongly agree) to 15 (strongly disagree), DeKalb College faculty show a mean of 8.56, a score in the agree-neutral range. This data, though not demonstrating intense opinion, seems to confirm previous research on academic dishonesty and faculty opinion. In her study of graduate teaching assistants, Daniell (1993) found a belief that the responsibility for handling academic dishonesty instances lies with the course instructor. A faculty attitude of classroom autonomy also emerged in studies by Ritter (1993) and Fass (1986). Though academic freedom does not mean unlimited faculty authority in the classroom, some faculty may hold this view. The fear of personal liability has also

emerged in the literature (Daniell, 1993, Dowd, 1992, Kibler, Nuss, Patterson & Pavela, 1988), though a publication by Gehring and Pavela (1994) is educative. The authors contend that faculty have more to fear in failing to follow institutional policy than in responding according to procedure. A "good faith" effort is accompanied by a qualified immunity from legal action. Faculty therefore, should be certain of academic dishonesty before formally taking action, but when certain should proceed according to policy.

Hardy (1982) writes that faculty may avoid reporting academic dishonesty for fear of such action reflecting poorly on their teaching ability. Such a belief on the part of faculty should be addressed by Department Chairs. Certainly those evaluating teaching performance want to encourage an effective response to academic dishonesty.

It does not appear that faculty avoid the academic dishonesty policy for procedural concerns; the extent to which the DeKalb College academic dishonesty policy raises concerns through implementation is unclear. Results of cases that do proceed according to policy may not be communicated and apparently are few. Faculty may, however, hold personal and ideological views that mitigate against policy use. These concerns should be considered, especially in the context of serving as roadblocks to consistent use of academic dishonesty procedure.

What are the responses to academic dishonesty by DeKalb College faculty members? DeKalb College faculty do not follow institutional policy in cases of academic dishonesty. Only 7 percent report certain instances of cheating or plagiarism to the Dean of Students as specified by policy. The most common faculty response to cases of classroom academic dishonesty which faculty are certain occurred is to deal with the student one-on-one (37%) or to lower the item grade (25%). This data closely matches previous research on faculty member response. Rates of reporting, as required by policy, have been shown to be consistently low (5%, Bayens & Paige, 1993; 12%, Daniell, 1993; 15%, Wright & Kelly, 1974; 21% Singhal, 1982). Comments from DeKalb College faculty seem to suggest that there may be concern over inability to adequately "prove" cheating or plagiarism. Further, comments indicate relative ease in addressing academic dishonesty when it occurs, swiftly and individually.

Clearly a major concern in faculty member adjudication of individual cases of academic dishonesty in the classroom relates to the legal rights of students. Singhal and Johnson (1983) describe faculty reporting of academic dishonesty cases as a legal requirement. Academic dishonesty is a behavior not in the realm of academic evaluation by the professional educator. While the courts have been unwilling to substitute judicial opinion for that of faculty in matters of academic evaluation (Board of Curators of the University of Missouri v. Horowitz, 1978,

Regents of the University of Michigan v. Ewing, 1985), in academic dishonesty cases questions of fact must be addressed. The proscribed behavior in such cases is a behavior, rather than a measure of knowledge, skill or ability. Thus, institutions develop policy designed to protect student due process rights. Gehring and Pavela (1994) offer that faculty who fail to follow institutional policy are acting outside of the scope of employment and should expect no support in the event of legal action. As is the case with institutional policies in general, employees should make concerted efforts to comply.

What are the attitudes of DeKalb College faculty members concerning values education? DeKalb College faculty believe they have a role in values education. Agreement was found with statements that teaching values is a primary role for DeKalb College faculty and that DeKalb College faculty should teach the importance of academic integrity. On a scale of 2 (strongly agree) to 10 (strongly disagree) the mean for faculty was 4.59, a score in the agree to neutral range. This finding provides for comparison to several studies. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1989) reported a 14 year decline among faculty in a national study who believed that "shaping students values" was important. Faculty at the two-year college, however, showed higher rates of belief in the importance of shaping values than all four-year colleges except those designated as liberal arts. The conclusions of Dowd (1992) offer

further comparison. In his study of academic dishonesty in a community college Dowd noted that the community college tradition of serving adult students has resulted in institutions not promoting values. These results seem contradicted by the data on DeKalb College faculty. There may be a difference, however, in the attitude of faculty toward values education and actual institutional action. What are the attitudes of DeKalb College faculty members about the responsibility for reducing academic dishonesty? DeKalb College faculty believe that students are most responsible for reducing academic dishonesty at the college. They also believe that they have much responsibility to share. Further, faculty believe that administrators (academic and student services) hold the least responsibility for reducing incidents of cheating and plagiarism. These findings support the research of Daniell (1993) on attitudes of graduate teaching assistants at the University of Georgia.

Numerous comments from research participants demonstrate specific measures adopted to reduce or prevent classroom academic dishonesty. These efforts mirror faculty strategies reported in the literature on academic dishonesty (Blinn, 1994, Wilhoit, 1994, Rafetto, 1985, Hawley, 1984). Keith-Spiegel, et al (1993) argue that such responses are simply a component of effective teaching. One participant agreed, summarizing colleagues comments, "I design my tests

so that cheating is almost impossible. I consider this part of my duties as a good teacher."

Most interesting may be the wide disparity between perceived responsibility of students and faculty, and responsibility of the administration. Compared with faculty and students, administrators are not viewed as having much responsibility for reducing academic dishonesty at all. Policy viewed, therefore, as an administrative response to a faculty/student problem may be prone to ineffectiveness.

Secondary Research Questions

The second set of research questions was designed to determine if differences exist in the perceptions of, responses to, and attitude toward academic dishonesty and academic dishonesty policy in faculty subgroups. Results showed statistically significant differences among all groups in perceptions of the seriousness of the academic dishonesty problems and among faculty categorized by employment status in concerns with policy implementation. On other research scales, faculty members seem to share perceptions, responses and attitudes regarding academic dishonesty and academic dishonesty policy.

Are there differences among faculty subgroups in the perceptions of the extent of the academic dishonesty problem at DeKalb College? None of the faculty subgroups studied (employment status, campus, years of service, discipline) believed academic dishonesty to be a very serious issue at DeKalb College. Differences in subgroups, however, emerged

in comparison. ANOVAs were conducted to determine differences in group means for each of the four groups on the perception of the seriousness of the academic dishonesty problem at DeKalb College. The null hypothesis, that no differences exist, was tested each time. Faculty compared in each subgroup showed statistically significant differences; the null hypothesis was rejected in each of the four tests.

The test by employment status revealed that the greatest difference exists in the means of full-time and part-time faculty ($f=54.58$, $df=1$, $p<.01$). The test comparing means of faculty employed less than 5 years and those employed 5-11 years again revealed a statistically significant difference ($F=9.75$, $df=1$, $p<.01$). The clear difference between full-time and part-time faculty may simply be a result of the fact that full-time faculty see more students; in data on response, more full-time faculty report encountering academic dishonesty. The same explanation may be valid in the difference in perceptions of faculty by years of service. Faculty who have been with the college longer have had more opportunity to encounter DeKalb College students, college presidents, cafeteria food, or any other entity or phenomenon, including academic dishonesty. Perhaps a more important concept is the extent to which new faculty and part-time faculty are engaged in the community of faculty. For part-time faculty especially, this engagement may be difficult at best, as they have limited

time to spend so engaged. With 60 percent of faculty part-time, comprising 40 percent of the faculty workload, part-time faculty participation in the college community may be critical in addressing issues such as academic dishonesty.

Also statistically significant, differences appear among faculty grouped by campus ($F=5.51$, $df=2$, $p<.01$) and by discipline ($F=4.72$, $df=3$, $p<.01$) with regard to perception of the seriousness of the academic dishonesty problem. It should not be surprising that faculty from the campus on which the 1993 policy revision sprang, Central campus, report a perception that academic dishonesty is more serious than their colleagues at the other campuses. Active campus discussion may result in the perception of a more serious problem among faculty than the same perception among faculty not involved in such discussion. Central campus faculty also follow institutional policy in higher numbers, perhaps an indication of greater sensitivity to the academic dishonesty issue.

Among discipline subgroups, faculty in the Humanities and Mathematics and Science perceive the academic dishonesty problem to be more serious than do faculty in Developmental Studies or Social Science. Humanities and Mathematics and Science faculty also report higher incidents of classroom academic dishonesty, which may, as is the case for faculty grouped by employment status and years of service, help explain the differing perceptions. Humanities and Mathematics/Science faculty who encounter more academic

dishonesty would be expected to perceive the problem as more serious.

While differences appear among faculty subgroups in perceptions of the seriousness of the academic dishonesty problem at DeKalb College, none of the groups perceive academic dishonesty to be a very serious problem. The fact that the DeKalb College faculty, as a whole, do not perceive cheating and plagiarism as a major concern may be a far more significant finding than any differences among groups in the extent of lack of concern.

Are there differences among faculty subgroups in the perceptions of the Academic Dishonesty Policy and policy implementation issues? All of the faculty subgroups display the belief that they are familiar with the academic dishonesty policy and procedures. The only noticeable differences between groups, though small, appear among campus subgroups (Central, North, Gwinnett/South/Rockdale). Central campus faculty report less familiarity with policy and procedure than do their counterparts on other campuses. While the differences are small, Central campus faculty may be more aware of a new policy (4 years old) and working to understand a new procedure.

Subgroups all lack concern about problems in policy implementation. No statistically significant differences emerged from testing perceptions of policy implementation problems by campus, years of service or discipline. In each case, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected. In

employment status however, analysis of variance testing revealed a statistically significant difference in the means of full-time and part-time faculty ($F=6.79$, $df=1$, $p<.01$). The null hypothesis, that means were the same, was rejected. Full-time faculty are more concerned with issues surrounding policy implementation than are their part-time colleagues. Interestingly, full-time faculty report slightly less familiarity with policy and procedure than do part-time faculty. These differences may indicate a dichotomy between familiarity with policy and concern with implementation that is theoretical and familiarity and concern that is practical. Full-time faculty encounter academic dishonesty, and respond much more often. They therefore have had more opportunity to consider the academic dishonesty policy and its implementation in real situations. Many part-time faculty members, who have faced cheating and plagiarism less often, may have read the policy, or be aware of its existence, but not struggled with implementation. Thus, part-time faculty find the academic dishonesty problem less serious, are less concerned with issues surrounding policy implementation, yet report greater familiarity with policy and procedure. Many issues that seem clear in theory, lose clarity in practice.

Subgroups displayed no differences in their response to questions of personal and ideological concerns. ANOVA testing revealed no statistically significant differences in group means; the null hypothesis was therefore not rejected.

Are there differences among faculty subgroups in responses to academic dishonesty? Responses to academic dishonesty vary by subgroup. In employment status, full-time faculty indicate more encounters with academic dishonesty incidents than do part-time faculty. This is likely due to greater student contact by full-time faculty and simply the opportunity to observe more cheating and plagiarism instances. The same difference is evident between faculty who have worked at DeKalb College less than 5 years and those in the 5-11 years category. The same explanation applies. Differences observable by campus subgroup involved reporting of incidents. Central campus faculty indicate higher rates of reporting academic dishonesty to the Department Chair and to the Dean of Students than do faculty at the other campuses. Central campus faculty also report higher rates of assigning an "F" for the course. Central campus faculty appear more likely to follow institutional policy by reporting cases to the Dean of Students. This might be explained by the fact that the 1993 policy revision began with a group of Central campus faculty. They may have more of a sense of "ownership" of the policy and be more willing to attempt to follow the procedure.

In the discipline subgrouping, faculty in the Humanities differed most from faculty in Developmental Studies, Mathematics and Science, and Social Science. Humanities faculty indicated higher rates of encountering academic dishonesty, higher rates of responding with grade

penalties, and lower rates of responding with non-punitive penalties (confrontation without pursuing the matter, warning). Disciplinary differences, particularly those between Humanities faculty and faculty in Mathematics and Science, emerge from a survey of faculty teaching goals by Angelo and Cross (1993). In their study, Humanities faculty held "student development" as a component of essential teaching goals to be much more important than faculty in Mathematics and Science. Similar differences are reported in a Carnegie Foundation study (1989) between Humanities and Math/Science faculty on the "shaping" of student values. In keeping with the previous research then, DeKalb College Humanities faculty may be using incidents of academic dishonesty to teach honesty, and addressing incidents substantively, with consequences designed to instruct.

Are there differences among faculty subgroups in attitudes concerning values education? Differences between group means were tested for questions measuring faculty attitude toward values education. ANOVA tests comparing subgroups by employment status, campus, years of service, and discipline revealed no statistically significant differences in means. The null hypothesis was not rejected. Observable differences, though not statistically significant, were apparent by discipline. Humanities faculty display the greatest agreement that values education is a faculty role while faculty in mathematics and science show the least agreement. Once again, this data is consistent with results

from Angelo and Cross (1993) on essential teaching goals and the results from the Carnegie Foundation report (1989) on values education. Faculty attitudes about values education seem impacted by discipline.

Are there differences among faculty subgroups in attitude about the responsibility for reducing academic dishonesty?

Differences among faculty subgroups in attitude toward responsibility for reducing academic dishonesty, though small, exist. Faculty employed less than 5 years show more inclination to believe that administrators are responsible for reducing academic dishonesty than do faculty employed 5-11 years. Whether the newer faculty has more faith in the administration, views the administrative role as more comprehensive, or some other explanation applies cannot be determined from the data. A greater percentage of 5-11 year faculty do believe students to be primarily responsible for reducing academic dishonesty.

In the discipline subgroups lie the greatest disparities in perceived responsibility. Mathematics and Science faculty place more responsibility on students, Humanities and Social Science on faculty and Developmental Studies on academic administrators than faculty in different discipline groups. This data once again confirms the research of Angelo and Cross (1993) and the Carnegie Foundation (1989). Humanities faculty, more concerned with values education, would be expected to adopt higher levels of self-responsibility for academic dishonesty. Mathematics

and Science faculty might be expected to view values education in general, and academic integrity issues in particular, as less of a faculty role and responsibility. The responsibility of academic administrators, as viewed by Developmental Studies faculty, may be indicative of a more prominent administrative role in Developmental Studies in testing, placement, and support.

Policy Implications

The results of this research, and the conclusions drawn from the results are varied. Clearly academic dishonesty is not perceived as a major concern by faculty nor are issues related to implementation of academic dishonesty policy, though minor concern exists with personal and ideological issues related to procedure. Though faculty believe the chief responsibility for reducing academic dishonesty belongs to students, they acknowledge some responsibility and agree that values education is a faculty role. While DeKalb College faculty claim familiarity with academic dishonesty policy and procedure, few utilize procedures when confronting cheating and plagiarism. The majority of faculty have encountered classroom academic dishonesty and handled incidents themselves. Statistically significant group differences appear in perceptions of the seriousness of the problem by all faculty subgroups (employment status, campus, years of service and discipline) and in concerns with policy implementation by employment status. Implications for policy development and revision of these

findings may be most significant in the areas of policy usage, values education, reducing academic dishonesty, and the influence of multiple campuses and part-time faculty.

Policy Usage

The majority of DeKalb College faculty members fail to use institutional academic dishonesty policy. Reasons for this non-use are unclear. Faculty reported familiarity with the policy may in fact be familiarity with a pre-1993 policy that did not call for reporting of incidents. Even if aware that a newer policy exists, faculty may not be knowledgeable about specificity of procedure. This appears likely in the case of part-time faculty. The data does not suggest that faculty have grave concerns with policy implementation. Whatever the reasons for failure to utilize policy several legal issues arise.

First, students may not be afforded due process rights. Minimal due process guarantees afford the accused student notice of the charges against him and the right to defend himself against those charges at a hearing. Full-blown hearings, with attorneys, strict rules of evidence and other procedural safeguards are not necessary. In fact, this type of due process may undermine the educational value in addressing student behavior (Pavela, 1989, Travelstead, 1987). The DeKalb College academic dishonesty procedures meet minimal due process requirements when the faculty member confronts the student (notice) and meets with the student to discuss the incident (hearing). The policy,

however, requires the college court to hear the case whether the student admits the offense or not. If the student admits the offense, the court will simply consider a sanction in addition to that which the faculty member imposes. If the student denies the charge, guilt or innocence is determined by the court. As indicated in comments from research participants, students often admit the dishonest act and accept the faculty sanction. It is imperative, however, that the policy be adhered to, that a report be made to the Dean of Students, and the college court review each incident. This process helps safeguard the rights of students and faculty; it is also college policy.

Second, faculty who avoid institutional policy, and faculty who fail to afford due process rights to students increase their liability and potential legal risk. Most of the academic dishonesty cases reaching a courtroom involve students with substantial interest at stake. Many involve students in professional programs (medicine, law) or students seeking entry to such programs. With the significance of the outcome so grave for the student, and the student's potential earnings, students and their parents will employ every legal maneuver at their disposal in hopes of prevailing. At the two-year college, the stakes may not be as high. A finding of academic dishonesty will probably have less impact on the student in a non-collegiate, freshman or sophomore course. Institutions and instructional faculty, however, should not use this fact as

a basis for limiting minimal due process. A less affluent student body, with fewer resources, including access to legal assistance, may very well tip the balance of power in the favor of the faculty member. Fundamental fairness, then, requires that two-year college faculty insure due process rights. Failure to do so will surely raise the fundamental fairness flag should a case progress to litigation. Avoiding institutional policy will both jettison the faculty member from the umbrella of institutionally-provided legal assistance and raise concerns about fairness.

A major impetus for the policy revision of 1993 was the desire, by a group of Central Campus faculty, to document academic dishonesty instances. They especially wanted to address the issue of repeat offenders. Under the former policy, a student could cheat in every class he took, be caught each time, and each time be treated as a first-time offender. Systematic records were not kept, and those that existed were not readily available to faculty. Not only does the new policy seek to insure due process, but to identify students who continually demonstrate academic dishonesty; sanctions for a first time offender should differ from those of a multiple violator. Faculty, armed with the knowledge that a student has cheated before, will be better prepared to offer an appropriate sanction, as will the college court. Thus, reporting can be in the individual interest of the faculty member. What seems missing,

however, is a collective concern among faculty for the impact of academic dishonesty.

DeKalb College faculty appear to view academic dishonesty simply as an issue that occurs within the walls of their classroom. Though over 48 percent (190) of participants added comments to their survey answers, no one mentioned academic dishonesty as an issue outside their individual classes. Interestingly, while most who commented used the word "I," not one used "we" to comment on academic dishonesty. Cheating and plagiarism appear to be viewed as an individual issue, occurring in an individual classroom, involving an individual instructor and an individual student. This limited view may mitigate against an effective institutional response. The collective interest of faculty would be served, and an environment of integrity fostered, through consistent reporting of cases of academic dishonesty.

Chief policy implications, in the area of usage of academic dishonesty policy, can be summarized as safeguarding the rights of students, encouraging faculty policy use and adopting an institutional approach to combating academic dishonesty. Clearly policy must be written and enacted to guarantee due process rights of students. Faculty have an obligation to follow policy, both to assure due process for students as well as to protect themselves. Policy should be written carefully and communicated effectively. Faculty members should remain at

the heart of any effort, policy or procedure designed to address cheating and plagiarism. A concerted, institutional response to academic dishonesty may prove most successful.

Values Education

A significant finding in this study is the attitude among DeKalb College faculty that they have an important role to play in values education. This student development concept becomes increasingly significant to two-year colleges as they attempt to establish increased influence in their communities and educate "good citizens" through initiatives such as service learning. Several implications arise in an institutional effort to teach values.

From data on faculty response it is clear that faculty members adjudicate cases of academic dishonesty on their own. Many faculty may use this process to teach students the importance of integrity, how to cite references properly, and to avoid plagiarism. Often, however, faculty appear to adopt a punitive approach and seek to rid their classroom of the offending student. While each of these responses may serve to teach students an important lesson about academic integrity, the punitive method may simply instill in the student the desire to avoid being caught the next time he cheats. A more educational approach may also include punitive elements, but the foundation is educational; the student should learn from the experience. An educational approach in student disciplinary sanctions, particularly in cases of academic dishonesty, appears a

constant refrain among scholars (Kibler, 1993, Kibler, Nuss, Paterson & Pavela, 1988, Pavela and McCabe, 1993).

Addressing academic dishonesty from an educational perspective, as an instructional opportunity, may be a classic instance of values education.

Institutional commitment to values education should support faculty efforts. What are accused students learning from a college court hearing on academic dishonesty? Most likely, if sanctions aren't designed to be instructive, they learn the intricacies of court operations. Common sanctions at DeKalb College are probation or suspension for an academic term. These appear similar to instructor sanctions of warning and forced withdrawal from class. If faculty seem willing to focus on values education, institutional policy should be supportive. Institutions such as the University of Maryland and the University of Delaware have adopted a system whereby penalties for academic dishonesty include both punitive and educational components. Students found guilty of academic dishonesty receive a grade of "XF," indicating course failure due to academic dishonesty. The grade, however, can be converted to an "F" upon successful completion of a seminar on academic integrity by the student. In such a system, the importance of academic integrity is stressed and punishment not forgotten. Values education, thus, can be a joint effort between faculty and administration.

In values education then, implications for policy development are clear. Policy-makers must recognize faculty commitment to the importance of teaching values and academic integrity to students. They should therefore adopt an educational approach in procedure and penalty. The institution can support, through written policy, a renewed focus on values education.

Reducing Academic Dishonesty

A key to addressing academic dishonesty can be found in preventing occurrences. Though indicating their belief that students are primarily responsible for reducing incidents of academic dishonesty, faculty clearly recognize their important role in reducing academic dishonesty. Many faculty comments related steps taken to limit opportunities for students to cheat and intensified instruction designed to help students avoid plagiarism. Faculty, thus demonstrate a commitment to reduce incidents of academic dishonesty. This commitment appears, however, at the individual classroom level by individual instructors. It is clearly needed in individual classrooms, but also in discussion outside classroom walls, engaging the entire college.

Since faculty members view students as primarily responsible for reducing academic dishonesty, students might be considered partners in programmatic efforts to reduce cheating and plagiarism. A cooperative venture between faculty and students might significantly impact academic

dishonesty at the college. In colleges that have successfully addressed academic dishonesty with an Honor Code, perhaps the most vital element has not been the Honor Code itself, but the resultant discussion and collaboration between faculty and students (McCabe, 1993, McCabe and Trevino, 1993). Involving students in efforts to reduce academic dishonesty would appear consistent with faculty attitudes.

If faculty view students and themselves as primarily responsible for reducing academic dishonesty, they view administrators as having very little responsibility in this area. It therefore becomes critical for policy and procedure to be viewed by faculty as developed by faculty. At DeKalb College the current policy was indeed developed by faculty, in response to faculty concerns, to meet faculty needs. If, however, it is viewed as another policy promulgated by the administration and imposed on faculty, it will not likely enjoy a warm reception. An academic dishonesty policy, perceived by faculty to have been developed by administrators, will be considered irrelevant by faculty. Communication, especially among faculty, seems critical.

Efforts to reduce academic dishonesty have significant policy implications. An institutional approach led by faculty members may be the most effective method for reducing cheating rates. Any effort viewed as an administrative edict may be doomed.

Multiple Campuses and Part-time Faculty

Finally, the impact of multiple campuses and part-time faculty may have implications not simply for DeKalb College but for other multi-campus, two year colleges. A chief difference between this study and others that have preceded it (Jendrek, 1989, Nuss, 1984, Bayens & Paige, 1993, Daniell, 1993) was the fact that it involved a two-year college with several instructional locations and large numbers of part-time faculty. Further, faculty were compared by subgroups, including campus and employment status, to identify differences in perceptions, responses and attitudes. Few differences emerged. Statistically significant differences emerged in perception of the seriousness of the academic dishonesty problem among all groups tested, and in concerns with policy implementation among faculty categorized by employment status. Responses to academic dishonesty also offer some insight into group differences. Part-time faculty view the academic dishonesty problem as less serious, are less concerned with policy implementation issues, and encounter cheating and plagiarism instances less often than their full-time counterparts. Central Campus faculty view the academic dishonesty problem as more serious and report instances of academic dishonesty more frequently than their colleagues at North Campus or at the small campuses of Gwinnett, South and Rockdale.

Part-time faculty, perhaps obviously, are engaged in the life of the college to a lesser extent than are full-

time faculty. Maybe a more critical issue deserves attention. Are part-time faculty unable to become actively involved in the college or unwilling? If part-time faculty are unable to involve themselves in college issues and discussion because of limited hours spent on campus, technology may offer some assistance. Much of the communication, discussion, and issues-oriented debate now occurs electronically. While it may never replace coffee and conversation in the faculty lounge, e-mail communication is increasingly the norm. Part-time faculty could easily access this world of discussion through participation via electronic communication. Some do; more should. In addition, institutions could make greater efforts to include part-time faculty in activities, events, and informal gatherings to assist in assimilation to the college culture. If part-time faculty are unwilling to participate in the life of the college, efforts aimed toward inclusion could be futile.

Multiple campus locations seem to impact faculty member perceptions and responses to academic dishonesty. When a faculty community engages in discussion of academic dishonesty and academic dishonesty policy outside of individual classrooms, one result may be that faculty members view academic dishonesty to be a more serious problem. Conversely, where discussion is absent, so too may be the opinion that any issue is serious. Further, when a faculty community, engaged in discussion of academic

dishonesty offers a policy revision, it is expected that members will attempt to use the new policy at rates higher than those of faculty not so engaged. Despite these campus differences, most issues surrounding academic dishonesty may be viewed by faculty as classroom issues. Campus differences may not apply; the classroom environment created by the faculty may not actually be dissimilar. If faculty teach a common core of classes, using similar techniques and the same text, the expectation would be similar classroom environments. Campus differences may appear less significant inside of the traditional classroom. Multiple instructional locations may impact faculty perceptions of, responses to, and attitudes toward academic dishonesty and academic dishonesty policy only when academic dishonesty is viewed as an issue outside the walls of the individual classroom.

Policy implications related to part-time faculty and multiple campuses are substantial. Any policy must be written with an understanding of implementation issues. The ability and willingness of part-time faculty to engage in a collective effort to address academic dishonesty is key to a successful approach. Further, various instructional locations may lead to a variety of approaches to combat academic dishonesty.

Recommendations: Addressing Academic Dishonesty at a Two-Year, Multi-Campus College

Developing an effective response to academic dishonesty begins with an institutional commitment to address the issue. While 80 percent of DeKalb College faculty have suspected academic dishonesty in their classrooms, it is not viewed as a pressing concern. Clearly, institutional policy is avoided; faculty choose to adjudicate cheating and plagiarism cases themselves. Academic dishonesty may be viewed as a problem best left quietly handled out of public view. An institutional focus on academic integrity, despite noble intentions, may highlight an issue the institution would rather address away from public scrutiny. In fact, if the community of faculty discusses and debates issues surrounding academic dishonesty and academic dishonesty policy and procedure, perceptions, attitudes and responses may change. A focus on institutional response to academic dishonesty would not create a new problem, however, but perhaps allow for the addressing of existent but long denied issues. Whatever the response rationale of faculty or administrators, a willingness must exist to seriously address academic dishonesty and develop consistent responses to cheating and plagiarism incidents. This willingness is a fundamental component in a concerted institutional effort to foster an environment of academic integrity.

Responding to academic dishonesty offers an opportunity for collaboration between faculty, administrators and students. Balancing competing interests involved in the

process emerges as critical. The rights of students must be balanced with the rights, perceptions, and attitudes of faculty. The perceptions that policy is imposed on faculty must be balanced with the attitude, among faculty, that they have the right to individually adjudicate cheating and plagiarism cases as they see fit. Any policy must meet procedural muster, yet be simple enough to invite use. Students have a constitutional right to due process when accused of cheating or plagiarism. While faculty do not have an academic freedom right to adjudicate cases, they do, however, have a primary role in adjudication. Gary Pavela (1988) offers an interesting perspective on this balance. He argues that academic dishonesty offenses are both disciplinary and academic in nature. As disciplinary offenses, students must be afforded notice and a hearing. These rudiments of due process need not occur in the absence of faculty; as academic offenses, faculty should hold, at least in part, jurisdiction. Thus, balance is struck between student and faculty rights. Student due process rights are guaranteed in a process involving faculty.

Aaron (1992) and Ludeman (1988) note that four-year college faculty are more involved in the formal process for adjudicating cases of academic dishonesty. Two-year colleges are more likely to have one hearing panel to process common disciplinary violations and academic dishonesty cases, while four-year colleges are more likely

to have separate panels, including one designed specifically to hear cheating and plagiarism cases.

The DeKalb College policy centers on the individual faculty member and classroom academic dishonesty. The formal process begins with notice and hearing when the faculty member meets with the student to discuss the issue. Pavela's advice seems in effect; if faculty notify students of the accusation and meet with them to discuss the charge, then student due process is provided in a system recognizing faculty jurisdiction. The process, at this point, breaks down; cases are not reported. The policy requires involvement by the college court. The court, composed of faculty members and students, considers each case in a formal and impartial environment. Even if a student admits the charge and accepts a faculty sanction, policy requires involvement of the court. If a student denies the charge and the case is not reported, student rights are violated. Though due process guarantees may not require that cases in which a student admits a charge be reviewed by the college court, the DeKalb College Policy seeks to insure student rights. Further, college court review allows for a student to confront his behavior, before peers, and provides an opportunity for educational sanctioning.

Evidence does not support the idea that faculty avoid academic dishonesty procedures because the college court, composed of students and faculty, hear academic dishonesty cases. Faculty are significantly involved in adjudication

at every level. A separate, faculty-only system for hearing academic dishonesty cases does not appear warranted.

Though a variety of authors note that time-consuming, adversarial processes may impact faculty response to academic dishonesty, the data in this study do not lend support. The DeKalb College policy appears streamlined and relatively simple to use. Faculty do not perceive implementation problems to be major obstacles. Recommendations for components of policy are substantially met. A policy should be inclusive of faculty, balance student and faculty rights, lack unnecessary procedural complexity and be easy to use. Communication of policy, procedure, and implementation, however, may need attention.

A system composed of the basic and necessary elements, if not communicated, may be ineffective. The DeKalb College policy appears fundamentally sound. It may not, however, have been effectively disseminated, nor have issues surrounding implementation been widely discussed. The policy might be viewed as another procedural imposition on faculty by the administration. It was, however, created by, and for faculty in response to faculty concerns. This has most likely not been communicated. Definitions for prohibited behavior (cheating and plagiarism) are not consistent. The DeKalb College policy lacks definitions, and such definitions have not been developed college-wide. Each department was instructed to develop definitions; the results of this departmental assignment are unclear.

Faculty cannot assume that students know what behaviors constitute cheating. This lack of knowledge is even more pronounced in the area of plagiarism. Two-year college students, more diverse than their university counterparts, vary widely in age, ethnic background, academic skill level and life experience. Any assumption that a common understanding or definition of cheating or plagiarism exists among such students is invalid. Faculty, and the institution, must be clear to students what behaviors are prohibited.

The implementation process should be clear to faculty. Though faculty report familiarity with policy, researcher suspicion is that they are not as familiar with the step-by-step procedures for processing an academic dishonesty case as data suggests. This difference may be one of theoretical versus practical knowledge. After adoption of the 1993 policy, the new procedures were not accompanied by training, workshops, seminars or other methods to help faculty understand the process. It may not be clear to faculty whether the policy is mandatory or is used at the discretion of the individual faculty member.

Communication on adjudication and feedback from faculty on academic dishonesty procedure is missing and needed. Faculty comments indicate lack of knowledge of outcomes of academic dishonesty court cases. Faculty certainly lack knowledge of outcomes of individual adjudication of cheating and plagiarism incidents by other faculty members. An

effective response to academic dishonesty addresses the issue with clarity; policy is straightforward and outcomes of cases are known. Individual students need not be identified, but the college community should know that sanctions are imposed, educational penalties enforced, and academic dishonesty is addressed. Further, faculty should have a clear method by which to offer input on the system. If faculty have concerns with policy, there exists no obvious group at which to direct those concerns. One advantage of an Honor Code system, that can be adopted without instituting a full-blown honor system, is the permanent faculty group, or committee, seeking to promote academic integrity. Such a group could be instrumental in communicating issues surrounding academic dishonesty and fostering a college environment of academic integrity.

Finally, any effective response to academic dishonesty must be undergirded by an educational philosophy, and a commitment from a "community of learners." As noted by Kibler (1993), the value of honesty and academic integrity can serve as the foundation of this approach, an "ethos" of integrity. DeKalb College faculty have indicated a belief in the importance of values education and their role in it. What may be missing is a concerted effort to address academic dishonesty from a values education perspective. Such an effort would benefit from the addition of educational sanction options for violations of the academic dishonesty policy. Currently, sanction options available to

the college court are punitive in nature. None are designed specifically to help a student learn about the impact of his behavior. In addition, faculty imposed sanctions are most often grade penalties, and most likely viewed as punitive as well. Penalties designed to teach an offending student both the impact of cheating and plagiarism and how to avoid such behavior would support a values education philosophy. Perhaps in no other area is the opportunity for faculty, student and administrator collaboration as obvious as in responding to academic dishonesty. A "learning community" can readily rally around an effort to create an environment of academic integrity. Research on Honor Code institutions indicates this joint effort to be a major contributor in reducing incidents of academic dishonesty (McCabe, 1993, McCabe and Trevino, 1993, Kibler, 1988). Clearly, DeKalb College faculty believe that students and faculty share the bulk of responsibility for reducing academic dishonesty. Collaboration in initiatives designed to address the issue seems a logical step.

Developing a community response to any issue may be a difficult task in an institution with multiple campuses and large numbers of part-time faculty. What may prove effective is the concept of deliberately developing multiple, smaller communities within a larger institution. This approach has been taken at DeKalb College in a new decentralized governance structure, with smaller communities being fostered through a natural categorization, campus

location. Results of this research seem to suggest that at Central Campus, where discussion has occurred, faculty are more likely to follow institutional policy and contribute to a community response to academic dishonesty. An effective community response, including faculty, students and administrators, might then be appropriate on individual campuses. While college policy is consistent across campuses, and centralized records maintained to address repeat offenders, initiatives designed to create environments conducive to academic integrity might be most effective, and different, on individual campuses. Clearly, faculty, student and administrative collaboration is more likely in an environment where people know one another. This smaller, more localized venue may also be conducive to involvement by part-time faculty.

Summary

Recommendations for responding to academic dishonesty at a two-year, multi-campus college can be summarized as follows:

1. Develop sound policy and simple procedures.
2. Adopt clear definitions for behavior deemed in violation of academic dishonesty policy.
3. Communicate policy and procedures to the college community. Options might include training sessions, seminars, electronic mail use, and electronic discussion groups.

4. Gather a group of faculty to provide continuing feedback and communication on academic dishonesty and policy implementation.
5. Develop educational sanctions for academic dishonesty offenses.
6. Institute a community response to academic dishonesty, campus-based and characterized by collaborative initiatives by faculty (full-time and part-time), students and administrators.

Recommendations for Future Research

This research offers insight to perceptions, responses, and attitudes of faculty members in academic dishonesty and academic dishonesty policy issues. While research questions are answered, new questions emerge.

As noted, little research exists in the area of academic dishonesty in the two-year college. Just as there is diversity among students in two-year colleges, there is diversity in types of two-year institutions. Significant issues at a multi-campus, metropolitan, transfer-oriented two-year college may differ from those at a rural, community college with technical education as a core function. The instrumentation used in this study could be modified for study at a variety of two-year colleges.

An important, though not surprising, implication in this study is the involvement of part-time faculty in addressing academic dishonesty. Part-time faculty continue to comprise significant percentages of the corps of

instruction in two-year institutions. The number of part-time faculty employed in four-year colleges seems likely to grow as well. Research on part-time faculty, and part-time faculty issues would be instructive. Research is needed particularly in the area of involvement by part-time faculty in institutional efforts to address major college issues.

Though much has been written on the extent to which fear of legal action impacts faculty response in academic dishonesty cases, most has been opinion offered by individual authors. The same authors note that faculty need not fear litigation, but should follow institutional policy. Data from numerous studies, including this one, shows that faculty members fail to utilize institutional policy. Much less clear is the extent to which this non-response is impacted by legal concerns. Research in this area would benefit policy-makers. Research involving faculty at an institution where litigation involving an academic dishonesty case has proceeded might offer valuable faculty opinion.

Results of this study, together with results from similar research, indicate that only small numbers of faculty follow official, step-by-step procedures for academic dishonesty adjudication. These faculty clearly have a more intimate knowledge of adjudication procedure than their colleagues who handle incidents themselves. Faculty with experience in policy implementation may have valuable opinions and advice to offer policy-makers.

Qualitative research designed to yield implementation information, from the perspective of the faculty, would be an important addition to the literature on academic dishonesty and academic dishonesty policy.

Summary

Academic dishonesty continues to detract from the learning environment so valued in American colleges and universities. Effective response must include collaboration between faculty, students and administrators. Perhaps no other issue cuts so clearly across divisional boundaries and impacts the entire college community.

In the two-year, multi-campus college, the community of learners (faculty, students and administrators) must be willing to seriously address the issue. Institutions should explore methods for involving part-time faculty in response efforts. Multiple campuses may offer the solution of multiple innovations to combat the problem. An institutional commitment to values education can provide the framework for response to academic dishonesty. Such a commitment might in fact offer philosophical support for practical solutions to a variety of institutional problems.

Failure to address academic dishonesty may very well result in the problem continuing, unabated and unnoticed. The impact of academic dishonesty on the learning environment, however, may be long-term and substantial.

REFERENCES

- Aaron, R. M. (1992). Student academic dishonesty: Are collegiate institutions addressing the issue? NASPA Journal, 29(2), 107-113.
- Aaron, R. M., & Georgia, R. T. (1994). Administrator perceptions of student academic dishonesty in collegiate institutions. NASPA Journal, 31(2), 83-91.
- Allen, W., & O'Bryan, S. (1993). Building a community of trust: the "single sanction" at Virginia. Synthesis: Law and Policy in Higher Education, 5(2), 356, 370-371.
- Anderson, R. E., & Obeshain, S. S. (1994). Cheating by students: Findings, reflections and remedies. Academic Medicine, 69(5), 323-332.
- Angelo, T. A., & Cross, K. P. (1993). Classroom Assessment Techniques: A Handbook for College Teachers. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Baird, J. S. (1980). Current trends in college cheating. Psychology In The Schools, 17(4), 515-522.
- Barnett, D. C., & Dalton, J. C. (1981). Why college students cheat. Journal of College Student Personnel, 22(6), 545-551.
- Bayens, E. J., & Paige, L. (1993). Academic dishonesty: A faculty's perspective. Georgia Journal of College Student Affairs, 8(1), 6-10.
- Berdie, D. R., Anderson, J. F., & Niebuhr, M. A. (1986). Questionnaires: Design and Use (2nd ed.). Metuchen, NJ: The Scarecrow Press, Inc.
- Berton, L. (1995 April). Business students hope to cheat and prosper, a new study shows. Wall Street Journal, p. 1.
- Bishop, M. (1993). What's wrong with cheating? Synthesis: Law and Policy in Higher Education, 5(1), 344-345.
- Blinn, L. V. (1994). Coping with cheating. Journal of College Science Teaching, 23(3), 173-174.

- Brenner, S. W. (1981). Charlotte's web: Due process in academic decisionmaking. Indiana Law Journal, 56(4), 725-755.
- Bricker, J. F. (1978). Administrative law - Due process - School and student rights - Fourteenth amendment due process does not require a hearing prior to the dismissal of a student for academic deficiencies. University of Detroit Journal of Urban Law, 56(1), 225-243.
- Brock, A. D. (1979). Board of Curators of the University of Missouri v. Horowitz: Student due process rights and judicial deference to academic dismissals. Williamette Law Review, 15(3), 577-590.
- Brock, P. (1994). The extremes of honor. Esquire, 122(4), 114-120.
- Brown, B. S. (1995). The academic ethics of graduate business students: A survey. Journal of Education for Business, 70(3), 151-156.
- Brown, V. L., & Buttolph, K. (1993). Student disciplinary issues: A legal compendium. Washington, DC: National Association of College and University Attorneys. (ERIC Document No. ED363186).
- California Community Colleges. (1994). Faculty ethics: Expanding the AAUP Ethics Statement. Sacramento, CA: Academic Senate, California Community Colleges. (ERIC Document No. ED369442).
- Caplin, L. (1994). 'Goughing' the honor system. Newsweek, 123(June 6), 33.
- Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. (1979). Fair Practices in Higher Education: Rights and Responsibilities of Students and Their Colleges in a Period of Intensified Competition for Enrollments. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1989). The Condition of the Professoriate: Attitudes and Trends, 1989. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. (ERIC Document No. ED312963).
- Collison, M. (1990 January). Apparent rise in student cheating has college officers worried. Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. 33,35.

- Cozby, P.C. (1993). Methods in Behavioral Research. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Co.
- Daniell, S. J. (1993). Graduate teaching assistants' attitudes toward and responses to academic honesty. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia.
- Davis, S. (1993). Cheating in college is for a career: Academic dishonesty in the 1990's. Atlanta, GA: Southeastern Psychological Association. (ERIC Document No. ED358382).
- Davis, S. (1992). Your cheating heart. Psychology Today, 25(November/December), 9.
- 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.
- Davis, S. F., & Ludvingson, H. W. (1995). Faculty forum: Additional data on academic dishonesty and a proposal for remediation. Teaching of Psychology, 22(2), 119-121.
- DiMatteo, L. A., & Wiesner, D. (1994). Academic honor codes: A legal and ethical analysis. Southern Illinois University Law Journal, 19(Fall), 49-106.
- Dowd, S. B. (1992). Academic integrity--A review and case study. Springfield, IL: Lincoln Land Community College. (ERIC Document No. ED349060).
- Dwyer, D. J., & Hecht, J. B. (1994). Cheating detection: Statistical, legal and policy implications. Illinois State University. (ERIC Document No. ED382066).
- Erdos, P. L. (1983). Professional Mail Surveys. Malabar, FL: Robert E. Krieger Publishing Co.
- Fass, R. A. (1986). By honor bound: Encouraging academic honesty. Educational Record, 67(4), 32-35.
- Fishbein, L. (1994). We can curb college cheating. Educational Digest, 59(7), 58-61.
- Forsyth, D. R., Pope, W. R., & McMillan, J. H. (1985). Students' reactions after cheating. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 10(1), 72-82.

- Fox, K. H. (1988). Due process and student academic misconduct. American Business Law Journal, 25(4), 671-700.
- Garred, E. (1991). Schools for scandal. People Weekly, 35(18), 103-104.
- Gehring, D., & Pavela, G. (1994). Issues and Perspectives on Academic Integrity. Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.
- Georgia, R. T. (1989). Permissiveness and discipline in the higher education setting: A prolegomenon. NASPA Journal, 27(2), 90-94.
- Gouran, D. S. (1989). Academic freedom and the management of higher education: An administrative perspective. San Francisco: Speech Communication Association. (ERIC Document No. ED313725).
- Graham, M. A. (1994). Cheating at small colleges: An examination of student and faculty attitudes and behaviors. Journal of College Student Development, 35(4), 255-260.
- 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), 343-354.
- Hanson, A. C. (1990). Academic dishonesty: The impact of student and institutional characteristics on cheating behavior. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles.
- Hardy, R. J. (1982). Preventing academic dishonesty: Some important tips for political science professors. Teaching Political Science, 9(2), 68-77.
- Hawley, C. S. (1984). The thieves of academe: Plagiarism in the university system. Improving College and University Teaching, 32(1), 35-39.
- Holcomb, T. (1992). A case study analysis of honor codes at six institutions of higher education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, Athens, GA.

- Hollander, P. A., Young, D. P., & Gehring, D. D. (1985). A practical guide to legal issues affecting college teachers. Asheville, NC: College Administration Publications.
- Jendrek, M. P. (1989). Faculty reactions to academic dishonesty. Journal of College Student Development, 30(5), 401-406.
- Jendrek, M. P. (1992). Students' reactions to academic dishonesty. Journal of College Student Development, 33(3), 260-273.
- Kagan. (1991). Adversarial legalism and American government. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 10(3), 369-406.
- Keith-Spiegel, P., Wittig, A. F., Perkins, D. V., Balogh, D. W., & Whitney, B. E. Jr. (1993). The Ethics of Teaching: A Casebook. Muncie, IN: Ball State University.
- Kerkvliet, J. (1994). Cheating by economics students: A comparison of survey results. Journal of Economic Education, 25(2), 121-133.
- Kibler, W. L. (1993). Academic dishonesty: A student development perspective. NASPA Journal, 30(4), 252-267.
- Kibler, W. L. (1993). Addressing academic dishonesty: What are institutions of higher education doing and not doing? NASPA Journal, 31(2), 92-101.
- Kibler, W. L. (1993). A framework for addressing academic dishonesty from a student development perspective. NASPA Journal, 31 (1), 8-18.
- Kibler, W. L., Nuss, E. M., Paterson, B. G., & Pavela, G. (1988). Academic Integrity and Student Development: Legal Issues, Policy Perspectives. Asheville, NC: College Administration Publications.
- Kibler, W. L., & Paterson, B. G. (1988). Strategies to Prevent Academic Dishonesty. W. L. Kibler, E. M. Nuss, B. G. Paterson, & G. Pavela (Eds.), Academic Integrity and Student Development: Legal Issues, Policy Perspectives. (pp. 19-36). Asheville, NC: College Administration Publications, Inc.

- Kingery, D. W., Bryant, L. D. P. L. K., & Araghi, F. A. (1989). A Handbook of Survey Research. Athens, GA: Survey Research Center, University of Georgia.
- Kolakowski, A. (1996). Why children cheat. Our Kids: The Magazine for Atlanta Parents, September, 35-39.
- Lee, B. (1987). Governance and the judiciary. M. Peterson ((Ed.)), Key resources on higher education governance, management and leadership (pp. 93-113). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Levine, D. R. (1995). Cheating in our schools: A national scandal. Reader's Digest, 147(882), 65-70.
- Livosky, M., & Tauber, R. T. (1994). View of cheating among college students and faculty. Psychology In The Schools, 31(1), 72-82.
- Ludeman, R. B. (1988). A survey of academic integrity practices in U.S. higher education. Journal of College Student Development, 29(2), 172-173.
- Manegold, C. S. (1994 April). Soul-searching by class of '94 at Annapolis. New York Times (Late New York Edition), p. 1.
- Maramark, S., & Maline, M. B. (1993). Issues in education: Academic dishonesty among college students (Report No. OR 93-3082 ed.). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.
- Markie, P. J. (1994). A Professor's Duties: Ethical Issues in College Teaching. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Mawdsley, R. D., & Permuth, S. (1986). Plagiarism and cheating. In Thomas N. Jones & Darel P. Semler, Eds., School Law Update, 1986. (ERIC Document No. ED272995).
- May, K. M., & Loyd, B. H. (1993). Academic dishonesty: The honor system and students' attitudes. Journal of College Student Development, 34(2), 125-129.
- McCabe, D. L. (1993). Faculty responses to academic dishonesty: The influence of honor codes. Research in Higher Education, 34(5), 647-658.

- McCabe, D. L., & Bowers, W. J. (1994). Academic dishonesty among males in college: A thirty year perspective. Journal of College Student Development, 35(1), 5-10.
- McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (1993). Academic dishonesty, honor codes and other contextual influences. Journal of Higher Education, 64(5), 522-538.
- Meade, J. (1992). Cheating: Is academic dishonesty par for the course? Prism, 1(2), 30-32.
- Miles, A. S. (1987). The due process rights of students in public school or college disciplinary hearings. The Alabama Lawyer, 48(3), 144-46.
- Moffatt, M. (1990). Undergraduate cheating. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University. (ERIC Document No. ED334921).
- Nuss, E. M. (1984). Academic integrity: Comparing faculty and student attitudes. Improving College and University Teaching, 32(3), 140-144.
- Partello, P. (1993). First-year students and cheating: A study at Keene State College. Research Strategies, 11(3), 174-79.
- Pavela, G. (1989). Academic decision-making and the law. Synthesis: Law and Policy in Higher Education, 1(3), 21-32.
- Pavela, G. (1993). Academic integrity and cultural diversity. Synfax Weekly Report, May 24(93.99), 95-96.
- Pavela, G. (1993). Academic integrity: Part 1. Synthesis: Law and Policy in Higher Education, 5(1), 337-352.
- Pavela, G. (1993). Academic integrity: Part 2. Synthesis: Law and Policy in Higher Education, 5(2), 353-372.
- Pavela, G. (1981 February). Cheating on the campus: Who's really to blame? Chronicle of Higher Education, p. 64.
- Pavela, G. (1988). The law and academic integrity. W. L. Kibler, E. M. Nuss, B. G. Paterson, & G. Pavela (Eds.), Academic Integrity and Student Development: Legal Issues, Policy Perspectives. (pp. 37-63). Asheville, NC: College Administration Publications, Inc.
- Pavela, G. (1990). Law and policy - 1990. Synthesis: Law and Policy in Higher Education, 2(1), 61-80.

- Pavela, G. (1992). Law and policy - 1992. Synthesis: Law and Policy in Higher Education, 4(1), 241-272.
- Pavela, G. (1993). Law and policy - 1993. Synthesis: Law and Policy in Higher Education, 4(4), 313-336.
- Pavela, G. (1994). Law and Policy: 1994. Synthesis: Law and Policy in Higher Education, 5(4), 397-416.
- Pavela, G. (1995). A media focus on academic fraud. Synfax Weekly Report, April 24(95.23), 354-355.
- Pavela, G. (1994). New data reveal increase in test cheating. Synfax Weekly Report, October 17(94.76), 285.
- Pavela, G. (1994). The perils of self-examination: MIT's academic dishonesty survey. Synfax Weekly Report, January 24(94.10), 179-181.
- Pavela, G. (1996). Preventing academic dishonesty. Synfax Weekly Report, January 22(96.3), 440.
- Pavela, G., & McCabe, D. (1993). The surprising return of honor codes. Planning for Higher Education, 21(4), 27-32.
- Pedhazur, E.J. & Schmelkin, L.P. (1991). Measurement, Design, and Analysis: An Integrated Approach. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates
- Peyser, M. (1992). A cheaters guide to high marks. Newsweek, 45.
- Rafetto, W. G. (1985). The cheat. Community and Junior College Journal, 56(2), 26-27.
- Rea, L.M. & Parker, R.A. (1992). Designing and Conducting Survey Research: A Comprehensive Guide. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ritter, D. A. (1993). Faculty approaches to plagiarism: Multiple influences, multiple strategies. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.
- Roig, M., & Ballew, C. (1992). Attitudes toward cheating by college students and professors. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association, (63rd, Boston, MA, April 3-5, 1992). (ERIC Document No. ED349895).

- Rutherford, D. G., & Olswang, S. G. (1981). Academic misconduct: The due process rights of students. NASPA Journal, 19(2), 12-16.
- Saunders, E. J. (1993). Confronting academic dishonesty. Journal of Social Work Education, 29(2), 224-231.
- Singhal, A. C. (1982). Factors in students' dishonesty. Psychological Reports, 51(3), 775-780.
- Singhal, A. C., & Johnson, P. (1983). How to halt student dishonesty. College Student Journal, 17(1), 13-19.
- Stoner, E. N., & Cerminara, K. L. (1990). Harnessing the "Spirit of Insubordination": A model student disciplinary code. Journal of College and University Law, 17(2), 277-297.
- Suskie, L. A. (1992). Questionnaire Survey Research: What Works. Tallahassee, FL: Association for Institutional Research.
- Swem, L. L. (1987). Due process rights in student disciplinary matters. Journal of College and University Law, 14(2), 359-382.
- Tabachnick, B., Keith-Spiegel, P., & Pope, K. S. (1991). Ethics of teaching: Beliefs and behaviors of psychologists as educators. American Psychologist, 46(5), 506-515.
- Tauber, R. T. (1984). Cheating and plagiarism: Matters beyond a faculty member's right to decide. New Orleans, LA: National Association of Teacher Educators . (ERIC Document No. ED 240969).
- Travelstead, W. W. (1987). Introduction and historical context. R. Caruso, & W. W. Travelstead (Eds.), (pp. 3-16). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Wilhoit, S. (1994). Helping students avoid cheating. College Teaching, 42(4), 161-164.
- Wright, J.C. & Kelly, R. (1974). Cheating: Student/faculty views and responsibilities. Improving College and University Teaching, 22(1), 31-34.
- Young, D.P. & Braswell, M.C. (1987). An Analysis of Student Academic Rights. J. C. Smart (Ed.), Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research (Vol. 3 ed., pp. 327-359). New York: Agathon Press.

COURT DECISIONS

Board of Curators of the University of Missouri v. Horowitz.
435 U.S. 78 (1978).

Clayton v. Trustees of Princeton University. 608 F.Supp.
413 (United States District Court, D. New Jersey,
1985).

Corso v. Creighton University. 731 F.2d 529. (United States
Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit, 1984).

Dixon v. Alabama State Board of Education. 294 F.2d 150.
(United States Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit. 1961).

Goldberg v. Regents of University of California. 57 Cal.
Rptr. 463. (California Court of Appeals, 1967).

Goss v. Lopez. 95 S.Ct. 729. (United States Supreme Court.
1975).

Hall v. Medical College of Ohio at Toledo. 742 F.2d 299
(United State Court of Appeals, Sixth Circuit, 1984).

Henson v. Honor Committee of University of Virginia. 719
F.2d 69. (United States Court of Appeals, Fourth
Circuit, 1983).

Hill v. Trustees of Indiana University. 537 F.2d 248.
(United States Court of Appeals, Seventh Circuit.
1976).

Jaska v. Regents of University of Michigan. 597 F.Supp.
1245 (United States District Court, E.D. Michigan,
S.D., 1984).

Jones v. Board of Governors of University of North Carolina.
704 F.2d 713. (United States Court of Appeals, Fourth
Circuit, 1983).

Lightsey v. King. 567 F.Supp. 645 (United States District
Court, E.D. New York, 1983).

Mary M. v. Clark. 473 N.Y.S. 2d 843 (Supreme Court of New
York, Appellate Division, Third Department, 1984).

McDonald v. Board of Trustees of University of Illinois.
375 *F.Supp.* 95. (United States District Court, N.D.
Illinois, E.D., 1974).

Napolitano v. Princeton University Trustees. 453 A.2d 263.
(Superior Court of New Jersey, App. Div., 1982).

Nash v. Auburn University. 812 *F.2d* 655. (United States
Court of Appeals, Eleventh Circuit, 1987).

Picozzi v. Sandalow. 623 *F.Supp.* 1571. (United States
District Court, E.D. Michigan, S.D. 1986).

Regents of the University of Michigan v. Ewing. 106 S.Ct.
507 (1985).

Slaughter v. Brigham Young University. 514 *F.2d* 622
(United States Court of Appeals, Tenth Circuit. 1975).

Sofair v. State University of New York. 406 N.Y.S. 2d 276
(Court of Appeals of New York, 1978).

Wood v. Strickland. 95 S.Ct. 992 (United States Supreme
Court. 1975).

APPENDIX A

**DEKALB COLLEGE ACADEMIC DISHONESTY POLICY
(Excerpt from DeKalb College Faculty Handbook)**

SECTION 400 - STUDENT AFFAIRS

401 ACADEMIC DISHONESTY POLICY

PROCEDURE

The student Academic Dishonesty Procedures are available to faculty members and other College personnel (hereinafter referred to as "faculty") who have reason to believe that a student has cheated or plagiarized. Prior to speaking to the student regarding the offense, the faculty member should have good reason to suspect that a student has committed these acts. The student must, in all cases, be given due process.

The College document "Report of Alleged Cheating or Plagiarism Incident," including a narrative describing the alleged offense, must be completed by the faculty member who chooses to bring a charge of cheating or plagiarism. The procedure is as follows:

1. A conference between the faculty member and student should be scheduled as soon as the incident occurs.
2. During the conference, the faculty member should explore with the student the incident or act of cheating or plagiarism that forms the basis of the accusation.
3. The content of the "Report of Alleged Cheating or Plagiarism Incident" should be discussed, and the student should sign in the designated space to acknowledge he or she has read and understood the report.
4. At this point, the student may choose either to appeal the accusation (Option 1) or to admit to violating the instructor's and/or the College's cheating policy by signing under Option 2. In either case, the student is given copy 3 of the report, and copy 1 is forwarded to the Campus Dean of Student Affairs.
5. Should the student choose to admit the offense (Option 2), the student signs a second time before a witness. The student must then be given a copy of the Report and advised to make an appointment with the Dean of Student Affairs. The student case should be heard by the College Court and a penalty assigned. The faculty member is free to assign the grade he or she thinks is appropriate for the assignment or the quarter.
6. Should the student choose to deny the act and/or request a hearing (Option 1), then a copy of the Report should be given to the student. The student must then be advised to make an appointment with the Dean of Student Affairs. The Dean

SECTION 400 - 401 (cont.)

will explain the procedures of the College's judicial system and will initiate the proceedings as explained in the *DeKalb College Student Handbook*.

7. A hearing will be arranged by the College Court Chief Justice during which the faculty member (accuser), student (accused) and witnesses will be called. A penalty in addition to the grade penalty which the faculty member may assign may be established by the Court if the student is found guilty.

The student may choose to remain in the class (unless suspended) until the end of the quarter. The faculty member assigns the grade appropriate according to the course syllabus. A grade of "NR" may be assigned if the case is in progress at the end of the grading period.

8. Both student and faculty member have the right to appeal a decision of the College Court as outlined in the *DeKalb College Catalog* and the *DeKalb College Student Handbook*.

APPENDIX B
SURVEY ON ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

A study of the perceptions of DeKalb College faculty of academic dishonesty and academic dishonesty policy.

The purpose of this research is to survey your perceptions of academic dishonesty and academic dishonesty policy at DeKalb College. The questionnaire asks basic questions about how you view issues surrounding academic dishonesty and academic dishonesty policy and procedures. Your participation is extremely important; the survey should take no longer than 10 minutes to complete.

Be assured that all responses will be held in strict confidence. Data and results will be presented in group form only; no data will be individually identifiable. Instruments are numbered for statistical coding and follow-up purposes alone. Please respond honestly to each item.

Responses should be based on what you consider to be your "home campus" (campus where you have taught the majority of your classes in the last 3 years); **Please answer all questions with your "home campus" in mind.** Academic dishonesty, as defined by the DeKalb College Academic Dishonesty Policy, refers to cheating and plagiarism.

Please answer every item. Upon completion please fold, place the questionnaire in the envelope provided, and place in campus mail, or the enclosed pre-addressed, stamped envelope.

YOUR PARTICIPATION IS APPRECIATED!

This research is supported by DeKalb College and by the Institute of Higher Education at the University of Georgia. Questions about this research can be directed to the Office of Institutional Research and Planning at DeKalb College (404) 244-5767 or the Institute of Higher Education at UGA (706) 542-3464.

=====

1. Please indicate what you consider to be your "home campus" (campus at which you have taught the majority of your classes the last 3 years). **Check one.**
 Central North Gwinnett South Rockdale Off-campus location

Please <u>circle the number</u> that most closely indicates your response.	not serious	somewhat serious	moderately serious	quite serious	very serious
2. How serious a problem is academic dishonesty at DeKalb College?	1	2	3	4	5
3. How serious a problem is academic dishonesty at your home campus?	1	2	3	4	5
4. How serious a problem is academic dishonesty in the courses you teach?	1	2	3	4	5

Please **circle the number** that most closely indicates your response.

- | | never | seldom | occasionally | often | frequently |
|--|-------|--------|--------------|-------|------------|
| 5. How often have you <u>suspected</u> that academic dishonesty occurred in your classroom? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. How often have you been <u>certain</u> that academic dishonesty occurred in your classroom? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

7. How did you respond the last time you suspected academic dishonesty in your classroom? **Check all that apply.**

- did not encounter academic dishonesty
- did nothing
- confronted student but didn't pursue the matter further
- dealt with the student one-on-one
- gave the student a warning
- lowered the grade on the item in question
- assigned an "F" for the course
- reported the incident to Department Chair
- reported the incident to the campus Dean of Students
- other (please specify) _____

8. How did you respond the last time you were certain academic dishonesty occurred in your classroom? **Check all that apply.**

- did not encounter academic dishonesty
- did nothing
- confronted student but didn't pursue the matter further
- dealt with the student one-on-one
- gave the student a warning
- lowered the grade on the item in question
- assigned an "F" for the course
- reported the incident to Department Chair
- reported the incident to the campus Dean of Students
- other (please specify) _____

Please circle the number that most closely indicates your response.

	strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
9. I am familiar with the college academic dishonesty policies and procedures.	1	2	3	4	5
10. The academic dishonesty procedures are overly time-consuming.	1	2	3	4	5
11. The academic dishonesty procedures are too adversarial.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Penalties handed down by the college court, for academic dishonesty, are often too lenient.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Penalties handed down by the college court, for academic dishonesty, are often too severe.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Allowing faculty to handle instances of academic dishonesty in the classroom, as they see fit, is an issue of academic freedom.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Potential personal liability, stemming from accusing a student of academic dishonesty, concerns me.	1	2	3	4	5
16. Reporting instances of academic dishonesty might be viewed, by a Department Chairperson, as evidence of the insufficient teaching skill of a faculty member.	1	2	3	4	5
17. A primary role of faculty members at DeKalb College is to teach values.	1	2	3	4	5
18. DeKalb College faculty should teach the importance of academic integrity.	1	2	3	4	5
19. In your opinion, who is primarily responsible for reducing academic dishonesty at DeKalb College? Please rank these four groups by assigning "1" to the group you feel should have the greatest responsibility to "4" as the group you feel should have the least responsibility.					

- Students _____
- Faculty _____
- Academic Administrators _____
- Student Services Administrators _____

Please check the one item for each question that best describes your status.

20. Employment status:
 full-time part-time
21. Normal teaching time(majority of courses):
 day evening/weekend
22. Tenure status:
 tenured non-tenured (tenure track) non-tenured (not tenure track) part-time faculty quarter-to-quarter contracted faculty
23. Rank:
 professor associate professor assistant professor instructor part-time faculty other _____
24. Academic Discipline/Department:
 Business Administration
 Developmental Studies
 English as a Second Language
 Fine Arts
 Health Science
 Humanities
 Interpreter Training
 Mathematics
 Physical Education
 Science
 Social Science
 Other _____
25. Length of service at DeKalb College:
 less than one year 1-2 years 3-4 years 5-11 years more than 11 years

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THE SURVEY!
PLEASE FOLD, PLACE IN THE PRE-ADDRESSED ENVELOPE, AND DROP IN CAMPUS MAIL.
IF YOU HAVE A PRE-ADDRESSED STAMPED ENVELOPE, SIMPLY PLACE IN THE U.S. MAIL.

APPENDIX C

SCALES FOR DATA ANALYSIS

Research Questions - Scale Scores

Scale 1 - Seriousness of the Academic Dishonesty Problem at DeKalb College

Scale 1 was composed of survey questions 2-6, seeking opinion on:

2. How serious a problem is academic dishonesty at DeKalb College?
3. How serious a problem is academic dishonesty at your home campus?
4. How serious a problem is academic dishonesty in the courses/labs you teach?
5. How often have you suspected that academic dishonesty occurred in your classroom?
6. How often have you been certain that academic dishonesty occurred in your classroom?

Individual questions yielded Likert Scale scores ranging from 1-5.
Scale 1 scores ranged from 5-25.

(5=not serious/never, 10=somewhat serious/seldom,
15=moderately serious/occasionally, 20=quite serious/often,
25= very serious/frequently)

Scale 2 - Concerns with Policy Implementation

Scale 2 was composed of survey questions 10-14, seeking response to:

10. The academic dishonesty procedures are overly time-consuming.
11. The academic dishonesty procedures are too adversarial.
12. Penalties handed down by the college court, for academic dishonesty, are often too lenient.
13. Penalties handed down by the college court, for academic dishonesty, are often too severe.

Individual questions yielded Likert Scale scores ranging from 1-5.
Scale 2 scores ranged from 4-20.

(4=strongly agree, 8=agree, 12=neutral, 16=disagree,
20=strongly disagree)

Scale 3 - Personal and Ideological Concerns

Scale 3 was composed of survey questions 14-16, seeking response to:

14. Allowing faculty to handle instances of academic dishonesty in the classroom, as they see fit, is an issue of academic freedom.
15. Potential personal liability, stemming from accusing a student of academic dishonesty, concerns me.
16. Reporting instances of academic dishonesty might be viewed, by a Department Chairperson, as evidence of the insufficient teaching skill of a faculty member.

Individual questions yielded Likert Scale scores ranging from 1-5.
Scale 3 scores ranged from 3-15.

(3=strongly agree, 6=agree, 9=neutral, 12=disagree,
15=strongly disagree)

Scale 4 - Attitudes About Values Education

Scale 4 was composed of survey questions 17&18, seeking response to:

17. A primary role of faculty members at DeKalb College is to teach values.
18. DeKalb College faculty should teach the importance of academic integrity.

Individual questions yielded Likert Scale scores ranging from 1-5.
Scale 4 scores ranged from 2-10.

(2=strongly agree, 4=agree, 6=neutral, 8=disagree, 10=strongly disagree)

APPENDIX D

ELECTRONIC MAIL TO DEKALB COLLEGE FACULTY

Message 7/22 From Jonathan L Burke

Feb 6, 97 12:25:18 pm -0500

Subject: Academic Dishonesty Survey

Date: Thu, 6 Feb 1997 12:25:18 -0500 (EST)

GENERAL MAILING - routed by George Bingaman (email - george)
To send mail to all users, send mail to email id "genmail".

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: DeKalb College Faculty

FROM: Jon Burke, Central Campus, Student Activities

Today, or tomorrow, you will receive a short survey in your campus mailbox. The survey, which is the data-collection portion of my doctoral research, seeks your opinion on issues related to academic dishonesty at DeKalb College. The research is approved and supported by both the Institute of Higher Education at the University of Georgia and by DeKalb College.

It should take no more than 5-10 minutes to complete; a return envelope is provided so that you may simply drop the survey back in campus mail. Responses will NOT BE individually identifiable; surveys are numbered for mailing and follow-up purposes ONLY.

I hope you can find a few minutes to assist in this important research project.

JB

APPENDIX E

COVER LETTER TO DEKALB COLLEGE FACULTY

MEMORANDUM

TO: DeKalb College Faculty

FROM: Jon Burke, Director of Student Activities, Central Campus *JB*

THROUGH: Thomas J. Anderson, Central Campus Provost *TJA*
Gretchen Neill, North Campus Provost *Gretchen Neill*
Randy Pierce, Gwinnett Campus Provost *Randy Pierce*
William Crews, South Campus Provost *William Crews*
Faye Tate, Rockdale Center Provost *Faye Tate*

DATE: February 6, 1997

Please find enclosed a short questionnaire on academic dishonesty. It should take only a few minutes to complete; your participation is extremely important. The questionnaire seeks your opinion on policies and procedures related to academic dishonesty at DeKalb College.

Your role in this research project is critical. There may be no more significant a perspective on academic integrity than that of the faculty, yet faculty perspective receives scant attention in the literature. The important view of both full-time and part-time two-year college faculty, who offer direct instruction to hundreds of thousands of college students each year, demands a forum.

Be assured that all responses will remain confidential and will be used for research purposes alone. Results will not be used in any individually-identifiable form. Instruments are numbered for mailing purposes only. Please respond candidly to each item, fold the instrument and return it via campus mail, in the envelope provided, no later than February 17.

As many of you know, this questionnaire serves as the data collection portion of my dissertation. The results should help to advance the base of knowledge in the area of academic integrity. Please feel free to contact me at (404) 299-4055, or by e-mail (jburke) should you have questions. This research is supported by both the Institute of Higher Education at the University of Georgia and by DeKalb College.

JB

Enclosure

NORTH CAMPUS
2101 WOMACK ROAD
DUNWOODY, GEORGIA 30338

CENTRAL CAMPUS
555 N. INDIAN CREEK DR.
CLARKSTON, GEORGIA 30021

SOUTH CAMPUS
3251 PANTHERSVILLE ROAD
DECATUR, GEORGIA 30034

GWINNETT CAMPUS
1301 ATKINSON ROAD
LAWRENCEVILLE, GEORGIA 30243

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES • 3251 PANTHERSVILLE ROAD • DECATUR, GEORGIA 30034

A TWO-YEAR UNIT OF THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA • *AFFIRMATIVE ACTION / EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

181

APPENDIX F

FOLLOW-UP POSTCARD

February 13, 1997

Last week a questionnaire seeking your views on the issue of ACADEMIC DISHONESTY was sent to you in Campus Mail. Full-time and Part-time teaching faculty at DeKalb College constitute the research population.

If you have already completed and returned the questionnaire, please accept my sincere thanks. If you have not returned the questionnaire, please do so today. Your participation in this research is extremely important.

If you did not receive the questionnaire, or if it has been misplaced, please call me at (404)299-4055, or contact me via e-mail (jburke) and I will see that you receive one today. Again, thank you for your help.

Jon Burke, Director of Student Activities, Central Campus

APPENDIX G

FOLLOW-UP ELECTRONIC MESSAGES

E-Mail Follow-Up Message: North Campus

Message 2/22 From Gretchen H Neill

Feb 24, 97 11:50:29 am -0500

Subject: Second and Final Distribution/Academic Dishonesty Questionnaire
To: north-faculty
Date: Mon, 24 Feb 1997 11:50:29 -0500 (EST)
Cc: jburke (Jonathan L Burke)

Dear North Faculty:

The second and final mailing of Jonathan Burke's questionnaire on academic dishonesty will be distributed this Thursday and Friday. John has again requested the support of the Provosts in this effort, and I hope that you will take a few moments to assist him with this project.

John reports that his total return rate is about 37% to date, and he would be very encouraged to boost this to 50%. Your assistance is very much appreciated.

Gretchen H. Neill
Interim Provost
North Campus NA2144

TEL 770 551-3060
FAX 770 604-3795
ELM gneill

E-Mail Follow-Up Message: South Campus

Message 3/22 From William C Crews

Feb 18, 97 11:01:42 am -0500

Subject: Research Project - Jon Burke

To: South-Faculty

Date: Tue, 18 Feb 1997 11:01:42 -0500 (EST)

Cc: WCrews, JBurke

You recently received a survey concerning Academic Dishonesty from Jon Burke. If you haven't already done so I would appreciate your completing the survey as soon as possible.

Thanks for your help!

Bill Crews

E-Mail Follow-Up Message: Gwinnett Campus

Message 4/22 From Carolyn C Darr

Feb 18, 97 09:19:01 am -0500

Subject: John Burke's Study

To: gwinnett-faculty

Date: Tue, 18 Feb 1997 09:19:01 -0500 (EST)

Cc: jburke (Jonathan L Burke)

I know everyone is busy. The end of the quarter is just around the corner. I just wanted to remind you to complete John's questionnaire on Academic Dishonesty if you haven't done so.

We need to support scholarly research. Besides, you may need a respondent or two yourself someday.

Thanks, Randy Pierce

APPENDIX H
FOLLOW-UP COVER LETTER



February 20, 1997

Dear Faculty Member:

Two weeks ago I requested your input for a research project on academic dishonesty at DeKalb College. The response has been encouraging; faculty have both an obvious interest in the topic and an important viewpoint to be considered. I am writing you today to ask for your response. Records indicate that you have not yet returned a questionnaire. Your participation in the research is significant; your opinions are valuable.

An underlying premise of the research is that institutional policy is too often promulgated without consideration of issues in implementation. Central to the implementation of many college policies is the role of instructional faculty. The opinion of the faculty, I'm convinced, is critical to success in addressing academic dishonesty in the collegiate setting.

The questionnaire will take only a few minutes to complete. A return envelope has been enclosed for your convenience. Simply fold the completed questionnaire, place in the return envelope, and drop in campus mail (or in the U.S. Mail if you have a *stamped* return envelope) by March 7, 1997. Please be assured that responses will remain confidential. Questionnaires are numbered simply for mailing and follow-up purposes. Data will not be reported in individually identifiable form.

Your cooperation in this research will both assist me in completing my dissertation, and help add to the scholarship in the area of academic integrity. Please don't hesitate to contact me at (404) 299-4055 or by e-mail (jburke) should you have any questions. This project is supported by both the Institute of Higher Education at the University of Georgia and by DeKalb College.

Sincerely,

Jon Burke
Director, Student Activities
Central Campus

Enclosure

Central Campus • 555 N. Indian Creek Drive • Clarkston, GA 30021-2395 • (404) 299-4000

District Offices
3251 Panthersville Rd.
Decatur, GA 30034
(404) 244-5090

North Campus
2101 Womack Rd.
Dunwoody, GA 30338
(404) 551-3000

South Campus
3251 Panthersville Rd.
Decatur, GA 30034
(404) 244-5090

Gwinnett Campus
1301 Atkinson Rd.
Lawrenceville, GA 30243
(404) 995-2191

Rockdale Center
1115 West Avenue
Conyers, GA 30207
(404) 785-6970

A two-year unit of the University System of Georgia • An Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity employer

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX I

DEKALB COLLEGE APPROVAL OF RESEARCH

189

Memorandum

DeKalb College
Office of Institutional Research and Planning

DATE: July 5, 1996
TO: Bill Crews
FROM: Albertine Walker-Marshall *AWM*
RE: Doctoral Research Proposal -- Jon Burke
CC: Jon Burke
Martha Nesbitt
Deborah Urquhart
Linda Exley

I have reviewed the research proposal as submitted by Jon Burke. The extent to which our faculty members use the academic dishonesty policy should be of benefit to the College as we continue the process renewal initiative. I, therefore, grant approval from this office for the research to take place.

I am forwarding a copy of the proposal to Linda Exley.



U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



JC 990415

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Faculty Perceptions of and Attitudes Toward Academic Dishonesty at a Two-year College	
Author(s): Jonathan L. Burke	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date: 5/27/97

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 1



XX

Level 2A



Level 2B



Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, →

Signature:	Printed Name/Position/Title: Jonathan L. Burke, Dean of Students	
Organization Address: Elizabethtown Community College Elizabethtown, KY 42701	Telephone: 270-769-2371	FAX:
	E-Mail Address: jon.burke@kctcs.net	Date: 7/12/99

