

MOTIVES FOR ACADEMIC DISHONESTY:
GENDER DIFFERENCES AMONG
CRIMINAL JUSTICE
STUDENTS

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council
of Texas State University- San Marcos
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements

for the Degree

Master of SCIENCE

by

Brooke Anderson Miller, B.A.

San Marcos, Texas
August 2005

COPYRIGHT

by

Brooke Anderson Miller

2005

This thesis is dedicated to my father,
Gregory Anderson Miller.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my mother and sister for their everlasting love and encouragement. They are my inspiration for everything that I do in life. Also, I would like to thank my fiancé for his patience, support and love during this stressful time. As always, he gave me the strength that I needed to succeed.

I am very thankful to the members of my thesis committee, Dr. Pollock, Dr. Martinez and Dr. Deibert. Their assistance and guidance made this possible. It is to my thesis chair, Dr. Pollock, that I owe the most overwhelming debt of gratitude. Her persistence, knowledge and encouragement helped me to accomplish this task. Finally, thank you to all the criminal justice professors who allowed me to administer surveys during class time and to all of the students who completed the surveys.

This manuscript was submitted on July 8, 2005.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	viii
ABSTRACT	ix
CHAPTER	
I. OVERVIEW OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY	1
Who Cheats?	
Situational Characteristics	
Individual Characteristics	
Academic Characteristics	
Personality Characteristics	
Why Students Cheat?	
Reasons for Engaging in Academic Dishonesty	
Future Cheating Behaviors	
II. CHEATING FROM A THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE	39
Social Control Theory	
Rational Choice Theory	
Hypotheses	
III. DATA COLLECTION	50
Measure	
Procedure	
Sample	
IV. RESULTS	56
Cheating	
Cheating and Gender	
Attachment	
Rational Choice Theory	

V.	DISCUSSION	68
	Cheating	
	Cheating and Gender	
	Attachment	
	Rational Choice Theory	
VI.	LIMITATIONS, FUTURE STUDIES, POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSION	77
	Limitations	
	Future Studies	
	Policy Implications	
	Conclusion	
	APPENDIX A	87
	APPENDIX B	91
	APPENDIX C	93
	APPENDIX D	94
	REFERENCES	95

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1 Situational Characteristics and Academic Dishonesty	7
Table 1.2 Individual Characteristics and Academic Dishonesty	16
Table 1.3 Academic Characteristics and Academic Dishonesty	21
Table 1.4 Personality Characteristics and Academic Dishonesty	26
Table 1.5 Reasons Students Cheat	36
Table 3.1 Age of Respondents	54
Table 4.1 Cheating Scales	57
Table 4.2 Total Collegiate Cheating	60
Table 4.3 Cheating and Gender	62

ABSTRACT

MOTIVES FOR ACADEMIC DISHONESTY: GENDER DIFFERENCES AMONG CRIMINAL JUSTICE STUDENTS

by

Brooke Anderson Miller, B.A.

Texas State University-San Marcos

August 2005

SUPERVISING PROFESSOR: JOYCELYN POLLOCK

Regardless of the level at which it occurs, academic dishonesty is a serious matter. The issue of collegiate academic dishonesty is especially problematic, as it undermines the goals and principles of academia. Because of this, it is essential for universities to more fully understand academic dishonesty, specifically the motives and

rationales that students embrace. In doing this, universities can minimize future transgressions and preserve the dignity of higher education.

This research explores the topic of collegiate academic dishonesty. Relevant literature from various disciplines is reviewed, with special attention given to which students of higher education cheat, why they engage in academic dishonesty and whether any significant gender differences exist. The hypothesis presented in this paper is that among undergraduate college students enrolled in criminal justice courses, differences exist with regard to the cheating behaviors of women and men. Specifically, male college students will cheat more than their female counterparts.

Cheating can be classified as a deviant or a criminal act. For this reason, theories of delinquency and crime serve as an appropriate framework for studying academic dishonesty. In this study, Hirschi's social control theory and rational choice theory are used to explain the cheating behaviors of female and male students. The hypotheses presented in this paper are that the attachment component of social control theory will better explain the cheating behaviors of women and that rational choice theory will better explain the cheating behaviors of men.

CHAPTER I

OVERVIEW OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

Research indicates that academic dishonesty is a pervasive phenomenon in the United States (Davis, Grover, Becker and McGregor, 1992; Maramark and Maline, 1993; McCabe and Trevino, 1997, 1996; Pulvers and Diekhoff, 1999; Tang and Zuo, 1997; Tibbetts, 1998; Whitley, 1998). While students at all academic levels engage in cheating behaviors, academic dishonesty among undergraduate college students is particularly problematic. Although many researchers disagree on the actual rate of academic dishonesty (McCabe and Bowers, 1994; Tibbetts, 1998), studies indicate that between 40 and 90 percent of college students admit to cheating (Davis et al., 1992:16). Despite these statistics more than 80 percent of college students report that “under no circumstances is cheating justified” (McCabe and Trevino, 1996:30).

Not only has cheating been coined “the academic equivalent of urban crime” (Alschuler and Blimling, 1995:123), but academic dishonesty has become so prevalent that it has been described as “...an academic skill almost as important as reading, writing, and math” (Moffatt, 1990:2). Research on academic dishonesty reveals that the cheating epidemic has skyrocketed over the years. Early literature on academic dishonesty estimated that 23 percent of students in 1941 were guilty of cheating (Drake, 1941:419).

Incidents of cheating continued to increase with reports of 37 percent in 1952 (Goldsen, Rosenberg, Williams and Suchman, 1960:75), 50 percent in 1964 (Hetherington and Feldman, 1964:214), and 76 percent in 1980 (Baird, 1980:519). According to The Center for Academic Integrity (CAI), approximately 70 percent of students on college campuses report engaging in some form of academic dishonesty during their college career, with 25 percent engaging in “serious” cheating (CAI, 2005). Although the estimates of academic dishonesty are fairly high, Haines, Diekhoff, LaBeff and Clark (1986:345) estimate that the detection rate is as low as 1.3 percent. As the research illustrates, academic dishonesty is a perpetual problem that warrants attention.

Academic dishonesty is typically defined as “any action or behavior that provides a student with undue or unfair advantage over others without the explicit consent of the instructor” (Hall and Kuh, 1998:3-4). Although academic dishonesty consists of various forms of cheating, including plagiarism, researchers typically focus on direct test cheating, as it is viewed as the most severe and most common mode of cheating (McCabe and Bowers, 1994; Spiller and Crown, 1995; Tibbetts, 1999). While there are countless methods of cheating, technological advancements have created additional opportunities and techniques for students to cheat. Computers and word processing programs allow students to “cut and paste” information and the Internet provides students with instantaneous access to vast amounts of information, including websites that manufacture research papers (Austin and Brown, 1999). There are hundreds of these “term paper mills” in operation and some, such as the “School Sucks” website (www.schoolsucks.com), receive over 10,000 “unique visitors” each day (Personal Correspondence with Sahr, 2005).

In addition, students have used programmable calculators and watches, cellular phones, personal electronic organizers, such as Palm Pilots, and other electronic devices to commit acts of academic dishonesty (Lathrop and Foss, 2000). These new hi-tech methods are likely to increase the occurrence of cheating in the years to come. As a result, information generated from studies on academic dishonesty can provide valuable insight for professors and administrators who must constantly battle academic dishonesty.

WHO CHEATS?

SITUATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Various situational characteristics have been studied in relation to academic dishonesty. These findings are presented in Table 1.1. In terms of locality of the college, Robinson, Amburgey, Swank and Faulkner (2004) report similar cheating behaviors between rural and urban institutions. When studying academic dishonesty among high school students, those who attended private religious schools cheated more than those attending public and non-religious private schools (Josephson Institute, 2002). However, McCabe and Trevino (1993) failed to find any significant differences regarding the cheating behaviors of students in private and public institutions.

Research has consistently found that cheating is less common at schools with honor codes (Bowers, 1964; May and Loyd, 1993; McCabe and Trevino, 1997, 1993; McCabe, Trevino and Butterfield, 2002) than at schools that use proctor systems to control academic dishonesty (Bonjean and McGee, 1965a). These findings are presented in Table 1.1. According to The Center for Academic Integrity, test cheating is approximately one-third to one-half lower at honor code campuses, while cheating on

written assignments is one-fourth to one-third lower (CAI, 2005). According to McCabe et al. (2002), academic dishonesty is highest at institutions without any type of honor code at all, moderate at institutions with modified honor codes and lowest at institutions with traditional honor codes. However, having an academic honor code does not automatically translate into lower levels of cheating. “The honor system by itself means very little; the key is adoption of the honor system values by the individual student. Values of academic dishonesty cannot be imposed, but must be adopted” (May and Loyd, 1993:128). In addition to accepting the institutional policy, students must fully understand the code in order for it to be an effective deterrent. Researchers have found that students who cheat have a less clear understanding of their schools’ cheating policy than those who do not cheat (Bonjean and McGee, 1965a; Jordan, 2001; McCabe and Trevino, 1993).

McCabe and Trevino (1997) and Thorpe, Pittenger and Reed (1999) conclude that academic dishonesty is more common at large state-supported campuses. Nevertheless, some studies still indicate that up to 64 percent of students from smaller universities engage in academic dishonesty (Davis et al., 1992:17). In addition, schools with selective admission policies and those with more students living on-campus tend to report lower levels of academic dishonesty (McCabe and Trevino, 1996).

In contrast, others have found that students who cheat more often tend to live on-campus in college residence halls (Graham, Monday, O’Brien and Steffen, 1994; Whitley, 1998). These findings are presented in Table 1.1. When analyzing academic dishonesty on a smaller college campus with an enrollment of 8,350 students, Dawkins (2004) found that students who live on-campus report higher rates of classroom cheating

than those who live off-campus. Furthermore, of the students living on-campus, those who live in high occupancy dormitories are significantly less likely to cheat than those students who reside in lower occupancy dormitories (Dawkins, 2004).

Other factors, such as classroom environment and student-instructor relationships have been associated with academic dishonesty (Stearns, 2001) and are presented in Table 1.1. Nowell and Laufer (1997) conclude that large class size, which is most often found at larger campuses, increases the amount of cheating. Similarly, Hall and Kuh (1998) found that cheating occurs more often in large, lecture-oriented introductory courses because of the anonymity and lack of student-instructor relationship. In terms of academic dishonesty and seating in the classroom, Houston (1976) did not find a significant relationship between sitting in the front or back of the classroom, but did find that cheating occurs more often when there is free seating, as opposed to assigned seating, and when students sit near their friends during exams (Houston, 1986).

Moreover, Kerkvliet and Sigmund (1999) found that several techniques reduced the likelihood of academic dishonesty during exams. Specifically, having multiple versions of exams can reduce cheating approximately 25 percent, using additional proctors can reduce cheating by 11 percent, and issuing verbal warnings before exams begin can reduce cheating by 13 percent (Kerkvliet and Sigmund, 1999:341). Hollinger and Lanza-Kaduce (1996) found that the most effective countermeasures were scrambling of the test questions, using multiple forms of the exam, having smaller classes and increasing the number of test proctors. Essay exams, widely spaced seating during exams and high instructor vigilance were other effective measures for decreasing the

occurrence of academic dishonesty (Genereux and McLeod, 1995). These findings are presented in Table 1.1.

Genereux and McLeod (1995) found that the personality of the instructor was linked to collegiate cheating. Specifically, students with positive perceptions of their instructors cheated less than those with negative perceptions. In addition to perceptions of the instructor, perceptions of the instructor-student relationship are also related to cheating (Stearns, 2001). Students are less likely to cheat if they believe their instructor is genuinely concerned with academic dishonesty (Genereux and McLeod, 1995; Roig and Ballew, 1994) or committed to the course (McCabe and Trevino, 1996). According to The Center for Academic Integrity, students report that academic dishonesty is more pervasive in courses where faculty members overlook cheating (CAI, 2005). Also, Jackson, Levine, Furnham and Burr (2002) found a relationship between academic dishonesty and a relaxed departmental climate.

In a similar vein, students reported higher rates of cheating when they perceived class material as irrelevant or boring (Genereux and McLeod, 1995; Pulvers and Diekhoff, 1999) and if class exams or assignments are perceived as being unreasonably difficult (Davis and Ludvigson, 1995; Genereux and McLeod, 1995). Graham et al. (1994) discovered that students in their sample said they were more inclined to cheat if they believed that their instructor was unfair. Bichler and Tibbetts (2003) found that students who experience several forms of strain related to unfairness were more likely to cheat.

Kerkvliet and Sigmund (1999) and Nowell and Laufer (1997) discovered that the professional status of the instructor affected academic dishonesty. These findings are

presented in Table 1.1. In classes taught by Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs), students were 32 percent more likely to cheat (Kerkvliet and Sigmund, 1999:341). Similarly, compared to tenured faculty, Nowell and Laufer (1997) found higher rates of academic dishonesty with adjunct professors.

Table 1.1. Situational Characteristics and Academic Dishonesty

SITUATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS	SIGNIFICANT CHEATING FINDINGS	STUDY (YEAR)	METHOD	N
Class Material	More cheating when material is viewed as boring or irrelevant	Genereux & McLeod (1995)	Survey	365
		Pulvers & Diekhoff (1999)	Survey	280
	More cheating when material is viewed as unreasonably difficult	Davis & Ludvigson (1995)	Survey	2,153
		Genereux & McLeod (1995)	Survey	365
Class Size	More cheating in large classes	Hall & Kuh (1998)	Interview	303
		Hollinger & Lanza-Kaduce (1996)	Survey	1,672
		Nowell & Laufer (1997)	Experiment	311
Exams and Related Variables	Less cheating when multiple versions of exams are used	Hollinger & Lanza-Kaduce (1996)	Survey	1,672
		Kerkvliet & Sigmund (1999)	Survey	393
	Less cheating with essay exams	Genereux & McLeod (1995)	Survey	365
	Less cheating when additional proctors are used during exams	Hollinger & Lanza-Kaduce (1996)	Survey	1,672
		Kerkvliet & Sigmund (1999)	Survey	393
	Less cheating when verbal warnings are issued before exams	Kerkvliet & Sigmund (1999)	Survey	393
	Less cheating when exam questions are scrambled	Hollinger & Lanza-Kaduce (1996)	Survey	1,672
Instructor	Less cheating for students with positive perceptions of instructor	Genereux & McLeod (1995)	Survey	365
	Less cheating when students believe instructor is concerned with cheating	Genereux & McLeod (1995)	Survey	365
		Roig & Ballew (1994)	Survey	404
	Less cheating when students believe instructor is committed to the course	McCabe & Trevino (1996)	Meta-Analysis	N/A
	More cheating when instructors overlook cheating	CAI (2005)	Survey	12,000
	More cheating when departmental climate is relaxed	Jackson et al (2002)	Survey	107
	More cheating when students believe instructor is unfair	Graham et al (1994)	Survey	480
	More cheating when instructor is a Graduate Teaching Assistant	Kerkvliet & Sigmund (1999)	Survey	393
	More cheating when instructor is an adjunct professor	Nowell & Laufer (1997)	Experiment	311

Location of Institution	No difference for location of institution	Robinson et al (2004)	Survey	118
Seating Arrangement	More cheating when sitting next to friends	Houston (1986)	Survey	100
	No difference between sitting in the front or back of the classroom	Houston (1976)	Experiment	197
	Less cheating with spaced seating	Genereux & McLeod (1995)	Survey	365
Student Living	Less cheating at institutions with more students living on-campus	McCabe & Trevino (1996)	Meta-Analysis	N/A
	More cheating for students living on-campus in residence halls	Dawkins (2004)	Survey	858
		Graham et al (1994)	Survey	480
		Whitley (1998)	Meta-Analysis	N/A
	Less cheating for students living in high-occupancy dormitories	Dawkins (2004)	Survey	858
Type of Institution	More cheating at private religious institutions	Josephson Institute (2002)	Survey	12,000
	No difference for type of institution	McCabe & Trevino (1993)	Survey	6,096
	Less cheating at honor code institutions	Bonjean & McGee (1965a)	Survey/ Vignette	392
		Bowers (1964)	Survey	5,422
		CAI (2005)	Survey	50,000
		May & Loyd (1993)	Survey	177
		McCabe & Trevino (1997)	Survey	1,793
		McCabe & Trevino (1993)	Survey	6,096
		McCabe et al (2002)	Survey	N/A
	More cheating at large state-supported institutions	McCabe & Trevino (1997)	Survey	1,793
		Thorpe et al (1999)	Survey	310
	Less cheating at institutions with selective admission policies	McCabe & Trevino (1996)	Meta-Analysis	N/A

INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS

Numerous individual factors have been analyzed in order to identify which students in higher education cheat. These findings are presented in Table 1.2. For instance, the majority of research indicates that younger college students cheat more frequently than their older counterparts (Antion and Michael, 1983; Haines et al., 1986; McCabe and Trevino, 1997; Nonis and Swift, 2001; Whitley, 1998). Tang and Zuo (1997), however, found that older students engage in acts of academic dishonesty more

often than younger students. Interestingly, Hetherington and Feldman (1964) found that first-born children were more likely to cheat.

When looking at classification or year in school, the research is fairly inconsistent. These findings are presented in Table 1.2. According to some (Crown and Spiller, 1998; Michaels and Miethe, 1989), students who are underclassmen engage in the most academic dishonesty. Nevertheless, Lipson and McGavern (1993) conclude that sophomores are the most likely to cheat, while others suggest that students approaching graduation cheat more (Barnes, 1975; Kerkvliet and Sigmund, 1999; Pino and Smith, 2003).

When comparing students who cheat with those who do not, cheaters tend to be less mature and are less likely to be married (Diekhoff, LaBeff, Clark, Williams, Francis and Haines, 1996; Haines et al., 1986). It seems that students who have more of their own money invested in their education are less likely to cheat. For instance, those who cheat are more likely to be receiving scholarships (Diekhoff et al., 1996) and more likely to be financially dependent on their parents (Diekhoff et al., 1996; Haines et al., 1986; Whitley, 1998). Also, according to The Center for Academic Integrity, students whose families earn over \$150,000 a year are 50 percent more likely to cheat regularly in college than students whose families earn less than \$25,000 a year (Tetzeli, 1991:14). These findings are presented in Table 1.2.

Haines et al. (1986) found that cheaters were less likely to be employed. In terms of students who are employed, a negative relationship has been found between cheating and the number of hours worked (Diekhoff et al., 1996; Haines et al., 1986; Whitley, 1998). On the other hand, Nowell and Laufer (1997) found that students who worked,

whether it was full-time or part-time, were more likely to engage in acts of academic dishonesty than were students who did not work. These findings are presented in Table 1.2.

Among high school students, varsity athletes were found to cheat on exams more than students who were not varsity athletes (Josephson Institute, 2002). Both intercollegiate athletes and students who participate in extracurricular activities report higher rates of cheating in college (McCabe and Trevino, 1997). Students who are more involved in extracurricular activities (Whitley, 1998), such as intramural or varsity sports (Haines et al., 1986), tend to report more instances of academic dishonesty.

Storch and Storch (2002) studied academic dishonesty among members and non-members of Greek organizations. Consistent with previous research (Bonjean and McGee, 1965b; Goldsen et al., 1960; Haines et al., 1986; McCabe and Bowers, 1996; McCabe and Trevino, 1997; Pino and Smith, 2003; Robinson et al., 2004; Stannard and Bowers, 1970; Whitley, 1998), they conclude that compared to non-members, members of fraternities and sororities reported higher rates of academic dishonesty (Storch and Storch, 2002). While no difference was found between sororities and fraternities, Storch and Storch (2002) did discover that members with greater involvement in their Greek organizations reported higher rates of academic dishonesty. This was consistent with the findings of Bowers (1964) and McCabe and Bowers (1996), in that members of Greek organizations who live in their fraternity or sorority houses, report higher levels of academic dishonesty than those who are affiliated with a Greek organization, but live elsewhere.

Stannard and Bowers (1970) found that although members of fraternities and sororities engage in greater amounts of academic dishonesty than non-members, when the overall campus dominance of Greek organizations is high, lower rates of cheating occur. When campuses have high percentages of students involved in Greek organizations, both the members, as well as the non-members, report lower instances of cheating (Stannard and Bowers, 1970). However, this finding was not replicated by McCabe and Bowers (1996).

In addition, a study conducted by Eberhardt, Rice and Smith (2003) at a small, church-affiliated, liberal arts college found that the only difference between Greeks and non-Greeks was with fabrication of sources, not with direct test cheating. Moreover, this difference was only significant among Greek and non-Greek women, and did not apply to Greek and non-Greek men (Eberhardt et al., 2003). Regardless, it is important to remember that "...although it is clear that more cheating occurs among fraternity and sorority members than non-members, it is also clear that cheating would not disappear, or even change dramatically, if fraternities or sororities did not exist on campus" (McCabe and Bowers, 1996:290).

Kerkvliet (1994) utilized self-report surveys, as well as a random response questionnaire, when studying academic dishonesty and found that the student who was the most likely to cheat was both a resident member of a Greek organization, as well as a heavy drinker. Drinking and "partying" are factors related to academic dishonesty, regardless of membership in a fraternity or a sorority. Straw (2002) and Whitley (1998) found that partying and socializing are positively related to cheating, while Kerkvliet (1994) found that weekly alcohol consumption was directly related to cheating.

Very little research has been conducted on the topic of race or ethnicity and academic cheating. No relationship has been found between the frequency of academic dishonesty and race or ethnicity (Tang and Zuo, 1997). Sutton and Huba (1995) found that no racial differences existed between Caucasian and African-American students in terms of their perceptions of what types of behaviors constitute or define academic dishonesty. These findings are presented in Table 1.2.

According to Sutton and Huba (1995), students who participate in religious activities vary in their perceptions of what behaviors are considered to be acts of academic dishonesty. These findings are presented in Table 1.2. Students with higher levels of religious participation were more likely than other students to believe that “padding” a bibliography, plagiarizing a few sentences in a paper and collaborating with students on homework when the professor specifically forbids it, constitute academic dishonesty (Sutton and Huba, 1995). Additionally, students who had higher levels of religious involvement were less likely than students with lower levels to believe that cheating can be justified (Sutton and Huba, 1995).

Storch and Storch (2001) explored academic dishonesty and three domains of religiosity: specifically, organizational, non-organizational and intrinsic religiosity. As defined by Koenig, Parkerson and Meador (1997), organizational religiosity refers to attending formal religious services, such as church, while non-organizational religiosity refers to participation in private religious activities, for instance, meditation and prayer. Intrinsic religiosity, however, refers to the integration of religiousness into life endeavors, such as experiencing a Divine presence (Koenig et al., 1997; Storch and Storch, 2001). Storch and Storch (2001) discovered that those with high non-organizational and intrinsic

religiosity reported the lowest levels of cheating. Although Bonjean and McGee (1965b) found that religiously active students cheat less than religiously inactive students, Hetherington and Feldman (1964) found that those who attend church regularly cheated more frequently than those who attend church irregularly. These findings are presented in Table 1.2.

In terms of gender, previous research has yielded mixed results. These inconsistent findings are presented in Table 1.2. The majority of research reveals that men generally report higher rates of cheating than women (Aiken, 1991; Bowers, 1964; Calabrese and Cochran, 1990; Davis et al., 1992; Davis and Ludvigson, 1995; Genereux and McLeod, 1995; Hetherington and Feldman, 1964; McCabe and Trevino, 1997; Tang and Zuo, 1997; Whitley, Nelson and Jones, 1999). More specifically, male college students tend to report higher rates of cheating on exams than female college students (Michaels and Miethe, 1989), as well as higher rates of repeat cheating in both high school and college (Davis and Ludvigson, 1995). Moreover, female students tend to cheat less than male students on vocabulary tests in elementary school, but more than male students on math exams (David, 1973 as cited in Bushway and Nash, 1977). Female students may also cheat more often during the first years of education; however, male students surpass them by the end of high school (Feldman and Feldman, 1967 as cited in Bushway and Nash, 1977).

Male college students also admitted to more serious cheating behaviors than female college students (Rettinger, Jordan and Peschiera, 2004) and were more likely than female students to use false excuses, “fabricated specifically for the purpose of avoiding an academic responsibility” (Caron, Whitbourne and Halgin, 1992:90).

Likewise, McCabe and Bowers (1996:284) found that male students who engage in academic dishonesty do so significantly more often than female cheating students. This conclusion held true regardless of affiliation with a sorority or fraternity (McCabe and Bowers, 1996). Storch and Storch (2001) found that women with high organizational religiosity (for instance, participation in formal religious activities) reported higher levels of cheating compared to women with moderate and minimal levels of organizational religiosity.

The general finding that male students cheat more than female students is not unique to the United States. Newstead, Franklyn-Stokes and Armstead (1996) found that English men cheated at a higher rate than English women. Other researchers, however, conclude that there is no significant difference between the cheating behaviors of male and female college students (Baird, 1980; Diekhoff et al., 1996; Diekhoff, LaBeff, Shinohara and Yasukawa, 1999; Haines et al., 1986; McCabe and Trevino, 1997; Nowell and Laufer, 1997). For instance, Storch and Storch (2001) found that male and female students who rated high in organizational religiosity did not differ in terms of their reported rates of cheating. Nevertheless, some find that women cheat more than their male counterparts (Jacobson, Berger and Millham, 1970; Kerkvliet, 1994; Leming, 1980). These findings are presented in Table 1.2.

Some credit the increase in cheating over the years to an increase in the number of female students who cheat, as well as to the increase in the total number of female students. According to McCabe and Bowers (1996:285), in the 30 years between 1963 and 1993, the number of female college students who admitted to cheating increased from 59 percent to 70 percent, while their male counterparts consistently reported 69 and

70 percent. McCabe and Bowers (1996) attribute this increase in cheating among female college students to their need to become and remain competitive in previously male dominated majors, such as business, science and engineering. Furthermore, female graduate students pursuing a Master of Business Administration (MBA) cheat more frequently than female students in other graduate programs (Tetzeli, 1991).

In addition, Whitley (1998) discovered that differences in the cheating behaviors of men and women vary depending upon the measurement tool used. Specifically, greater differences exist between genders when the researcher utilizes self-report measures as in survey research, as opposed to direct measurement or experimental designs. According to Smith, Davy, Rosenberg and Haight (2002) and Smith, Ryan and Diggins (1972) this difference can be attributed to the idea that male students would feel less guilty about cheating, and thus, would be more likely to confess than female students.

On the other hand, female students may simply be more ethical than male students. In a review of the literature on ethical decision-making, Ford and Richardson (1994:206) discovered that half of the studies found that women tend to act more ethically than men. Others have supported this idea, attributing the difference to the different socialization processes of men and women (Cochran, Wood, Sellers, Wilkerson and Chamlin, 1998; Ward and Beck, 1990; Whitley, 1998). Sex-role socialization, according to Ward and Beck (1990), purports that, unlike men, women are socialized to obey the rules of society. In addition, sex-role socialization "...is thought to influence tendencies toward dishonesty through differences in internalized role requirements" (Ward and Beck, 1990:333). Alternatively, this difference can be credited to biological

differences, specifically that men are innately prone to participate in more risky and sensation-seeking behaviors (Zuckerman, 1994), which could include acts of academic cheating.

When constructing a profile of the typical college cheater, Tang and Zuo (1997) discovered differences between the genders. For instance, they found that while there is no pattern of when male students cheat, female are typically sophomores, juniors or seniors, but not freshman. Male cheaters typically have lower GPAs and claim to have high academic ability. Moreover, the combination of these two factors increases their likelihood of engaging in academic dishonesty. These factors, however, are not as important for female cheaters. Instead, a positive attitude towards cheating is a greater indicator of academic dishonesty among female students. Similarly, Roberts, Anderson and Yanish (1997:11) found that "...being male and/or younger than 24 years of age were characteristics associated with greater involvement in academic misconduct."

Table 1.2. Individual Characteristics and Academic Dishonesty

INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS	SIGNIFICANT CHEATING FINDINGS	STUDY (YEAR)	METHOD	N
Age	Younger students cheat more	Antion & Michael (1983)	Self-Graded Test	148
		Haines et al. (1986)	Survey	380
		McCabe & Trevino (1997)	Survey	1,793
		Nonis & Swift (2001)	Survey	1,051
		Whitley (1998)	Meta-Analysis	N/A
	Older students cheat more	Tang & Zuo (1997)	Survey	288
	First-born children cheat more	Hetherington & Feldman (1964)	Experiment	78
	Less mature students cheat more	Diekhoff et al (1996)	Survey	474
Class	Underclassman cheat more	Haines et al. (1986)	Survey	380
		Crown & Spiller (1998)	Meta-Analysis	N/A
	Sophomores cheat more	Michaels & Miethe (1989)	Experiment	623
		Lipson & McGavern (1993)	Survey	891
	Upperclassman cheat more	Barnes (1975)	Experiment	261
		Kerkvliet & Sigmund (1999)	Survey	393
		Pino & Smith (2003)	Survey	675

Employment	Unemployed students cheat more	Haines et al (1986)	Survey	380
	Negative relationship between cheating and number of hours worked	Diekhoff et al (1996)	Survey	474
		Haines et al (1986)	Survey	380
		Whitley (1998)	Meta-Analysis	N/A
	Employed students cheat more	Nowell & Laufer (1997)	Experiment	311
Ethnicity/Race	No significant differences between race & cheating	Tang & Zuo (1997)	Survey	288
	No racial differences between perceptions or definitions of cheating	Sutton & Huba (1995)	Survey	322
Extracurricular Activities	Varsity high school athletes cheat more	Josephson Institute (2002)	Survey	12,000
	Intercollegiate athletes cheat more	McCabe & Trevino (1997)	Survey	1,793
	Students who participate in intramural/varsity sports cheat more	Haines et al (1986)	Survey	380
	Students who participate in extracurricular activities cheat more	McCabe & Trevino (1997)	Survey	1,793
		Whitley (1998)	Meta-Analysis	N/A
Financial Status	Students receiving scholarships cheat more	Diekhoff et al (1996)	Survey	474
	Financially dependent students cheat more	Diekhoff et al (1996)	Survey	474
		Haines et al (1986)	Survey	380
		Whitley (1998)	Meta-Analysis	N/A
	Students with family incomes over \$150,000 cheat more	Tetzeli (1991)	Survey	6,000
Gender	Men cheat more	Aiken (1991)	Survey	200
		Bowers (1964)	Survey	5,422
		Calabrese & Cochran (1990)	Survey	1,534
		Davis et al (1992)	Survey	6,000
		Davis & Ludvigson (1995)	Survey	2,155
		Genereux & McLeod (1995)	Survey	365
		Hetherington & Feldman (1964)	Experiment	78
		McCabe & Trevino (1997)	Survey	1,793
		Michaels & Miethe (1989)	Experiment	623
		Newstead et al. (1996)	Survey	943
		Rettinger et al. (2004)	Survey/Vignette	103

Gender	Men cheat more	Tang & Zuo (1997)	Survey	288
		Whitley et al (1999)	Meta-Analysis	N/A
	Men fabricate sources more	Caron et al (1992)	Survey	261
	No significant difference between gender & cheating	Baird (1980)	Survey	200
		Diekhoff et al (1996)	Survey	474
		Diekhoff et al (1999)	Survey	668
		Haines et al (1986)	Survey	380
		McCabe & Trevino (1997)	Survey	1,793
		Nowell & Laufer (1997)	Experiment	311
		Storch & Storch (2001)	Survey	244
	Women cheat more	Jacobson et al (1970)	Experiment	276
		Kerkvliet (1994)	Survey	420
		Leming (1980)	Experiment	153
	Women with high organizational religiosity cheat more than other women	Storch & Storch (2001)	Survey	244
	Gender differences in profiles of cheating students	Roberts et al (1997)	Survey	422
		Tang & Zuo (1997)	Survey	288
Marital Status	Unmarried students cheat more	Diekhoff et al (1996)	Survey	474
		Haines et al (1986)	Survey	380
Membership in Greek Organizations	Members of Greek organizations fabricate sources more	Eberhardt et al (2003)	Survey	247
	Members of Greek organizations cheat more	Bonjean & McGee (1965b)	Survey/Vignette	392
		Goldsen et al (1960)	Survey	2,975
		Haines et al (1986)	Survey	380
		McCabe & Bowers (1996)	Survey	1,793
		McCabe & Trevino (1997)	Survey	1,793
		Pino & Smith (2003)	Survey	675
		Robinson et al (2004)	Survey	118
		Stannard & Bowers (1970)	Survey	1,647
		Storch & Storch (2002)	Survey	244
		Whitley (1998)	Meta-Analysis	N/A
	Members with greater involvement in Greek organizations cheat more	Storch & Storch (2002)	Survey	244
	More cheating for students who live in fraternity/sorority house	Bowers (1964)	Survey	5,422
		Kerkvliet (1994)	Survey/RRT	420
		McCabe & Bowers (1996)	Survey	1,793
	Less cheating when the campus dominance of Greek organizations is high	Stannard & Bowers (1970)	Survey	1,647
	No difference between campus dominance of Greek organizations and cheating	McCabe & Bowers (1996)	Survey	1,793
Partying	Weekly alcohol consumption is related to cheating	Kerkvliet (1994)	Survey/RRT	420
		Straw (2002)	N/A	N/A
		Whitley (1998)	Meta-Analysis	N/A

Religiosity	Students with different levels of religiosity differ in terms of their perceptions of cheating	Sutton & Huba (1995)	Survey	322
	Less cheating among those with high non-organizational and intrinsic religiosity	Storch & Storch (2001)	Survey	244
	Less cheating among religiously active students	Bonjean & McGee (1965b)	Survey/ Vignette	392
	More cheating among students who attend church regularly	Hetherington & Feldman (1964)	Experiment	78

ACADEMIC CHARACTERISTICS

College students with lower grade point averages (GPAs) report cheating more frequently than those with higher GPAs (Bunn, Caudill and Gropper, 1992; Genereux and McLeod, 1995; Haines et al., 1986; McCabe and Trevino, 1997; Nowell and Laufer, 1997; Tang and Zuo, 1997). This finding is not unique to university students, as community college students with lower GPAs are also more likely to cheat (Antion and Michael, 1983). Also, students with lower ACT scores report cheating more than those with higher scores (Kelly and Worell, 1978). These findings are presented in Table 1.3. Even though students with lower GPAs are more likely to cheat, students at the top of the class are not exempt from engaging in academic dishonesty. For instance, approximately 80 percent of the students who received the *Who's Who Among American High School Students* recognition in 1999 admitted to committing some form of academic dishonesty (Kleiner and Lord, 1999:55).

A variety of other academic characteristics have been linked to academic dishonesty. These findings are presented in Table 1.3. In terms of study habits, students who study under unfavorable conditions cheat more, with the quality of the studying being more significant than the amount of time devoted to studying (Whitley, 1998). Michaels and Miethe (1989) found an inverse relationship between class attendance and

academic dishonesty. Additionally, college students with heavier course loads were more likely to cheat than students with lighter course loads (Kerkvliet and Sigmund, 1999; Nowell and Laufer, 1997). Academic stress can produce test anxiety among students, which also has been linked to academic dishonesty, as students with high test anxiety engage in academic dishonesty more frequently than students with lower levels (Heisler, 1974; Whitley, 1998).

The academic major has been a focal point in the research on academic dishonesty among college students. These findings are presented in Table 1.3. Bowers (1964) analyzed 11 majors across the country and discovered different rates of cheating among the various disciplines. For instance, Bowers (1964) found that the business and engineering departments had the highest rates of cheating, while the arts and humanities had the lowest rates. Bowers (1964) also discovered that the education, social science, and science disciplines fell in the middle with regards to the rate of cheating.

Additional studies support the findings of Bowers (1964), specifically, the conclusion that business students engage in cheating behaviors more frequently than non-business students (Baird, 1980; Crown and Spiller, 1998; McCabe and Trevino, 1993). Roberts et al. (1997) confirmed Bowers' (1964) finding that business students cheat more than other college students, with performing and visual arts students reporting the least amounts of academic dishonesty. Moreover, Roig and Ballew (1994) found that compared to other academic majors, business majors had the most tolerant attitudes toward academic dishonesty, as well as lower scores of moral development and reasoning (Bernardi, Metzger, Bruno, Hoogkamp, Reyes and Barnaby, 2004) and lower degrees of ethical behavior (Smyth and Davis, 2004). To the contrary, Coleman and Mahaffey

(2000) found that compared to non-business students, students majoring in the field of business did not have more tolerant attitudes toward academic dishonesty.

More recent attention, however, has been given to the field of criminal justice (Eskridge and Ames, 1993; Tibbetts, 1998). These findings are presented in Table 1.3. One might expect criminal justice majors to be more “law abiding” than students from other majors because of the nature of their future professions, specifically because “they are expected to function on a high moral and ethical level; higher...than the norm” (Eskridge and Ames, 1993:65). Therefore, one might expect to find fewer criminal justice majors engaging in cheating behaviors. This idea was supported by the findings of Coston and Jenks (1998), even though they caution that an intervening variable might have affected the outcome, particularly the enrollment in an ethics course by some of the students who participated in the study. However, when comparing criminal justice majors to students from other disciplines, few differences have been identified (Eskridge and Ames, 1993). Specifically, researchers have found criminal justice and non-criminal justice students are similar in terms of the levels and types of cheating, as well as attitudes regarding cheating (Eskridge and Ames, 1993; Tibbetts, 1998).

Table 1.3. Academic Characteristics and Academic Dishonesty

ACADEMIC CHARACTERISTICS	SIGNIFICANT CHEATING FINDINGS	STUDY (YEAR)	METHOD	N
Academic Major	Business students cheat more	Baird (1980)	Survey	200
		Bowers (1964)	Survey	5,422
		Crown & Spiller (1998)	Meta-Analysis	N/A
		McCabe & Trevino (1993)	Survey	6,096
		Roberts et al (1997)	Survey	422
	Business students have the most tolerant attitudes toward cheating	Roig & Ballew (1994)	Survey	404
	Business students have lower scores of moral development & reasoning	Bernardi et al (2004)	Survey	220
	No significant difference between major & cheating	Coleman & Mahaffey (2000)	Survey	N/A

Academic Major	Criminal justice students cheat less	Coston & Jenks (1998)	Survey	102
	No significant differences between criminal justice majors and students from other majors	Eskridge & Ames (1993)	Survey	639
		Tibbetts (1998)	Survey	330
Grades & GPA	Students with low GPAs cheat more	Antion & Michael (1983)	Self-Graded Test	148
		Bunn et al (1992)	Survey	476
		Genereux & McLeod (1995)	Survey	365
		Haines et al (1986)	Survey	380
		McCabe & Trevino (1997)	Survey	1,793
		Nowell & Laufer (1997)	Experiment	311
		Tang & Zuo (1997)	Survey	244
	Students with low ACT scores cheat more	Kelly & Worrell (1978)	Experiment	591
Other Academic Characteristics	More cheating for students with poor class attendance	Michaels & Miethe (1989)	Experiment	623
	More cheating for students with heavy course loads	Kerkvliet & Sigmund (1999)	Survey	393
		Nowell & Laufer (1997)	Experiment	311
	More cheating for students with test anxiety or high academic stress	Heisler (1974)	Experiment	123
		Whitley (1998)	Meta-Analysis	N/A
	More cheating for students who study under unfavorable conditions	Whitley (1998)	Meta-Analysis	N/A

PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS

Students with higher intelligence tend to cheat less than those with lower intelligence (Bunn et al., 1992; Davis et al., 1992). Specifically, students who report greater levels of academic dishonesty tend to have lower IQ scores (Kelly and Worrell, 1978). Even though “successful” students are typically less likely to engage in academic dishonesty, students with Type A personalities and those with very high achievement motivation may be more likely to cheat (Perry, Kane, Bernesser and Spicker, 1990). As a result, it may be the competitiveness aspect of Type A personalities, specifically the competition for grades, that is associated with academic dishonesty (Stevens and Stevens, 1987). High neuroticism has also been linked to academic cheating (Jackson et al., 2002). Nevertheless, Weiss, Gilbert, Giordano and Davis (1993) found that students with Type A personalities cheated less than others students, while Huss, Curnyn, Roberts,

Davis, Yandell and Giordano (1993) did not find an effect for personality type and cheating. These findings are presented in Table 1.4.

Coleman and Mahaffey (2000) found that personality type and locus of control were significantly correlated with collegiate academic dishonesty. Locus of control can be categorized as either internal, in which an individual believes that event outcomes are within his or her control, or external, in which an individual believes that forces beyond control dictate the outcome of events. As presented in Table 1.4, the findings on locus of control and collegiate cheating are inconsistent. While some have found no relationship between academic dishonesty and locus of control (Antion and Michael, 1983; Thorpe et al., 1999), Leming (1980) found that students with an external locus of control cheat more. However, the findings of Coleman and Mahaffey (2000) indicate that students with an internal locus of control held less tolerant attitudes of cheating than did students with an external locus of control. Moreover, Coleman and Mahaffey (2000) revealed that the students who held the most tolerant views of cheating were those with Type B personalities and an external locus of control. On the other hand, students with the least tolerant attitudes toward academic dishonesty had Type A personalities coupled with an internal locus of control (Coleman and Mahaffey, 2000).

In addition, researchers have found that intrinsic goals lead to less academic cheating (Newstead et al., 1996) and that female students tend to be more intrinsically motivated than male students (Newstead et al., 1996; Robinson et al., 2004). Also linked to cheating is an orientation toward grades as opposed to an orientation toward learning (Diekhoff et al., 1996; Huss et al., 1993; Weiss et al., 1993). Those who are motivated by external factors, such as by grades, are more likely to cheat (Rettinger et al., 2004), while

students who are more concerned with learning class material are less likely to cheat. Students who report cheating behaviors are also less committed to school and academics than those who refrain from engaging in academic dishonesty (Diekhoff et al., 1996; Haines et al., 1986). However, Tang and Zuo (1997) found that male students with higher self-reported academic ability cheated more often. No such relationship was found for female students. In a similar vein, those who attend college for the purpose of securing future employment are more likely to engage in academic dishonesty (Davis and Ludvigson, 1995; Michaels and Miethe, 1989; Robinson et al., 2004).

Another correlate of cheating is alienation (Calabrese and Cochran, 1990; Roig and Neaman, 1994). These findings are presented in Table 1.4. According to Newhouse (1982), alienation from school-related activities is directly related to academic dishonesty. Because they perceive themselves as being “outside the school social structure,” students with high levels of alienation will commit higher levels of academic dishonesty as a “survival technique” (Newhouse, 1982:236). According to Roig and Neaman (1994), students’ cheating attitudes, in addition to their behaviors, are related to alienation.

While Bolin (2004) found no direct relationship between academic dishonesty and self-control, others have found that low self-control is related to academic dishonesty, specifically, students with lower levels of self-control are more likely to cheat in college (Bichler and Tibbetts, 2003; Cochran et al., 1998; Jensen, Arnett, Feldman and Cauffman, 2002; Tibbetts and Myers, 1999). When comparing binge drinkers to non-binge drinkers, Bichler and Tibbetts (2003) found low self-control was correlated with academic dishonesty among those who were heavy binge drinkers. Unlike individuals

with high levels of self-control, those with low levels of self-control are more likely to cheat when they experience high levels of frustration or unfairness and are presented with an opportunity (Bichler-Robertson, Potchak and Tibbetts, 2003).

Various other personality characteristics have been examined within the context of academic dishonesty. These findings are presented in Table 1.4. Thorpe et al. (1999) were unable to find a significant association between self-esteem and rate of cheating. Using the same scale as Thorpe et al. (1999), the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, Tang and Zuo (1997) were also unable to find a relationship between self-esteem and academic dishonesty. While Thorpe et al. (1999) found that students who had a higher need for approval cheated less, others have found that students are more likely to cheat if their need for approval is high (Antion and Michael, 1983; Jacobson et al., 1970; Smith et al., 1972).

In terms of morality, students who consider themselves to be less honest tend to cheat more, while those who report strong feelings of moral obligation not to engage in academic dishonesty tend to cheat less (Beck and Ajzen, 1991; Smith et al., 1972; Whitley, 1998). In addition to strong moral values, Eisenberger and Shank (1985) found that a strong work ethic was related to lower levels of cheating. Bolin (2004) found that attitude toward cheating was an important factor in actual cheating, with those who view cheating more leniently committing more acts of cheating (Jensen et al., 2002; Whitley, 1998). Students who consider themselves to be more effective cheaters are more likely to cheat (Michaels and Miethe, 1989; Whitley, 1998). These findings are presented in Table 1.4.

Students with negative attitudes toward cheating were less likely to commit acts of academic dishonesty when presented with the opportunity than those students with positive cheating attitudes (Uhlig and Howes, 1967). Not only are male students more accepting of cheating (Smyth and Davis, 2004; Whitley et al., 1999), but female students also tend to hold more negative attitudes toward and opinions of cheaters than male students (Davis et al., 1992; Jendrek, 1992). Moreover, among students who have observed acts of academic cheating, female students were more likely to report feelings of anger, while male students reported feelings of indifference (Jendrek, 1992). Similarly, male students were more likely to report a willingness to help other students cheat (Smyth and Davis, 2004).

In addition, according to Hall and Kuh (1998:12) students have a “hierarchy of acceptable behavior” when it comes to their attitudes and tolerance of academic dishonesty. For example, whereas cheating on homework is not viewed as a serious offense by students, cheating on a midterm or final exam is viewed as a serious transgression (Hall and Kuh, 1998). Cheating in distance learning courses is viewed by students and faculty alike as being easier than cheating in an actual classroom environment (Kennedy, Nowak, Raghuraman, Thomas and Davis, 2000).

Table 1.4. Personality Characteristics and Academic Dishonesty

PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS	SIGNIFICANT CHEATING FINDINGS	STUDY (YEAR)	METHOD	N
Alienation	More cheating for students with high levels of alienation	Calabrese & Cochran (1990)	Survey	1,534
		Newhouse (1982)	Experiment	120
		Roig & Neaman (1994)	Survey	154
Attitude	Students with lenient attitudes toward cheating tend to cheat more	Bolin (2004)	Survey	853
		Jensen et al. (2002)	Survey	490
		Whitley (1998)	Meta-Analysis	N/A
	More cheating among students who believe they are effective cheaters	Michaels & Miethe (1989)	Experiment	623
		Whitley (1998)	Meta-Analysis	N/A
Intelligence	Students with higher intelligence cheat less	Davis et al (1992)	Survey	6,000
		Bunn et al (1992)	Survey	476

Intelligence	Students with lower IQs cheat more	Kelly & Worrell (1978)	Experiment	591
Intrinsic Goals	Students with intrinsic goals cheat less	Newstead et al (1996)	Survey	943
Locus of Control	No significant difference between locus of control & cheating	Antion & Michael (1983)	Self-Graded Test	148
		Thorpe et al (1999)	Survey	310
	More cheating among students with external locus of control	Leming (1980)	Experiment	153
	Students with internal locus of control have less tolerant attitudes toward cheating	Coleman & Mahaffey (2000)	Survey	N/A
Morality	Students with strong feelings of moral obligation cheat less	Beck & Ajzen (1991)	Survey	192
		Smith et al. (1972)	Survey	112
		Whitley (1998)	Meta-Analysis	N/A
Motivation	Less cheating for students with intrinsic motivation	Newstead et al (1996)	Survey	943
		Rettinger et al (2004)	Survey/Vignette	103
Need for Approval	Less cheating among students with high need for approval	Thorpe et al (1999)	Survey	310
	More cheating among students with high need for approval	Antion & Michael (1983)	Self-Graded Test	148
		Jacobson et al (1970)	Experiment	276
		Smith et al (1972)	Survey	112
Neuroticism	Students with high neuroticism cheat more	Jackson et al. (2002)	Survey	107
Orientation	Students with orientation toward grades cheat more	Diekhoff et al (1996)	Survey	474
		Huss et al (1993)	Survey	220
		Weiss et al (1993)	Survey	183
Self-Control	No significant relationship between self-control & cheating	Bolin (2004)	Survey	853
		Bichler & Tibbetts (2003)	Survey	289
	More cheating among students with low self-control	Cochran et al (1998)	Survey	448
		Jensen et al (2002)	Survey	490
		Tibbetts & Myers (1999)	Survey	330
Self-Esteem	No significant difference between self-esteem & cheating	Tang & Zuo (1997)	Survey	288
		Thorpe et al (1999)	Survey	310
Type A Personality	Students with Type A personalities cheat more	Perry et al (1990)	Experiment	80
	No difference between Type A personality & cheating	Huss et al (1993)	Survey	220
	Students with Type A personalities cheat less	Weiss et al. (1993)	Survey	183
Work Ethic	Students with strong work ethic cheat less	Eisenberger & Shank (1985)	Experiment	357

WHY STUDENTS CHEAT?

REASONS FOR ENGAGING IN ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

In addition to identifying which students cheat, substantial research has been conducted in order to explain why students engage in academic dishonesty. These findings are presented in Table 1.5. When deciding whether or not to engage in cheating behaviors, students routinely report that the behaviors of their peers influence their decisions to cheat (Dawkins, 2004; Lanza-Kaduce and Klug, 1986; McCabe and Bowers, 1996; McCabe and Trevino, 1997, 1996; Michaels and Miethe, 1989; Robinson et al., 2004; Tibbetts, 1998). Cheating is higher among students who think that their peers cheat or where peer disapproval of cheating is relatively low (McCabe and Bowers, 1996; McCabe and Trevino, 1997, 1993). According to McCabe and Bowers (1996), this finding holds true for students who are members of a Greek organization, as well as for students who do not belong to a Greek organization.

Not only has this notion been replicated repeatedly, but the idea that one's peers influence cheating behaviors has been dominant since the earliest studies on academic dishonesty. Bowers (1964:196) found that "students' college peers have a powerful effect on their cheating behavior." Those with an external locus of control may be more prone to the influence of their cheating peers (Gehring and Pavela, 1994; McCabe and Trevino, 1993). In addition, compared to strangers, students tend to be more sympathetic and supportive of friends who engage in act of academic dishonesty (Jendrek, 1992).

Tibbetts (1998) found that criminal justice majors were influenced significantly more by their peers' cheating behaviors than non-criminal justice majors. He also

concluded that non-criminal justice majors were influenced more by their moral beliefs, as well as the perceived pleasure of cheating, than were criminal justice majors.

Crown and Spiller (1998) concluded that students are more inclined to engage in academic dishonesty if they observe other students cheating. This is troublesome given that over three-fourths of collegiate students report having witnessed other students cheat (Smyth and Davis, 2004:72). Students are also more likely to cheat if they believe that other students cheat (Crown and Spiller, 1998; Jordan, 2001; McCabe and Trevino, 1997, 1996). This includes believing that students in their classrooms cheat (Diekhoff et al., 1996; Genereux and McLeod, 1995), as well as students in the entire university (Genereux and McLeod, 1995; Graham et al., 1994; McCabe and Trevino, 1997). If students believe that the social norms (Beck and Ajzen, 1991; Whitley, 1998) or the campus culture (Hall and Kuh, 1998) tolerate acts of academic dishonesty, then they are more inclined to engage in cheating behaviors themselves.

According to Jordan (2001), when asked to estimate the percentage of students who cheat in the university, students who engage in academic dishonesty provided higher estimates, while students who refrain from cheating provided lower estimates. Moreover, students who admitted to the greatest amounts of cheating behaviors provided the highest estimates of campus-wide cheating (Jordan, 2001).

While the literature on academic dishonesty provides countless reasons why students cheat, two particular causes are routinely identified: stress and competition. These findings are presented in Table 1.5. Although faculty members tend to believe that students cheat because “they are unable to intellectually master the material” (Hall and Kuh, 1998:11), research has found that students report stress and pressure to excel

academically as chief reasons for engaging in academic dishonesty (Barnett and Dalton, 1981; Davis et al., 1992; Drake, 1941; Hall and Kuh, 1998). Newhouse (1982) suggests that male students may experience a greater pressure to excel and succeed than females, which may account for their higher rates of academic dishonesty. Moreover, pressure to succeed was identified by students regardless of whether or not their school had an honor code in place (McCabe, Trevino and Butterfield, 1999).

Students report that competition for grades is another primary reason for cheating in college (Baird, 1980; Keller, 1976 as cited in Davis et al., 1992; Singhal, 1982). In addition to academic competition, students also compete for admission into graduate and professional schools (Gehring and Pavela, 1994), as well as for scholarships (Maramark and Maline, 1993). Competition for future employment is also given as an explanation for cheating behaviors. Dey, Astin, Korn and Riggs (1992) found that freshman attribute their cheating behaviors to pressure to “get a better job,” as well as the need to “make more money” upon graduation. Stevens and Stevens (1987) also found that the desire for future success was a factor for students who engage in academic dishonesty. These findings are presented in Table 1.5.

In fact, some students report that they are unable to survive academically in college and feel they must rely on outside assistance in the form of cheating to help them succeed (Kibler, 1993). For instance, Davis and Ludvigson (1995:120) found that “I do study, but cheat to enhance my score” was the most commonly cited reason for engaging in academic dishonesty. Additionally, Baird (1980) found that students commonly cited insufficient time to study and an extremely heavy workload as reasons for cheating. Stevens and Stevens (1987) discovered that difficulty with assigned assignments was also

given as an explanation for cheating. However, some students cheat simply because they do not study and are not adequately prepared for exams. Research has also revealed that procrastination is positively related to academic dishonesty (Roig and DeTommaso, 1995). Possibly related to this is the finding that the more television that students watch, the more likely they are to cheat (Pino and Smith, 2003). These findings are presented in Table 1.5.

Opportunity, according to Barnett and Dalton (1981), is one of the many reasons students provide for committing acts of academic dishonesty. Bichler and Tibbetts (2003) found a correlation between high opportunity and academic dishonesty. Somewhat related to opportunity is risk. Cheating occurs more when students perceive that the risk of detection is low (Whitley, 1998). According to Whitley and Keith-Spiegel (2002), students often perceive that few cheaters actually get caught and/or punished, and therefore, the risks and the consequences appear minimal (Gehring and Pavela, 1994) and the consequences lenient (McCabe and Trevino, 1996). Also, as most faculty choose to bypass institutional regulations and handle incidences of cheating in a one-on-one manner, students may perceive the consequences of academic dishonesty to be less severe, which may lead to increases in cheating (McCabe et al., 2002). Yet, both the threat of detection and punishment deters academic dishonesty among collegiate students (Tittle and Rowe, 1973), as does severe punishments (Genereux and McLeod, 1995). Cheating is also more likely when the outcome is very important to students or when they believe there is an advantage from cheating (Michaels and Miethe, 1989; Whitley, 1998).

Also, some believe that other students are to blame, particularly for not covering their work during exams (Whitley and Keith-Spiegel, 2002), and that instructors who

leave the room during exams should also be held responsible (McCabe, 1992; Whitley and Keith-Spiegel, 2002). Students report that it is the responsibility of the faculty, not the students, to ensure academic integrity, and that this outlook helps relieve them of responsibility for their actions and for those of their friends (Hall and Kuh, 1998). Collectively, these factors may explain why only one percent of students reported that they would notify professors if they witnessed an act of academic cheating (Jendrek, 1992).

McCabe, Trevino and Butterfield (2001) found that peer reporting occurs more frequently at schools with honor codes in place. Peer reporting increases the role responsibility of students, which increases the perceived likelihood of getting caught, which decreases the likelihood committing academic dishonesty (McCabe et al., 2001). McCabe et al. (2002, 2001) also found that there was an inverse relationship between cheating and the perceived certainty of being turned in by another student.

Furthermore, Pavela and McCabe (1993:27) indicate that a chief reason academic dishonesty has increased is that "...students no longer seem to view cheating as morally wrong." As a result, it is becoming increasingly easier for students to justify or neutralize their cheating behaviors. Once they justify the behavior, it is no longer considered a deviant act. Nonis and Swift (1998) found that students do utilize techniques of neutralization to help them rationalize their cheating behaviors. By creating these "defenses of crimes," according to Sykes and Matza (1957:666), "the individual can avoid moral culpability for his criminal action—and thus avoid the negative sanctions of society." Sykes and Matza (1957) identified five techniques of neutralization that precede the criminal or deviant act: denial of responsibility, denial of injury, denial of

victim, condemnation of the condemners and appeals to higher loyalties. These techniques have been used to explain multiple forms of deviant and criminal activities, including cheating.

Haines et al. (1986) discovered that the process of neutralization was a factor in academic dishonesty. Compared to those students who do not engage in academic dishonesty, students who cheat engage in higher levels of neutralization. “The use of such techniques conveys the message that students recognize and accept cheating as an undesirable behavior; however, its occurrence can be excused in certain instances. This approach enables those who cheat to do so with a clear conscience” (Haines et al., 1986:353). Also, Diekhoff et al. (1996) and Pulvers and Diekhoff (1999) found that cheating students are more likely than non-cheating students to neutralize the act of cheating. Moreover, students that use higher levels of neutralization techniques were deterred the most by the formal consequences imposed by the institution, such as failing the course (Haines et al., 1986). .

LaBeff, Clark, Haines and Diekhoff (1990) found that students who cheat utilize three specific techniques of neutralization: denial of responsibility, condemnation of the condemners and appeal to higher loyalties. In the context of academic dishonesty, denial of responsibility occurs when students who cheat “blame their behavior on a specific situational context or other person,” while condemnation of the condemners occurs when students who cheat “attack the motives and behaviors of those who would disapprove of the cheating” (Pulvers and Diekhoff, 1999:489). According to Pulvers and Diekhoff (1999:489), appeal to higher loyalties occurs when “loyalty to the demands of the cheater’s social group takes precedence over the norms of the larger society.” McCabe

(1992:368) found denial of responsibility (61 percent) and condemnation of condemners (28 percent) to be the most frequently reported neutralization technique employed by students who engage in acts of academic dishonesty.

McCabe (1992) found that students who cheat employed all of Sykes and Matza's (1957) neutralization techniques, including denial of injury and denial of the victim. These findings are presented in Table 1.5. According to Pulvers and Diekhoff (1999:489), denial of injury occurs when students who cheat "rationalize their behavior with the belief that 'it is not hurting anyone,'" whereas denial of the victim occurs when students who cheat "vindictively use their behavior to punish the instructor." In addition, Smith et al. (2002) conclude that students who are more alienated are more likely to utilize neutralization techniques and that neutralization behaviors increase the likelihood of cheating again in the future. McCabe et al. (1999) found that students from schools with honor codes engaged in neutralizing behaviors less than students from schools without honor codes in place. Pulvers and Diekhoff (1999:495) discovered that neutralization of cheating occurred more often when students perceived their classroom environment as being less personalized, less satisfying, less cohesive, less involving, less individualized and less task-oriented.

When analyzing academic dishonesty among accounting majors, Smith et al. (2002) found that female students engage in neutralizing techniques more often than male students. They contend that because women, rather than men, exhibit stronger ethical attitudes (Borkowski and Ugras, 1998; Luthar, DiBattista and Gautschi, 1997), it is logical then that they would need to "...neutralize in order to reduce the sense of guilt or wrongdoing associated with the contemplation of cheating" (Smith et al., 2002:60).

Similarly, Ward and Beck (1990) found that as a result of sex-role socialization, American women have been socialized to abide by the rules of society, and thus, were significantly more likely than men to use techniques of neutralization prior to cheating. Moreover, Hendershott, Drinan and Cross (1999:347) discovered support for the sex-role socialization theory and that "...women were more likely than men to need to justify their cheating behaviors because these techniques become the psychological mechanism thorough which women deflect their internalized sex-role socialization." Tibbetts (1999) also found that the variation in gender among intentions to cheat can be explained by higher perceived shame among female students and lower self-control among male students.

According to Calabrese and Cochran (1990), males and females differ in the reasons for committing academic dishonesty, in that males cheated more in order to personally succeed. Newstead et al. (1996) found that, unlike female students, male students cheated more frequently in order to improve their grades. According to Tibbetts (1999), female students are more likely to be deterred by higher moral beliefs, whereas prior cheating behaviors and the perceived pleasure of academic dishonesty are more salient factors for cheating by male students.

Also, Tittle and Rowe (1973) found that both students with high academic ability and female students are impacted more by the threat of punishments, which reduces their likelihood of engaging in academic dishonesty. This finding was confirmed by Leming (1980), who found that women were more responsive to the threat of potential punishments, as well as by Davis and Ludvigson (1995), who found that female students were more deterred by professor-announced penalties than male students. The discovery

that women are more sensitive to potential punishments has also been attributed to the sex-role socialization theory, inasmuch that “women are more fully socialized than men and, hence, more conforming and obedient” (Leming, 1980:86).

Table 1.5. Reasons Students Cheat

REASONS FOR CHEATING	SIGNIFICANT CHEATING FINDINGS	STUDY (YEAR)	METHOD	N
Academic Stress	More cheating if students are academically stressed	Barnett & Dalton (1981)	Survey	1,480
		Davis et al (1992)	Survey	6,000
		Drake (1941)	Experiment	126
		McCabe et al (1999)	Survey	4,285
	Men experience more pressure to excel	Newhouse (1982)	Experiment	120
	Insufficient time to study	Baird (1980)	Survey	200
	Heavy workload	Baird (1980)	Survey	200
	Cheat to enhance score	Davis & Ludvigson (1995)	Survey	2,155
Competition	Competition for grades	Kibler (1983)	N/A	N/A
	Competition for admission to graduate programs	Baird (1980)	Survey	200
		Singhal (1982)	Survey	364
Neutralization	Competition for scholarships	Gehring & Pavela (1994)	N/A	N/A
		Maramark & Maline (1993)	N/A	N/A
	More cheating among students who neutralize the act of cheating	Diekhoff et al (1996)	Survey	474
		Haines et al (1986)	Survey	380
		LaBeff et al (1990)	Survey	380
Opportunity	Alienated students engage in more neutralization	McCabe (1992)	Survey	6,096
		Pulvers & Diekhoff (1999)	Survey	280
Other Reasons	Students from honor code schools engage in less neutralization	Smith et al (2002)	Survey	606
		McCabe et al (1999)	Survey	4,285
	Women engage in neutralization more	Smith et al (2002)	Survey	606
Peer Cheating	Opportunity leads to more cheating	Barnett & Dalton (1981)	Survey	1,480
		Bichler & Tibbetts (2003)	Survey	289
	More cheating from students who procrastinate	Roig & DeTommaso (1995)	Survey	115
	More cheating from students who watch great amounts of t v	Pino & Smith (2003)	Survey	675
	More cheating if peers cheat	Bowers (1964)	Survey	5,422
		Dawkins (2004)	Survey	858
		Lanza-Kaduce & Klug (1986)	Survey	175
		McCabe & Bowers (1996)	Meta-Analysis	N/A
		McCabe & Trevino (1997)	Survey	1,793
		McCabe & Trevino (1996)	Meta-Analysis	N/A
		Michaels & Miethe (1989)	Experiment	623
		Robinson et al. (2004)	Survey	118
		Tibbetts (1998)	Survey	330

Peer Cheating	Students with external locus of control are more influenced more by peers who cheat	Gehring & Pavela (1994)	N/A	N/A
		McCabe & Trevino (1993)	Survey	6,096
	Criminal justice students are influenced more by peers who cheat	Tibbetts (1998)	Survey	330
	More cheating if students observe peers cheating	Crown & Spiller (1998)	Meta-Analysis	N/A
	More cheating if students believe peers cheat	Crown & Spiller (1998)	Meta-Analysis	N/A
		Diekhoff et al. (1996)	Survey	474
		Genereux & McLeod (1995)	Survey	365
		Graham et al (1994)	Survey	480
		Jordan (2001)	Survey	175
		McCabe & Trevino (1997)	Survey	1,793
		McCabe & Trevino (1996)	Meta-Analysis	N/A
Pressure	Pressure to get a good job & to make money	Dey et al (1992)	N/A	N/A
Risk	More cheating when risk is perceived as low	Whitley (1998)	Meta-Analysis	N/A
		Whitley & Keith-Spiegel (2002)	N/A	N/A
Student Culture	More cheating if students believe social norms are tolerant of cheating	Beck & Ajzen (1991)	Survey	192
		Hall & Kuh (1998)	Interview	303
		Whitley (1998)	Meta-Analysis	N/A

FUTURE CHEATING BEHAVIORS

Academic dishonesty has also been linked to several forms of minor deviance. For instance, Blankenship and Whitley (2000) found that, compared to students who refrain from engaging in academic dishonesty, students who cheat scored higher on measures of risky driving behaviors and unreliability. Students who use false excuses, which are “fabricated specifically for the purpose of avoiding an academic responsibility” (Caron et al., 1992:90), also scored higher on those two measures, but also scored higher on measures of illegal behaviors and substance abuse (Blankenship and Whitley, 2000).

The research suggests that academic dishonesty is associated with other forms of unethical behaviors. According to Beck and Ajzen (1991), there is a significant correlation between cheating, lying and shoplifting. Academic dishonesty has also been linked to alcohol abuse (Kerkvliet, 1994), as well as to cheating in politics, college

athletics and on income taxes (Fass, 1990). Furthermore, academic dishonesty in college often predicts unethical professional behaviors as well (Sierles, Hendrickx and Circle, 1980). Nonis and Swift (2001) and Sims (1993) found that several forms of workplace dishonesty, including employee theft, were associated with cheating behaviors in college. Not only does academic dishonesty persist, but the most severe acts of dishonesty in the workplace are committed by those individuals who cheated in college (Sims, 1993).

Likewise, research on academic dishonesty of undergraduate students can be useful for graduate institutions. According to Greene and Saxe (1992 as cited in Love and Simmons, 1998), the majority of undergraduate students who reported cheating in college were also planning on attending either graduate or professional schools. Similarly, academic dishonesty in high school is a great predictor of academic dishonesty in college (Davis and Ludvigson, 1995; Whitley, 1998) because prior cheating is correlated with future cheating (CAI, 2005; Smith et al., 2002; Tibbetts, 1998). Because academic dishonesty constitutes a deviant act and because it is related to other deviant and criminal activities, it seems appropriate to utilize criminological and delinquency theories when explaining the cheating behaviors of students.

CHAPTER II

CHEATING FROM A THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

As cheating is a form of deviance, numerous social theories have been utilized to attempt to explain collegiate academic dishonesty. This study will focus on two popular social theories and their implications for academic dishonesty: social control and rational choice theory. It is hypothesized that the attachment component of Hirschi's social control theory will better explain the cheating behaviors of female college students, while rational choice theory will better explain the cheating behaviors of male college students.

SOCIAL CONTROL THEORY

Hirschi (1969) and other control theorists attempt to identify why individuals obey the rules of society. Hirschi's social control theory proposes that an individual's bond to society prevents him or her from engaging in deviant behavior and that "delinquent acts result when an individual's bond to society is weak or broken" (Hirschi, 1969:16). According to Hirschi, there are four elements of the social bond: attachment, commitment, involvement and belief. The last three elements, commitment, involvement

and belief, are briefly explained; however, greater attention is given to the element of attachment, as it is the focus of this paper.

Commitment can be defined as one's stake in conformity. According to Hirschi (1969:20), this is the "rational component" of the bond. An individual invests both time and energy into conventional activities and as a result, he or she must consider these commitments while deciding whether or not to engage in deviant behavior. An individual with a greater stake in conformity or a stronger commitment will opt not to jeopardize such an investment. Therefore, the stronger the commitment, the less likely an individual is to deviate.

Involvement refers to the amount of time and energy focused on conventional activities. According to Hirschi (1969:22), "...a person may be simply too busy doing conventional things to find the time to engage in deviant behavior." Such activities include going to school, working or participating in sports. As a result, the greater one's involvement, the less likely an individual is to deviate.

Belief refers to the acceptance of the rules and norms of society. This element deals with the acceptance of the conventional value system and the belief that the rules are morally valid (Durkin, Wolfe and Clark, 1999). Belief also refers to the respect an individual has for authority, as well as authority figures. The stronger the belief, the less likely an individual is to deviate.

Attachment to conventional individuals is considered to be the most powerful of the four elements. "If a person does not care about the wishes and expectations of other people—that is, if he is insensitive to the opinion of others—then he is to that extent not bound by the norms. He is free to deviate" (Hirschi, 1969:18). Hence, attachment

focuses on the extent to which an individual has emotional ties to other individuals, such as parents and family members, peers and teachers. According to Hirschi (1969), attachment to parents is particularly important, as they are responsible for initially socializing children. In addition to the emotional ties to significant others, attachment refers to the degree to which an individual identifies with them (Durkin et al., 1999). The stronger the attachment to these individuals, the less likely an individual is to deviate.

Social control theory has been used as a framework for explaining several types of deviant and delinquent acts. For instance, Durkin et al. (1999) found that an inverse relationship exists between frequent binge drinking among college students and most measures of the social bond. The stronger the social bond, the less likely the student was to be a frequent binge drinker. Tibbetts and Herz (1996) discovered that internal controls were useful in predicting the intentions of women to shoplift and drive drunk.

In addition, social control theory has predictive utility for explaining academic dishonesty (Michaels and Miethe, 1989) and can be used “to explain the statistically significant amounts of the variance in college cheating” (Eve and Bromley, 1981:18). More importantly, according to Pino and Smith (2003) social bonds can be used as a means of reducing the cheating behaviors of students. Specifically, “if one has an academic ethic...one may have stronger attachments to pro-social peers, a stronger commitment to legitimate academic activities, and can therefore resist the temptation to cheat or to procrastinate” (Pino and Smith, 2003:496).

Although referring to social control theory as “internal social control theory,” Eve and Bromley (1981:18) found that students who had high levels of internalized social control were less likely to cheat. These individuals have been effectively socialized by

their families and will be able resist the temptation to cheat. However, students with low levels of internalized social control will be more likely to engage in academic dishonesty. According to Eve and Bromley (1981:19), “a student who has not developed a high level of social control by his early adolescence is ‘free’ to be influenced without resistance by motivations leading in the direction of academic infractions.”

While social control theory began as a theory of delinquency, research suggests that its utility extends into adulthood (Sampson and Laub, 1990). Sampson and Laub (1990) found that among adults, stronger attachment to employment and family reduced crime and deviance. Alarid, Burtin and Cullen (2000) propose that social control theory can be used as a general theory of crime. Their research on incarcerated felons revealed that an inverse and significant relationship between attachment to parents and criminal behavior existed (Alarid et al., 2000). In addition, they found that, compared to men, weak attachment to parents was a better predictor of women’s participation in drug, property and violent crime. Covington (1985) also discovered that social control theory was a better predictor of women’s involvement in crime and attributes this difference to greater parental supervision of female children.

Within social control theory, other researchers have focused on gender differences and the element of attachment. In studies of delinquency, researchers have found that female adolescents have stronger levels of attachment than male adolescents (Canter, 1982; LaGrange and Silverman, 1999) and that they also engage in fewer delinquent acts than male adolescents (Mears, Ploeger and Warr, 1998). Gender differences in attachment are important, as negative correlations exist between the element of attachment and minor and serious delinquency (Rankin and Kern, 1994; Sokol-Katz,

Dunham and Zimmerman, 1997; Wiatrowski, Griswold and Roberts, 1981), as well as between attachment and cigarette, alcohol and drug use among adolescents (Sokol-Katz et al., 1997).

Similarly, when studying academic dishonesty and attachment, gender differences emerge. Cochran et al. (1998) found that parental attachment was positively related to self-control and that a negative relationship exists between self-control and academic dishonesty. According to Tibbetts and Herz (1996:199), “given that men are not subject to the same degree of controls as women, it seems reasonable to expect that women will be more affected by the perceived immorality of an action and will have more self-control, given their socialization.” Therefore, the difference in the socialization process of men and women cause women to “hold themselves to higher moral standards” (Whitley et al., 1999:658; Franke, Crown and Spake, 1997), particularly because “they have more to lose” (Tibbetts and Herz, 1996:198).

Hendershott et al. (1999) found that unlike male students, female students were significantly more likely to refrain from cheating out of “respect to others.” In addition, women expressed greater concern regarding the potential negative effects of their acts on others (Whitley et al., 1999). Specifically, they worried they would disappoint their significant others and jeopardize their “valued relationships” (Robbins and Martin, 1993:307). Women seem to exhibit traits and characteristics that portray a more “caring” nature and sensitivity towards significant others than men (Gilligan, 1982). On the other hand, men “tend to construe morality in utilitarian terms” (Mears et al., 1998:254) and use the language of “rights,” as opposed to needs, to determine whether an act is good or bad (Gilligan, 1982). One might argue, in fact, that while the socialization of women

creates an obligation to care for significant others, men are socialized to pursue their own self-interest, regardless of the consequences. As a result, women strive to avoid harming others. In the context of academic dishonesty, this may mean that female students choose not to cheat, so that they do not hurt people, i.e. the professor, other students, their parents, if they were caught. This last possibility complicates the ability to distinguish between attachment and rational choice (which will be discussed in the next section) because it references getting caught and being punished, but if the reason a student is deterred is because they do not want to hurt others than that motivation is more similar to attachment.

RATIONAL CHOICE THEORY

Rational choice theory, which is typically identified with Cornish and Clarke (1986), suggests that individuals choose to commit a criminal or deviant act after rationally calculating both the benefits and costs. According to Akers (1990:654), "...one takes those actions, criminal or lawful, which maximize payoff and minimize costs." This theory assumes that individuals are rational actors who weigh the potential costs, specifically the severity of the punishment, in terms of the risk involved or the certainty of the punishment (Cochran, Chamlin, Wood and Sellers, 1999). Therefore, an individual will be most deterred when the punishments are perceived as being severe and very likely to occur (Cochran et al., 1999).

When an individual perceives that the costs or risks of such an action outweigh the possible benefits, he or she is less likely to commit the deviant or criminal act. On the other hand, when the individual perceives that the benefits of committing a criminal or

deviant act outweigh the possible consequences or risks, he or she is more likely to commit the deviant or criminal act. Regardless of the outcome, this theory suggests that individuals consciously weigh both the benefits, as well as the costs, as part of their decision-making.

Originally developed as an economic theory, this perspective draws on the individual's "subjective evaluations of utility" (Tibbetts, 1997b:237) or one's perception of the potential benefits and consequences of a specific act. As a result, the perceived utility, as well as the potential benefits and costs of a specific act, vary depending upon the individual and the situation at hand. When evaluating the situation and deciding whether or not to commit a criminal or deviant act, not only will individuals identify different benefits and different consequences, but they will also assign different weights to these factors, thereby arriving at different decisions.

Rational choice theory has been used to explain a variety of deviant behaviors, including white-collar crime (Elis and Simpson, 1995), corporate crime (Paternoster and Simpson, 1993; Simpson, Piquero and Paternoster, 2002) and income tax evasion (Klepper and Nagin, 1989; Varma and Doob, 1998). Other offenses that have been linked to rational choice theory include domestic violence (Williams and Hawkins, 1989), sexual assault (Bachman, Paternoster and Ward, 1992; Nagin and Paternoster, 1994) and organized crime (Cornish and Clarke, 2002). Researchers have linked rational choice theory to acts of larceny-theft (Nagin and Paternoster, 1994; Piquero and Tibbetts, 1996) and have found rational choice theory to be a better explanation for theft than for assault (Blackwell and Eschholz, 2002).

Rational choice theory has been useful in understanding intoxicated violence (Assaad and Exum, 2002), as well as instances of drunk-driving (Nagin and Paternoster, 1994; Piquero and Tibbetts, 1996; Tibbetts and Herz, 1996). Rational choice theory has been associated with additional forms of rule-breaking, such as littering (Grasmick, Bursik and Kinsey, 1991) and traffic offenses (Corbett and Simon, 1992). It has also been used as a framework to study ransom kidnappings (Marongiu and Clarke, 1993), political crimes, such as terrorism (Taylor, 1993), the decision to use firearms in the pursuit of criminal activities (Harding, 1993) and the sale of tobacco products to underage individuals (O'Grady, Asbridge and Abernathy, 2000). Further, the literature suggests that gender differences may exist in the context of rational choice theory. Specifically, as the result of their different socialization and exposure to parental control, when evaluating a situation, women perceive there to be greater informal and formal sanctions than men (Blackwell and Eschholz, 2002).

Researchers have found that rational choice theory is applicable to the topic of academic dishonesty (Bunn et al., 1992; Michaels and Miethe, 1989; Tibbetts, 1998; Tibbetts and Myers, 1999). Like other forms of deviance, academic dishonesty involves a potential gain, as well as a potential loss. In terms of the gain, students who engage in cheating behaviors have the opportunity to improve their scores on the particular exam or assignment, in addition to their final grade in the course and their overall GPA. On the other hand, students who engage in cheating behaviors face the possibility of failing the course and lowering their GPA, as well as suspension or expulsion from the university. In addition to academic penalties, other consequences, such as social stigmatization, shame or embarrassment, may result from the decision to engage in academic dishonesty.

When analyzing the deterrent power of traditional consequences associated with academic dishonesty, the findings are mixed. Consistent with rational choice theory, Tittle and Rowe (1973) found that students were deterred by the threat of detection, as well as the threat of punishment associated with academic dishonesty. Diekhoff et al. (1999) found that students who cheat are most deterred by fear of punishment, students who do not cheat are deterred by guilt and that both groups ranked social stigma as the least effective deterrent in reducing academic dishonesty. Haines et al. (1986) also found that cheaters are more deterred by fear of punishment and less deterred by their own sense of guilt. Academic cheating is negatively associated with the severity of the consequences and the certainty of being reported by other students (McCabe and Trevino, 1993).

In contrast, Cochran et al. (1999) applied the deterrence/rational choice model to academic dishonesty and found that students were not deterred by the perceived severity and certainty of the formal punishments associated with academic dishonesty, nor were they deterred by the threat of embarrassment. Instead, they were deterred by “their own sense of shame associated with acts of academic dishonesty” (Cochran et al., 1999:98). According to Tibbetts (1997b:237), “...research has shown that shame is a source of internal punishment that may represent an important cost component in subjective evaluations of offending utility.” Tibbetts (1998) found that perceived costs, specifically perceived external sanctions and having been caught cheating before, did not influence students’ decisions to engage in acts of academic dishonesty. Therefore, it is likely that students who cheat are more heavily influenced by informal consequences as opposed to formal consequences (Genereux and McLeod, 1995; Tibbetts, 1998). Regardless of

whether the punishments are informal (e.g., shame) or formal (e.g., receiving an “F”), these students are using rational choice theory to calculate the benefits and consequences of engaging in academic dishonesty prior to committing the act.

It appears then that shame is significant component of both social control theory and rational choice theory, and therefore, is an important factor in academic dishonesty. According to Grasmick and Bursik (1990), shame, which is a self-imposed punishment, should be thought of as an informal sanction, as it is more certain than many other types of punishments. Moreover, self-control plays a role in rational choice theory because those with low levels of self-control are “less likely to be affected by anticipated penalties resulting from rule-violations, especially repercussions that are caused by internal evaluations of one’s self (e.g., shame) or due to violations of one’s moral code” (Tibbetts and Myers, 1999:193). Tibbetts (1999, 1997a) found that the gender difference in cheating can be explained by higher perceived shame among female students and lower self-control among male students. In addition, it seems to be the case that social control theory will not be as effective in explaining the cheating behaviors of male college students because “people with low self-control will also lack close emotional ties to conventional others” (Longshore, Chang, Hsieh and Messina, 2004:554-555) and because it has been found that rational choice models will provide a better framework for those students with low self-control (Tibbetts and Myers, 1999).

HYPOTHESES

As the majority of the studies on academic dishonesty have found that men cheat more than women, the first hypothesis presented in this paper is that male students

enrolled in undergraduate criminal justice courses at Texas State University will cheat more than female students. As women typically have stronger attachments to their significant others and are more sensitive to the feelings of these loved ones, the second hypothesis presented in this papers is that the attachment component of social control theory will better explain the cheating behaviors of female college students. As men have lower levels of self-control and shame, both of which affect their anticipation of consequences, and because models of rational choice are better equipped to explain the behaviors of those with low self-control, the third hypothesis in this papers is that rational choice theory will better explain the cheating behaviors of male college students.

- 1. Men will cheat more than women.**
- 2. Attachment will better explain the cheating behaviors of women.**
- 3. Rational choice theory will better explain the cheating behaviors of men.**

CHAPTER III

DATA COLLECTION

MEASURE

Survey research was utilized in order to test the hypotheses that male college students cheat more than female college students and that the attachment component of social control theory will better explain the cheating behaviors of women, while rational choice theory will better explain the cheating behaviors of men. Although self-report surveys can be tainted by several factors, including response bias and social desirability, which may underestimate cheating (Kerkvliet, 1994), Burton and Near (1995) found that self-reports of academic dishonesty do not under-represent students' actual cheating behaviors. Not only does the bulk of the literature on academic dishonesty involve the use of self-report surveys (Kerkvliet and Sigmund, 1999; Michaels and Miethe, 1989; Tibbetts, 1998), but "...confidential self-report surveys about minor forms of deviance among conventionally socialized individuals have been judged to be methodically valid and reliable" (Hollinger and Lanza-Kaduce, 1996:294).

The survey contained both original questions, as well as questions modeled after previous surveys, particularly from Hirschi's (1969) "Causes of Delinquency." Demographic questions were also included in the survey, as were a variety of questions

designed to test specific information from the literature on academic dishonesty. The survey contained a total of 82 close-ended questions (see Appendix A). From these questions, several separate scales were constructed. Three cheating scales were formed: total high school cheating, total college cheating and total cheating. In addition to the cheating scales, an attachment scale and a rational choice scale were created.

The first cheating scale, total high school cheating, was constructed from two questions measuring the frequency of cheating on exams, as well as on papers and projects in high school. The maximum score possible for this scale was six, with higher scores indicating more acts of academic dishonesty. The second cheating scale, total collegiate cheating, contained eight questions regarding collegiate cheating. These questions measured the frequency of cheating, specifically on exams and papers and projects for each year of college. The maximum score possible on the total collegiate cheating scale was 24, with higher scores representing more occurrences of academic dishonesty. The final cheating scale, total cheating, was the summation of the total high school cheating scale and the total collegiate cheating scale. A total of 10 questions were utilized and the maximum possible score was 30. Similar to the other two cheating scales, higher scores indicated more acts of academic dishonesty.

Two scales were created in order to analyze academic dishonesty from a theoretical perspective. First, an attachment scale was constructed from 17 different questions (see Appendix B). These questions measured attachment to parents, spouses, children and other family members, as well as to peers and professors. While certain questions were weighted differently, the maximum total score for the attachment scale was 64. Higher scores on the attachment scale indicated greater attachment to significant

others. In addition, a rational choice scale was created from 19 questions (see Appendix C). These questions measured both the potential benefits, as well as the potential consequences of committing academic dishonesty. The majority of the rational choice questions were recorded by a 5-point Likert scale. The maximum total for the rational choice scale was 89 and higher scores indicated greater measures of rational choice.

PROCEDURE

These surveys were administered to students enrolled in undergraduate criminal justice courses at Texas State University during the 2005 spring semester. Of the 37 undergraduate criminal justice classes that were held during this particular semester, 22 were surveyed. With the professors' permission, the surveys were administered during the beginning of the class period. In order to make the students more comfortable, professors were not present while students completed the survey. Surveys were strictly voluntary and students were allowed to leave at any time without penalty. However, students who completed the survey were given a piece of candy as an incentive and a reward. Students were asked to only complete the survey once, as most students were enrolled in multiple undergraduate criminal justice courses during the 2005 spring semester.

Although students were given their own copy of the Informed Consent Form (see Appendix D), the contents of the form was thoroughly reviewed with all participants. In order to ensure the students' anonymity, signatures on the consent form were not obtained. Therefore, it was reiterated that voluntary completion of the survey indicated consent. When students completed their survey, they dropped it into a covered ballot box

in order to further protect their anonymity. Students were reassured that their standing at the university could not be affected by this survey. Furthermore, it was explained that under no circumstance could their professors or the university view individual or class results.

SAMPLE

Overall, 594 surveys were collected, with a refusal rate of less than one percent ($N = 5$). Of the 594 subjects, 55 percent ($N = 324$) were men and 45 percent ($N = 266$) were women. This is representative to the population of the Criminal Justice Department, in which 59 percent are men and 41 percent are women. However, this sample is not representative of Texas State University as a whole, as 57 percent of all students enrolled are women and 43 percent are men.

In terms of ethnicity, 63 percent ($N = 370$) of the subjects sampled were Caucasian, 24 percent ($N = 143$) were Hispanic, approximately eight percent ($N = 45$) were African-American, one percent ($N = 6$) was Asian and four percent ($N = 24$) of the subjects selected “other” for their response. Again, these findings are representative of the students in the Criminal Justice Department, with 63 percent Caucasian, 26 percent Hispanic, nine percent African-American and one percent Asian. The sample is not quite as representative of the entire university student population, in which 73 percent is Caucasian, 19 percent Hispanic, five percent African-American and two percent Asian.

Of the 594 surveys collected, 74 percent ($N = 434$) of the subjects were criminal justice majors, while 26 percent ($N = 154$) were non-criminal justice majors. In terms of year in school, approximately eight percent ($N = 44$) were freshman, 21 percent

(N = 126) were sophomores, 35 percent (N = 208) were juniors and 36 percent (N = 211) were seniors. In order to protect their anonymity and confidentiality, respondents selected their age from a list rather than reporting their date of birth. Therefore, it is difficult to determine the mean age of the sample. However, the frequencies and percents for the variable age are presented in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1. Age of Respondents

AGE	N	%
18 and under	14	2 %
19	58	10 %
20	119	20 %
21	116	20 %
22	98	17 %
23	63	11 %
24 and older	120	20 %

The respondents' cumulative grade point averages (GPAs) were also selected from a list. Fifty-one percent of the students reported that their cumulative GPA was 2.00-2.99 (N = 299) and 44 percent reported a GPA of 3.00-3.99 (N = 256). Twenty-one percent (N = 127) of students lived on-campus, while the majority of students, 78 percent (N = 465), lived off-campus. Eight percent (N = 46) of the students sampled were married and eight percent (N = 46) had children. However, not all of the students who were married had children and not all of the students who had children were married.

In terms of employment, 35 percent (N = 202) were unemployed, while 50 percent (N = 286) worked part-time and 16 percent (N = 95) worked full-time.

Seventeen percent ($N = 101$) were members of a fraternity or a sorority. Thirteen percent ($N = 79$) of the sample were members of an academic honor society, while 27 percent ($N = 157$) were either student athletes or members of a student organization other than an honor society, fraternity or sorority. Only five percent ($N = 29$) were current or former members of the military. Seventy percent ($N = 418$) of the sample reported that they intend on pursuing a career in criminal justice and 48 percent ($N = 286$) plan on attending graduate school at some point in time.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

CHEATING

When looking at the total cheating scale, which includes both the total high school cheating and total collegiate cheating scales, 82 percent ($N = 487$) of the subjects admitted to engaging in some form of academic dishonesty. When analyzed separately, 80 percent ($N = 475$) of the subjects admitted to cheating in high school and 45 percent ($N = 266$) admitted to some form of cheating in college. These findings are presented in Table 4.1.

Further analysis revealed that 31 percent ($N = 182$) of the subjects reported cheating on papers or projects in college, while 36 percent ($N = 216$) admitted to cheating on exams in college. While in high school, 65 percent ($N = 387$) of the subjects admitted to cheating on papers or projects and 72 percent ($N = 430$) reported cheating on exams. These findings are also presented in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1. Cheating Scales

VARIABLE	N	%	M	SD	S²	MIN.	MAX.
Total Collegiate Cheating	266	45 %	1.59	2.81	7.90	0	24
Papers & Projects	182	31 %	.71	1.45	2.10	0	12
Exams	216	36 %	.87	1.61	2.60	0	12
Total High School Cheating	475	80 %	2.36	1.90	3.60	0	6
Papers & Projects	387	65 %	1.14	1.21	1.45	0	8
Exams	430	72 %	1.33	1.20	1.43	0	8
Total Cheating	487	82 %	3.95	4.09	16.75	0	30

Through independent-samples t-tests, one-way analysis of variances and bivariate analyses, a number of variables were significantly related to total collegiate cheating. These results are presented in Table 4.2. For instance, total collegiate cheating was significantly and positively related to total high school cheating. A significant relationship was found between total collegiate cheating and year in school. When analyzed closer, this difference was the result of the significant relationship between total collegiate cheating and being a freshman in college. This relationship was negative, with freshman reporting less acts of cheating in college.

A significant relationship was found between total collegiate cheating and having friends who cheat. Also, the number of cheating friends was directly correlated with total collegiate cheating. Virtually identical findings were found for both total high school cheating and total cheating. Total collegiate cheating was also related to the belief that other students cheat in class. Students, who believed that their fellow students cheat, engaged in more acts of academic dishonesty. Similar findings were discovered for both total high school cheating and total cheating.

Total collegiate cheating and frequency of “partying” per week were significantly related. Both “partying” per week and per month were positively correlated with total

collegiate cheating. Total collegiate cheating was inversely related to the number of hours spent on schoolwork per week. Also, there was a significant inverse relationship between total collegiate cheating and feelings of embarrassment associated with being caught cheating on papers, projects or exams. These results are presented in Table 4.2.

On the other hand, numerous variables were not significant when analyzed with the total collegiate cheating scale. These results are also presented in Table 4.2. In terms of total collegiate cheating and academic major, no significant relationship was found. No significant difference was found for total collegiate cheating and religion or for total collegiate cheating and monthly attendance at church or other religious services.

No significant differences were found when analyzing total collegiate cheating and ethnicity. However, in terms of high school cheating, two significant findings were discovered. The first significant relationship found was between Caucasian and total high school cheating ($t = 3.21$, $df = 589$, $p = .001$). The correlation between these variables was positive, ($r = .13$, $p = .01$). The second significant relationship that was found was between Hispanic and total high school cheating ($t = -1.97$, $df = 589$, $p = .05$). The correlation between these variables, however, was negative ($r = -.08$, $p = .05$). Similar findings occurred between Caucasian and total cheating ($t = 2.17$, $df = 589$, $p = .03$), as well as between Hispanic and total cheating ($t = -2.20$, $df = 589$, $p = .028$). The directions of the correlations were also consistent with the total high school cheating findings (Caucasian: $r = .09$, $p = .05$; Hispanic: $r = -.09$, $p = .05$).

Significant differences were not found between total collegiate cheating and living on-campus. No significance difference was found for total collegiate cheating and marital status or total collegiate cheating and having children. In terms of age and

cheating, several findings emerged. There was no significant difference between total collegiate cheating and age. However, after analyzing each age with total collegiate cheating, a significant and positive relationship was discovered between total collegiate cheating and being 23 years old. Furthermore, 20 year-old students were positively correlated with total high school cheating ($r = .11$, $p = .01$), while students 24 years old or older were negatively correlated with total high school cheating ($r = -.13$, $p = .01$).

No significance difference was found for total collegiate cheating and membership in a Greek organization, membership in an academic honor society or membership in any other student organizations, including athletics. Total collegiate cheating was not significantly related to employment. No significant relationship was found between total collegiate cheating and the number of classes skipped per week, although a positive correlation existed. Total collegiate cheating was not significantly related to the number of hours of television watched per week. These results are presented in Table 4.2.

Only 29 percent ($N = 171$) of the students indicated that it is the students' responsibility to report instances of cheating. Ninety percent ($N = 534$) of the students indicated that they had never reported an incident of cheating that they observed ($M = .18$, $SD = .73$, $s^2 = .53$) and only 19 percent ($N = 113$) reported that they definitely would report an incident of cheating they observed ($M = .76$, $SD = .87$, $s^2 = .76$).

Table 4.2. Total Collegiate Cheating

VARIABLE	TEST	VALUE	DF
Academic major	t-test	t = .74	583
Age	ANOVA	F = 1.70	7, 583
Belief that other students cheat	ANOVA	F = 15.35**	2, 588
	Pearson	r = .222**	N/A
Cheating friends	t-test	t = 8.54**	589
	Pearson	r = .33**	N/A
Children	t-test	t = -.66	588
Classes skipped per week	ANOVA	F = 2.32	3, 587
	Pearson	r = .10*	N/A
Employment	ANOVA	F = .79	2, 577
Ethnicity	ANOVA	F = 1.52	4, 580
Feelings of embarrassment if caught cheating on exams	ANOVA	F = 7.23**	5, 585
	Pearson	r = -.17**	N/A
Feelings of embarrassment if caught cheating on papers/projects	ANOVA	F = 6.58**	5, 585
	Pearson	r = -.15**	N/A
Freshman	ANOVA	F = 4.45*	1, 589
	Pearson	r = -.09*	N/A
Greek membership	t-test	t = 1.68	587
Hours of t.v. watched per week	ANOVA	F = 1.08	4, 586
Living on-campus	t-test	t = -1.29	587
Marriage	t-test	t = -1.87	588
Membership in honor society	t-test	t = .63	588
Membership in other activities	t-test	t = 1.38	588
Monthly church attendance	ANOVA	F = .64	5, 584
Partying per week	ANOVA	F = 5.11**	4, 586
	Pearson	r = .09*	N/A
Religion	ANOVA	F = 2.26	5, 574
Schoolwork per week	ANOVA	F = 7.40**	3, 586
	Pearson	r = -.17**	N/A
Total high school cheating	ANOVA	F = 34.11**	6, 584
	Pearson	r = .49**	N/A
Twenty-three years-old	t-test	t = 2.42*	589
Year in school	ANOVA	F = 3.23*	3, 582
	Pearson	r = .12**	N/A

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

CHEATING AND GENDER

All of the cheating scales were significantly related to gender. Results are presented in Table 4.3. An independent-samples t-test found a significant difference between gender and total collegiate cheating. Among the 45 percent that admitted to collegiate cheating, 60 percent were men ($N = 158$) and 40 percent ($N = 107$) were women. Bivariate correlational analysis revealed gender differences within total collegiate cheating. The Pearson correlation was positive for men and total collegiate cheating, but negative for women and total collegiate cheating. These findings confirm Hypothesis One that male students cheat more than female students.

When analyzing gender and the type of cheating committed in college, significant differences were found. For instance, an independent-samples t-test found a difference between gender and cheating on papers or projects in college, as well as for gender and cheating on exams in college. Bivariate correlational analysis revealed a positive relationship between men and cheating on papers or projects in college, but a negative relationship with women. Similarly, a positive relationship was found between men and cheating on collegiate exams, while a negative relationship was found between women and cheating on exams in college.

An independent-samples t-test found a significant difference between gender and total high school cheating. Among the 80 percent of students that admitted to cheating in high school, 56 percent ($N = 264$) were men and 44 percent were women ($N = 209$). Bivariate correlational analysis indicated that gender differences existed with regard to high school cheating. While the Pearson correlation for men and total high school

cheating revealed a positive relationship, a negative relationship was discovered between women and total high school cheating.

When looking solely at total high school cheating, differences were found regarding gender and the type of cheating committed. These results are presented in Table 4.3. An independent-samples t-test found significant differences between cheating on papers or projects in high school and gender. The Pearson correlation indicated a positive relationship between cheating on papers and projects in high school and men, but a negative relationship for women. On the other hand, no significant differences were found when analyzing cheating on high school exams and gender.

When total high school cheating and total collegiate cheating were combined to form a total cheating score, an independent-samples t-test revealed a significant difference between the total cheating score and gender. While 82 percent of the subjects admitted to cheating on the total cheating score, roughly 46 percent (N = 269) were men and 37 percent (N = 216) were women. Based on the Pearson correlation, a positive relationship was found between men and total cheating, while a negative relationship was found between women and total cheating. These results are presented in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3. Cheating and Gender

VARIABLE	GENDER			MEN		WOMEN	
	t-test value	df	p	r	p	r	p
Total Collegiate Cheating	3.36	585	.001	.14	.001	-.14	.001
Papers & Projects	3.83	585	.000	.15	.000	-.16	.000
Exams	2.41	585	.016	.10	.017	-.10	.016
Total High School Cheating	2.69	585	.007	.11	.006	-.11	.009
Papers & Projects	3.25	585	.001	.14	.001	-.13	.002
Exams	1.65	585	NS	.07	NS	-.07	NS
Total Cheating	3.57	585	.000	.15	.000	-.14	.000

ATTACHMENT

On the total attachment scale, the scores ranged from 8 to 55 ($M = 34.44$, $SD = 6.59$, $s^2 = 43.36$). A stepwise regression analysis was conducted in order to determine the predictability of collegiate cheating (dependent variable) using attachment and gender (independent variables). The data showed that 1.7 percent of the total variance in cheating can be explained by gender ($r^2 = .017$). However, the independent variables were highly correlated, creating a linear relationship. As a result, multicollinearity issues prevented the analysis from estimating the percent of total variance in cheating that is explained by the combination of attachment and gender.

Correlational analysis found a significant relationship between total collegiate cheating and gender ($\beta = .78$, $p = .001$), with male students reporting more cheating than female students ($r = .14$, $p = .01$). The results indicated that gender was significantly related to the attachment scale ($r = -.23$, $p = .01$). Pearson correlation revealed a positive relationship between women and attachment ($r = .23$, $p = .00$) and a negative relationship between men and attachment ($r = -.23$, $p = .00$). However, no significant difference was found between total collegiate cheating and the attachment scale ($r = -.05$, $p = .21$). These findings partially support Hypothesis Two because female students do have higher levels of attachment and do cheat less, but their lower levels of cheating do not appear to be caused by their higher levels of attachment.

Based on the finding that total collegiate cheating was not significantly related to measures of attachment, further analyses were conducted in order to determine whether specific elements of the attachment component were related to cheating. The attachment

scale was then broken down into attachment to family and attachment to professors. Only attachment to professors was significantly correlated to total collegiate cheating ($r = -.09$, $p = .034$). Consistently, significant relationships were found between collegiate cheating and the statements “I care what my professors think of me” ($F = 4.95$, $df = 5, 585$, $p = .00$) and “my professors are extremely important to me” ($F = 5.45$, $df = 5, 585$, $p = .00$). The correlations between each statement and collegiate cheating were negative, $r = -.19$, $p = .01$ and $r = -.15$, $p = .01$, respectively.

In addition to total collegiate cheating, the attachment scale was used to analyze total high school cheating and gender. High school cheating was significantly related to gender, with male students reporting more cheating than female students ($r = .11$, $p = .01$). Gender was significantly related to attachment ($r = -.23$, $p = .01$), with female students having higher levels of attachment (Men: $r = -.23$, $p = .01$; Women: $r = .23$, $p = .01$). However, unlike total collegiate cheating, total high school cheating was negatively correlated to attachment ($r = -.08$, $p = .05$). No significant correlation was found between total high school cheating and attachment to professors ($r = -.05$, $p = 1.89$).

Total cheating, which combines total collegiate cheating and total high school cheating, was also analyzed in conjunction with attachment and gender. The results indicate that gender was significantly related to total cheating with male students reporting more cheating than female students ($r = .15$, $p = .01$). Gender was significantly and negatively related to attachment ($r = -.23$, $p = .01$), with female students reporting higher levels of attachment than male students. In terms of attachment and total cheating,

no significant relationship was found ($r = -.07$, $p = .07$). When looking at total cheating in terms of attachment to professors, a negative correlation was found ($r = -.09$, $p = .039$).

RATIONAL CHOICE THEORY

On the total rational choice scale, the scores ranged from 11 to 74. ($M = 49.25$, $SD = 8.97$, $s^2 = 80.52$). A stepwise regression analysis was used to determine the predictability of cheating (dependent variable) using rational choice and gender (independent variables). The data showed that 7.3 percent of the total variance in cheating can be explained by rational choice and gender ($r^2 = .07$). With the first independent variable, rational choice, $\beta = .07$, $p = .000$. Once the second independent variable, gender, was introduced, $\beta = .66$, $p = .000$.

Correlational analysis revealed that total collegiate cheating was significantly related to gender, with male students reporting more cheating than female students ($r = .14$, $p = .01$). Gender and rational choice were significantly related ($r = .09$, $p = .05$). Specifically, a positive correlation was found between rational choice and men ($r = .09$, $p = .032$), while a negative correlation was found between rational choice and women ($r = -.08$, $p = .041$). In addition, a one-way analysis of variance found a significant relationship between total collegiate cheating and rational choice ($F = 1.65$, $df = 49, 541$, $p = .005$). Total collegiate cheating was positively correlated with the rational choice scale ($r = .25$, $p = .01$), with students with higher measures of rational choice reporting more instances of cheating. These findings provide support for Hypothesis Three. Not only do male students have higher rational choice scores and higher levels of cheating,

but the positive correlation between rational choice and cheating suggests that male students may cheat more as the result of their rational decision-making.

When analyzing total high school cheating and gender, a significant correlation was found ($r = .11$, $p = .01$), with male students reporting more cheating than female students. Gender was significantly related to rational choice ($r = .09$, $p = .05$), with male students scoring higher on measures of rational choice than female students. The rational choice scale and total high school cheating were significantly and positively related ($r = .29$, $p = .01$), with students with higher measures of rational choice reporting cheating more than those with lower measures of rational choice.

Total cheating, which combines total collegiate cheating and total high school cheating, was also analyzed with the rational choice scale and gender. Gender was significantly related to total cheating ($r = .15$, $p = .01$), with male students reporting more cheating than female students. Gender was also significantly related to rational choice ($r = .09$, $p = .05$), with male students scoring higher on measures of rational choice than female students. The rational choice scale and total cheating were significantly related ($r = .31$, $p = .01$), with students with higher measures of rational choice reporting more cheating.

When analyzing the perceived risk associated with cheating at Texas State University, a variety of questions were asked in terms of cheating on papers or projects and exams. For instance, 13.7 percent ($N = 81$) reported that the chances of getting caught cheating on papers or projects at Texas State University were either “high” or “very high,” while 21.3 percent ($N = 126$) felt the chances of getting caught cheating on an exam was “high” or “very high.” In terms of gender, negative correlations were found

between being a male student and the perceived likelihood of getting caught cheating on papers or projects ($r = -.12, p = .01$), as well as getting caught cheating on exams ($r = -.10, p = .05$). For female students, positive correlations were found for getting caught cheating on papers or projects ($r = .13, p = .01$) and exams ($r = .11, p = .05$).

Moreover, 91 percent ($N = 532$) indicated they would feel embarrassed if they were caught cheating on papers or projects ($M = 1.51, SD = .77, s^2 = .60$). Similarly, 92 percent ($N = 540$) of the respondents indicated they would feel embarrassed if they were caught cheating on exams ($M = 1.45, SD = .82, s^2 = .68$). These were significantly and negatively related total collegiate cheating, as well as significantly related to gender. For men, negative correlations indicated that they were less likely to report embarrassment for being caught cheating on papers or projects ($r = -.15, p = .01$) and exams ($r = -.12, p = .01$). For women, positive correlations indicated that they were more likely to report feelings of embarrassment for being caught cheating on papers or projects ($r = .15, p = .01$) and exams ($r = .12, p = .01$).

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

CHEATING

Although 78 percent of the students sampled agreed “it is morally wrong to cheat” and 62 percent claimed that “under no circumstance is cheating justified,” only 18 percent of the students reported that they had never cheated in either high school or college. Forty-five percent of the sample admitted to cheating at some point in their college careers, although half of these students report cheating only once or twice. The results of this study indicate that academic dishonesty is fairly common at Texas State University, at least for those students enrolled in undergraduate criminal justice courses. However, the majority of students do not report engaging in regular or frequent acts of academic dishonesty.

While 55 percent of the students reported that they have never engaged in collegiate academic dishonesty, when asked about high school cheating, this figure shrinks to 20 percent. In both high school and college, respondents reported cheating less on papers and projects and more on exams. While it is possible that students view cheating on exams as less serious than cheating on papers or projects, perhaps professors

teaching undergraduate criminal justice courses simply utilize exams more than papers or projects, thereby increasing the number of opportunities for students to cheat.

Regardless, these findings are consistent with the literature in the sense that cheating occurs more often in high school than college (Davis et al., 1992; Thorpe et al., 1999). Also consistent with the literature is the finding that high school cheating is significantly and directly related to collegiate cheating. It appears that cheating behaviors and tendencies are learned well before students begin college.

Consistent with the findings of Eskridge and Ames (1993) and Tibbetts (1998), criminal justice majors and non-criminal justice majors engaged in similar rates of cheating. Collegiate cheating among students enrolled in undergraduate criminal justice courses at Texas State University is not significantly related to ethnicity or religion. Interestingly, for both total high school cheating and total cheating, Caucasian students cheated more, while Hispanic students cheated less.

Year in school was related to cheating in college, but only because of the relationship between total collegiate cheating and being a freshman in school. While this finding initially seemed peculiar because high school cheating is highly correlated with collegiate cheating and freshman are typically straight out of high school, upon closer inspection, it seems logical, as students who are freshman have had fewer opportunities to cheat in college.

Although no significant relationship was found for age and total collegiate cheating, when analyzed separately, it appears that 23 year-old students cheat more than other age groups. It is possible that cheating at Texas State University increases with age up to a certain point before tapering off. While it appears then that older students cheat

more, the last age choice on the survey, 24 years old or older, does not lend itself to further analysis. Although this age group was not significantly related to collegiate cheating, a negative correlation was found between being 24 years old or older and total high school cheating.

Not surprising, total collegiate cheating was related to frequency of partying, both weekly and monthly. Logically, this makes sense, as students who spend many nights partying, especially weeknights, may have less time to devote to academics. On the other hand, a significant and inverse relationship was found between the amount of time devoted to schoolwork each week and total collegiate cheating. Students who spend more time studying and reading for classes will have less of a need to cheat.

Several variables that have been significantly related to collegiate cheating in previous research proved insignificant in this particular study. For instance, collegiate cheating was not related to being married or having children. No relationship was found between living on-campus and collegiate cheating. This finding, however, is not particularly surprising given the fact the Texas State University has an unusually large commuter population, with many students living in nearby cities.

Because prior studies consistently report significant differences between cheating and students who belong to fraternities and sororities, it was quite surprising that collegiate cheating was not significantly related to membership in a Greek organization. Perhaps students enrolled in undergraduate criminal justice courses have lower rates of Greek membership than other students at Texas State University. Likewise, no relationship was found between collegiate cheating and membership in an academic honor society or other student organizations, including athletics. No significant

relationship was found between employment and collegiate cheating for students enrolled in criminal justice undergraduate classes.

Although no significant relationship was found between total collegiate cheating and the number of classes skipped per week, a positive correlation existed. However, because students were surveyed in class, it is quite possible that students who skip class often and cheat frequently were not present when surveys were administered. Although collegiate cheating was not related to the number of hours of television watched per week, this finding is not quite as surprising, given the fact that television has become such a pervasive part of our society, particularly among younger generations. As 76 percent of the sample reported watching three or more hours of television each week, it appears that cheaters and non-cheaters are watching equal amounts of television. However, the difference may be the efficient use of time not spent in front of the television.

CHEATING AND GENDER

When analyzing academic dishonesty and gender, several significant differences were found. Gender was significantly related to all three cheating scales: total high school cheating, total collegiate cheating and total cheating. Consistent with the bulk of the literature on academic dishonesty and supporting Hypothesis One, male students enrolled in undergraduate criminal justice courses at Texas State University reported cheating more than female students. Moreover, this finding held true for both the total high school cheating and the total cheating scale.

Further analysis revealed that gender was significantly related to cheating on a paper or project in college, as well as to cheating on an exam in college. Because female students cheat less often, it seems logical that they would report less instances of cheating on papers and projects, as well as on exams. While this was the case for collegiate cheating, when analyzing high school cheating, gender differences existed only for cheating on papers or projects, but not for cheating on exams. Specifically, female students cheated less than male students on high school papers and projects, but cheated at the same rate as male students on high school exams. It is possible that high school teachers use exams at a far greater rate than papers and projects, thereby increasing the opportunities to cheat and reducing the effect of gender. Another alternative is that the social and academic environments of high schools support, or even encourage, cheating on exams.

ATTACHMENT

It was hypothesized that the attachment component of Hirschi's social control theory would better explain the cheating behaviors of female college students enrolled in undergraduate criminal justice courses at Texas State University. Specifically, it was thought that female college students would have higher levels of attachment than male college students and that their attachment would be responsible for their lower rates of cheating. Hypothesis Two was only partially supported.

The findings revealed that female students engaged in fewer acts of academic dishonesty and had higher levels of attachment than their male counterparts. However, no significant relationship was discovered between the total collegiate cheating scale and

the attachment scale. While female students do have higher levels of attachment and do cheat less, their higher levels of attachment do not cause their lower levels of cheating.

Further analyses revealed that within the attachment scale, a significant relationship existed between attachment to professors and collegiate cheating. The idea that attachment to professors reduces academic dishonesty is further supported by the significant relationships between collegiate cheating and the statements “I care what my professors think of me” and “my professors are extremely important to me.” In both cases, strongly agreeing with these statements was associated with lower rates of cheating. Overall, these findings are consistent with research on social control theory in junior high schools and high schools. Studies indicate that the stronger the bonds to the school and to teachers, the less likely female and male students are to commit delinquent school acts, which includes cheating (Jenkins, 1997). Specifically, students with higher levels of school attachment misbehave less in school (Stewart, 2003).

Although a relationship was found between attachment to professors and collegiate cheating, no such relationship was found when looking solely at attachment to parents. It is possible that college students’ attachment to their parents is less powerful once they are no longer subject to close parental supervision. If this were the case, then attachment to parents should be significantly related to total high school cheating. Surprisingly, this was not the case. When isolated, attachment to parents was not significantly related to high school cheating.

As with collegiate cheating, female high school students cheated less and had higher levels of attachment. However, unlike total collegiate cheating, an inverse relationship was found between total high school cheating and attachment. Therefore, in

high school, stronger attachment is associated with lower levels of cheating. It is possible then that female high school students cheat less because of their attachment to significant others.

Even though attachment is unable to explain the cheating behaviors of women in college, it is possible that greater attachment fosters other characteristics that deter women from cheating. Because of their stronger socialization and greater attachment, it appears that female college students are more likely to feel guilt and/or shame when violating social norms. For instance, although the statement “it is morally wrong to cheat” was negatively correlated with collegiate cheating, it was positively correlated with being a female student. Female students were more likely to believe that cheating hurts people and that they would feel embarrassed if they were caught cheating on papers, projects or exams.

Strongly related to all of the cheating scales was having friends who engage in academic dishonesty. Specifically, having a greater number of friends who cheat was associated with higher rates of cheating. In addition to cheating friends, academic dishonesty was also related to the belief that other students cheat in class. These findings were consistent regardless of the cheating scale used. However, because cheating is so significantly related to having friends who cheat and because no gender differences were found between these variables, it appears that strong attachment to friends does not prevent students from cheating.

RATIONAL CHOICE THEORY

It was hypothesized that rational choice theory would better explain the cheating behaviors of male college students enrolled in undergraduate criminal justice courses at Texas State University. It was thought that male students would score higher on measures of rational choice than female students and that this would be responsible for their higher rates of cheating. Hypothesis Three was supported.

The findings revealed that compared to female students, male students cheated more and scored higher on measures of rational choice. Moreover, cheating in college was significantly related to rational choice. Not only do male students have higher rational choice scores and higher levels of cheating, but also the positive correlation between rational choice and cheating suggests that male students may cheat more as the result of their rational decision-making.

Men are aware of the potential benefits and consequences associated with academic dishonesty, but opt to cheat. For instance, the findings indicate that male students would be less likely than female students to report future incidents of cheating that they observed. Because they would refrain from reporting students who cheat, male students believe the risk of peer reporting to be extremely minimal. Likewise, male students were more likely to believe that the likelihood of getting caught cheating on papers, projects and exams was low. Men were more likely than women to believe that “people wouldn’t cheat if it wasn’t so easy.”

Furthermore, male students were more likely than female students to believe that cheating is sometimes necessary in order to get good grades in college, as well as a good job after college. Male students were more likely to believe that “cheating is only wrong

if you get caught” and that “cheating does not hurt anyone.” Finally, men were less likely than women to report that they would feel embarrassed if they were caught cheating on papers, projects or exams.

Based on these findings, it appears that male students believe they can avoid detection and that the perceived risk of cheating is so minimal that they feel they can only gain by engaging in academic dishonesty. They are aware of the potential risks and consequences and still choose to engage in academic dishonesty. As a result, rational choice theory appears to be a better explanation of gender differences in collegiate cheating than the attachment component of social control theory.

CHAPTER VI

LIMITATIONS, FUTURE STUDIES, POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSION

LIMITATIONS

Like any research study, there are several potential methodological flaws in this exploratory research study; particularly, it is difficult to generalize findings from self-report surveys to other populations (Nowell and Laufer, 1997). While self-report data can produce countless methodological flaws, the sensitive nature of academic dishonesty, particularly when asked in an academic setting, can affect the accuracy of the responses.

For instance, social desirability may produce lower reports of academic dishonesty. Even though professors were not present while surveys were administered and both confidentiality and anonymity were assured, students may have still been hesitant to respond truthfully for fear of punishment. According to Sims (1993), students are less likely to admit to severely dishonest acts, which may include academic dishonesty. Similarly, although the findings of this study revealed that male students cheat more frequently than female students, it is possible that male students are simply more honest when reporting their cheating behaviors. As the result of different

socialization, women may feel a greater obligation to abide by the rules and norms of society, and therefore, may have a more difficult time admitting to such deviant acts.

On the other hand, students may have intentionally or unintentionally inflated the frequency of their cheating behaviors. For instance, students may have intentionally tried to skew the findings of the study. It is possible that some students wanted to shock the criminal justice department and faculty with high reports of academic dishonesty. However, students may have forgotten precisely how often they cheated in previous years, thus unintentionally affecting the outcome of the study. Generally speaking, however, interviews and polygraphs have demonstrated that self-reported delinquency is relatively accurate (Clark and Tifft, 1966).

Although students from other disciplines were enrolled in undergraduate criminal justice courses, the convenient nature of the sample may affect the findings of this study. Although a large sample was collected, subjects were not randomly selected for participation in this research project. In addition, in order to protect the anonymity of the students, it was not possible to survey absent students at a later date. It is quite possible that students who rarely attend class cheat more frequently because they are less familiar with class material. Therefore, a potentially different sub-population was lost altogether. Furthermore, because surveys were administered during the first 15 minutes of class, students who were tardy to class were unable to participate in this study. These students, too, may have higher rates of cheating.

Likewise, the undergraduate criminal justice courses were not randomly surveyed. While all undergraduate criminal justice professors were given the opportunity for their classes to participate in this project, surveys were administered only to those classes

where the professors were willing and able to participate. Even though the majority of students were surveyed in other criminal justice classes, there were 15 classes that were not surveyed. It is possible that surveying those additional classes could have produced significantly different findings. As a result, findings from this study may not be generalized to the other universities in the state or country, or even to other departments at Texas State University. Nevertheless, it is important to measure the cheating behaviors of criminal justice students, as they "...will be the future policy makers, practitioners, researchers, and academicians. Assessing the honesty and fairness of these students is paramount to understanding how ethical decision making in all areas of this profession can be enhanced" (Coston and Jenks, 1998:236).

Another potential flaw deals with the operationalization of the concepts used in this study. For instance, no definition of cheating was provided for students. This was intentionally done in order to measure the students' perceptions and accounts of academic dishonesty. Nevertheless, different definitions of cheating could produce drastically different results.

Similarly, both the element of attachment and the concepts of rational choice are difficult to operationalize. While some of the questions used to measure these terms have been previously tested, the attachment and rational choice scales created for this study have not been empirically validated by other researchers. However, this study utilized scales with multiple questions in order to increase the accuracy of measuring the operationalized terms.

FUTURE STUDIES

Future studies could explore whether differences exist between the motives and rationales of students who were home-schooled compared to those who attended public or private high schools. Perhaps students from dissimilar educational backgrounds will hold different opinions and attitudes concerning academic dishonesty. It is also possible that students who were home-schooled would have a greater attachment to significant others than students who attended public or private schools. Moreover, this attachment may be strong enough to deter cheating, regardless of the students' gender.

Similarly, the rational choice process may differ depending upon the educational background of the students. For instance, students who were home-schooled may not have been privy to acts of academic dishonesty. As a result, these students may hold erroneous perceptions regarding the potential risks and benefits associated with academic cheating. Such inaccurate perceptions may cause students who were home-schooled to cheat at different rates. While they may cheat less frequently because they are overly fearful of the potential consequences and overestimate the likelihood of detection, they may also exaggerate the benefits associated with academic dishonesty and cheat more frequently. Moreover, students who were home-schooled may utilize certain techniques of neutralization more than other techniques and may also use such rationalizations and justifications more frequently than students who were not home-schooled.

Additional studies that focus on attachment include studying the motives and rationales of students who were raised in one-parent households compared to two-parent households. These students are likely to have varying strengths of attachment, which may influence their cheating behaviors. Gender differences may also be explored in this

context. In terms of one-parent households, there may be a significant interaction between the gender of the student and the parent. Also, the reasons for the dissolution of the two-parent household, such as abandonment, divorce, death or imprisonment, may affect the strength of attachment, as well as the frequency of cheating.

The motives and rationales of students who cheat alone compared to those who cheat in groups would also serve as an interesting framework for studying academic dishonesty. It is possible that the rational choice process as a whole is different when students collectively analyze the potential risks and benefits of cheating. Moreover, differences may exist depending upon the makeup of the cheating group. For instance, male students who cheat in groups may be significantly different from female students who cheat in groups, as well as coed cheating groups. In the same vein, differences between planned and spontaneous cheating should be explored.

Also, the literature on academic dishonesty is virtually silent on why students refrain from committing acts of academic dishonesty. An attempt to identify gender or age differences among those who abstain from cheating would be an interesting avenue to pursue. Another alternative is to compare the cheating behaviors of first-time, transfer and continuing students. These students may vary in terms of their attachment to parents, significant others, peers and the university. Moreover, the rational choice process and techniques of neutralization may be different when comparing first-time, transfer and continuing students.

Instead of social control theory and rational choice theory, additional theories could be tested in order to determine if gender differences exist with regard to the motives and rationales for engaging in academic dishonesty. For instance, Sutherland's

differential association theory, Gottfredson and Hirschi's general theory of crime and Merton's anomie theory may prove useful for studying academic dishonesty.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Before administrators can develop university policies to reduce academic dishonesty, it is essential that they thoroughly analyze and understand their own cheating population. Because every university varies in terms of their student composition and academic environment, institutions will have to create and adopt policies that are tailored to their students and their cheating propensities. Nevertheless, it appears that several generalizations do exist among students who cheat and these generalities can be useful for all academic institutions.

Despite the potential limitations of this study, the findings suggest that while cheating is a significant problem among students enrolled in undergraduate criminal justice courses at Texas State University, professors and administrators are not powerless against academic dishonesty. First, as it appears that academic dishonesty peaks during high school, mandatory ethics courses should be held for students at the end of junior high school, as well as the beginning of high school. If cheating behaviors can be reduced in high school, it is very likely that collegiate academic dishonesty will also dwindle.

In addition, the finding that students enrolled in undergraduate criminal justice courses at Texas State University cheated more on exams and less on papers and projects can be extremely useful for undergraduate criminal justice professors. Those professors wishing to reduce academic dishonesty in their classrooms should incorporate more papers and projects into their curriculum, while veering away from traditional in-class

exams. Moreover, professors should create interesting and original assignments rather than lengthy term papers. Not only would these assignments make cheating more difficult, but also students tend to cheat less when they consider the assignment to be fair and interesting.

Also, the finding that attachment to professors is negatively related to academic dishonesty is very promising. It appears that professors who can form meaningful attachments with students are able to fend off cheating in their classroom. Whether through smaller classes or more classroom discussion, professors have the ability to strengthen student-professor relationships, while diminishing the anonymity commonly found at large, state-supported institutions, such as Texas State University.

The policy implications suggested by the significant relationship between rational choice and cheating are particularly important. Because men cheat more than women, reducing their levels of cheating will drastically decrease the overall level of cheating. The findings of this study indicate that male students are cognizant of, but not deterred by, the potential risks and consequences associated with cheating. It is only logical then that by increasing the severity and certainty of punishments, as well as the likelihood of detection, cheating among male students will decrease.

Fortunately, there are several reasonable methods to improve the certainty and severity of punishments among undergraduate criminal justice courses at Texas State University. Professors must adhere to university policies when dealing with academic dishonesty. According to Jendrek (1989:404), although 60 percent of faculty witnessed instances of academic dishonesty in their classrooms, only 20 percent notified the department chair, eight percent notified the dean and five percent notified the provost.

Professors may be hesitant to pursue cases of academic dishonesty because they fear the administration, as well as the university as a whole, will not support them (Diekhoff et al., 1996). In addition, professors may be fearful of potential litigation (Gehring and Pavela, 1994) or of damaging the cheating student's permanent record (Jendrek, 1989). As the majority of students surveyed do not believe the chances of being punished by the professor or expelled from Texas State University are very high, students, particularly men, are not deterred from cheating. It is crucial that professors at Texas State University not be hesitant to pursue cases of academic dishonesty because only then will students perceive the consequences of cheating as severe and not worth the risk.

In addition, administrators at Texas State University should follow the lead of other large universities, such as University of Maryland, and initiate an "XF" grade for students who fail a course because of cheating (Kibler, Nuss, Paterson and Pavela, 1988; Maramark and Maline, 1993). Unlike an "expulsion," an "XF" grade is identified on the students' transcript and personal record for future employers or graduate institutions. It is likely that students, especially male students, would be more hesitant to cheat if they knew that the consequences were severe.

Students must also take the initiative and students must notify professors of students in the classroom who engage in academic dishonesty. The results of this study suggest that that majority of students have not and would not report instances of cheating they observed. Without the element of peer reporting, students tend to believe that the probability of being detected is relatively low, which can increase the amount and frequency of cheating. Because students in this study perceive the likelihood of getting caught cheating as low and because they are reluctant to report instance of cheating, it

appears that the modified honor code at Texas State University has not been adopted into the student culture at this point in time.

CONCLUSION

The findings of this study indicate that 82 percent of the students reported engaging in academic dishonesty at some point in their high school or college careers. While cheating peaks during high school, approximately half of the students enrolled in undergraduate criminal justice courses report cheating at least once in college. Male students at Texas State University engaged in academic dishonesty more than female students in both college and high school, lending full support for Hypothesis One.

In terms of cheating from a theoretical perspective, Hirschi's social control theory and rational choice theory were utilized to identify the reasons students engage in academic dishonesty. Although female college students had higher levels of attachment and reported less instances of cheating, this study failed to find a significant relationship between attachment and collegiate cheating. As a result, Hypothesis Two was only partially supported.

On the other hand, Hypothesis Three was fully supported. Not only did male college students have higher levels of rational choice and cheating, but the results of this study indicate that rational choice theory and collegiate cheating were significantly related. Therefore, based on the findings of this study, it appears that rational choice theory, rather than the attachment component of social control theory, is a better explanation for the gender differences in collegiate cheating.

The sample used for this study was extremely representative of the Criminal Justice Department and fairly representative of Texas State University as a whole. While it may be difficult to generalize the findings to the entire university, previous research has found that criminal justice students are virtually identical to students from other disciplines. Also, because over one-fourth of the students sampled were non-criminal justice majors, it is likely that the findings regarding academic dishonesty can be applied to other undergraduate students at Texas State University.

Unfortunately, it appears the age-old adage “cheaters never prosper” may not necessarily be the case when dealing with academic dishonesty. The vast majority of the students who engage in academic dishonesty in undergraduate criminal justice courses at Texas State University are not properly punished. Students perceive the risk of detection, as well as the likelihood of punishment by professors and administrators, to be extremely low. Until academic dishonesty is taken more seriously and the written words of the honor code become actual procedure, grades will continue to improperly reflect students’ knowledge and the dignity of higher education will continue to suffer.

APPENDIX A

CHEATING SURVEY

***Please note that margin restrictions do not allow the actual survey to be included in this appendix. Therefore, only the questions and answer choices are provided, although not as they appeared on the actual survey. Question order, however, has been preserved.**

The results of this survey will be used for a graduate thesis on academic dishonesty. Please answer the following questions honestly and to the best of your ability. All responses will be coded by number and kept confidential. It is not possible for your identity as a participant to be revealed. Thank you for your time and assistance.

Please circle your response.

Sex:

- a.) Male
- b.) Female

Age:

- a.) 18 or under
- b.) 19
- c.) 20
- d.) 21
- e.) 22
- f.) 23
- g.) 24 or older

Ethnicity:

- a.) Caucasian
- b.) African-American
- c.) Hispanic
- d.) Asian
- e.) Other

Religion:

- a.) Christian
- b.) Jewish
- c.) Muslim
- d.) Other
- e.) N/A

Year in School:

- a.) Freshman (0-29 credit hrs)
- b.) Sophomore (30-59 credit hrs)
- c.) Junior (60-89 credit hrs)
- d.) Senior (90+ credit hrs)

Cumulative GPA:

- a.) N/A
- b.) < 1.00
- c.) 1.00-1.99
- d.) 2.00-2.99
- e.) 3.00-3.99
- f.) 4.00

Major:

- a.) Criminal Justice
- b.) Other

Are you employed?

- a.) No
- b.) Yes, Part-Time
- c.) Yes, Full-Time

Please circle your response.**(Yes, No)**

Are you a member of a fraternity or sorority?

Are you a member of an academic honor society?

Are you a member of any other student organization **OR** a student-athlete?

Are you a member of the military?

Are you married?

Do you have any children?

Do you live on campus?

Approximately how many times a WEEK do you...**(N/A, 0, 1 to 2, 3 to 4, 5 or more)**

Talk on the telephone with a family member (parents, sibling, etc...)

E-mail a family member (parents, siblings, etc...)

See a family member (parents, siblings, etc...)

Party (hang out at bars, clubs, parties, etc...)

Approximately how many times a MONTH do you...**(N/A, 0, 1 to 3, 4 to 6, 7 to 9, 10 or more)**

See a family member (parents, siblings, etc...)

Attend church or a religious service

Party (hang out at bars, clubs, parties, etc...)

Participate in community service activities

How would you rate the chances of these occurring at your university:**(Very Low, Low, Medium, High, Very High)**

Getting caught cheating on a paper or project

Getting caught cheating on a paper or project & being punished by the professor

Getting caught cheating on a paper or project & being expelled from the university

Getting caught cheating on an exam

Getting caught cheating on an exam & being punished by the professor

Getting caught cheating on an exam & being expelled from the university

Please circle your response.**(N/A, Yes, No, Don't Know)**

Have you ever reported an incident of cheating that you observed?

Would you report an incident of cheating that you observed?

Do any of your friends cheat?

Do you intend on pursuing a career in criminal justice?

Do you intend on going to graduate school?

Is it the responsibility of the student to report instances of cheating?

Do you think that students in your classes cheat?

Does your university have an honor code?

If so, have you seen or read the honor code?

Does it prevent you from cheating?

Do you think that it prevents other students from cheating?

How many times have you done the following:**(N/A, 0, 1 to 2, 3 to 4, 5 or more)**Cheat on a paper or project in high schoolCheat on an exam in high schoolCheat on a paper or project as a freshman in collegeCheat on an exam as a freshman in collegeCheat on a paper or project as a sophomore in collegeCheat on an exam as a sophomore in collegeCheat on a paper or project as a junior in collegeCheat on an exam as a junior in collegeCheat on a paper or project as a senior in collegeCheat on an exam as a senior in college

Please circle your response.**(0, 1 to 2, 3 to 4, 5 or more)**

On average, how many classes a week do you skip?

How many hours do you spend on schoolwork each week?

Approximately how many hours a week do you watch television?

How many times have you reported an incident of cheating that you observed?

How many of your friends cheat in college?

Please circle your response.

The worst part about being caught cheating is...

a.) People I care for losing respect for me

b.) Negative consequences

Please circle the number that corresponds with your response.**(Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree)**

My family is extremely important to me.

Under no circumstance is cheating justified.

It is morally wrong to cheat.

Cheating is only wrong if you get caught.

Cheating does not hurt anyone.

Cheating is sometimes necessary in order to get good grades in college.

Cheating is sometimes necessary in order to get a good job after college.

People wouldn't cheat if it wasn't so easy.

My friends are extremely important to me.

If I observed an incident of cheating, I would report it.

I think other students would report an incident of cheating they observed.

I care what my professors think of me.

I am more likely to cheat in classes where the grade is more important to me.

Getting away with cheating in college is fun.

I can easily be talked out of studying.

I would feel embarrassed if I was caught cheating on an exam.

I am less likely to cheat in classes where I respect the professor.

In general, I like school.

I would feel embarrassed if I was caught cheating on a paper or project.

I avoid teachers who are tough graders.

My professors are extremely important to me.

How many times have you been ARRESTED or CITED for:**(0, 1, 2, 3, 4 or more)**

Minor in Possession (MIP) of Alcohol

Driving While Intoxicated (DWI) or Driving Under Influence (DUI)

Public Intoxication (PI)

Non-alcohol related, criminal offenses

Speeding

Thank you for your time and assistance on this survey. All responses will remain confidential.

APPENDIX B

THE ATTACHMENT SCALE

Please circle your response.

(Yes, No)

Are you married?

Do you have any children?

Approximately how many times a WEEK do you...

(N/A, 0, 1 to 2, 3 to 4, 5 or more)

Talk on the telephone with a family member (parents, sibling, etc...)

E-mail a family member (parents, siblings, etc...)

See a family member (parents, siblings, etc...)

Approximately how many times a MONTH do you...

(N/A, 0, 1 to 3, 4 to 6, 7 to 9, 10 or more)

See a family member (parents, siblings, etc...)

Attend church or a religious service

Participate in community service activities

Please circle your response.

(Yes, No, Don't Know)

Do any of your friends cheat?

Please circle your response.

(0, 1 to 2, 3 to 4, 5 or more)

How many of your friends cheat in college?

The worst part about being caught cheating is...

a.) People I care for losing respect for me

Please circle the number that corresponds with your response.

(Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree)

My family is extremely important to me.

My friends are extremely important to me.

I care what my professors think of me.

I am less likely to cheat in classes where I respect the professor.

In general, I like school.

My professors are extremely important to me.

APPENDIX C

THE RATIONAL CHOICE SCALE

How would you rate the chances of these occurring at your university:

(Very Low, Low, Medium, High, Very High)

Getting caught cheating on a paper or project

Getting caught cheating on a paper or project & being punished by the professor

Getting caught cheating on a paper or project & being expelled from the university

Getting caught cheating on an exam

Getting caught cheating on an exam & being punished by the professor

Getting caught cheating on an exam & being expelled from the university

Please circle your response.

(Yes, No, Don't Know)

Do you think that students in your classes cheat?

The worst part about being caught cheating is...

b.) Negative consequences

Please circle the number that corresponds with your response.

(Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree)

Cheating is only wrong if you get caught.

Cheating does not hurt anyone.

Cheating is sometimes necessary in order to get good grades in college.

Cheating is sometimes necessary in order to get a good job after college.

People wouldn't cheat if it wasn't so easy.

I think other students would report an incident of cheating they observed.

I am more likely to cheat in classes where the grade is more important to me.

Getting away with cheating in college is fun.

I would feel embarrassed if I was caught cheating on an exam.

I would feel embarrassed if I was caught cheating on a paper or project.

I avoid teachers who are tough graders.

APPENDIX D

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

This study is being conducted in order to research academic dishonesty among undergraduate criminal justice students. The data gathered from the surveys will be used in a criminal justice graduate thesis. If you decide to participate in this study, you will be asked to complete the attached survey. Your involvement should take no more than 15 minutes.

Your participation is voluntary. There is no penalty if you refuse to participate in the study. You may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. Your standing at Texas State University will not be affected if you choose to withdraw. In order to protect your anonymity, signatures are not being collected. Therefore, your voluntary completion of this survey indicates your consent.

All information obtained in this study will be coded by number and kept confidential. There is no way for your identity as a participant to be revealed. It is not possible for your professors, the department, or the university to view either individual or class results. As a result, the foreseeable risks and/or discomforts from completing this survey are minimal. If you feel uncomfortable discussing the topic of academic dishonesty, you may quit at any time. To help minimize any discomfort and promote honest responses, subjects will drop surveys into a covered ballot box.

Please contact the researcher, Brooke Miller, (bm1120@txstate.edu, 245-3584) or the research supervisor, Dr. Joycelyn Pollock, (jp12@txstate.edu, 245-7706) if you wish to discuss anything resulting from your participation in this research, or if you have questions about subjects' rights or a research-related injury. Feel free to contact the researcher or the research supervisor if you have any additional questions or wish to know the results after the study is complete.

REFERENCES

- Aiken, L.R. 1991. "Detecting, Understanding, and Controlling for Cheating on Tests." *Research in Higher Education* 32, 6:725-736
- Akers, R.L. 1990. "Rational Choice, Deterrence, and Social Learning Theory in Criminology: The Path Not Taken." *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 81, 3:653-676.
- Alarid, L.F., Burtin, V.S., Jr. and Cullen, F.T. 2000. "Gender and Crime Among Felony Offenders: Assessing the Generality of Social Control and Differential Association Theories." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 37, 2:171-199.
- Alschuler, A.S. and Blimling, G.S. 1995. "Curbing Academic Cheating Through Systemic Change." *College Teaching* 43, 4:123-125.
- Antion, D.L. and Michael, W.B. 1983. "Short-Term Predictive Validity of Demographic, Affective, Personal and Cognitive Variables in Relation to Two Criterion Measures of Cheating Behavior." *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 43, 2:467-483.
- Assaad, J.M. and Exum, M.L. 2002. "Understanding Intoxicated Violence from a Rational Choice Perspective." In A.R. Piquero and S.G. Tibbetts (Eds.), *Rational Choice and Criminal Behavior: Recent Research and Future Challenges* 65-84. New York: Routledge.
- Austin, M.J. and Brown, L.D. 1999. "Internet Plagiarism: Developing Strategies to Curb Student Academic Dishonesty." *The Internet and Higher Education* 2, 1:21-33.
- Bachman, R., Paternoster, R. and Ward, S. 1992. "The Rationality of Sexual Offending: Testing a Deterrence/Rational Choice Conception of Sexual Assault." *Law and Society Review* 26, 2:343-372.
- Baird, J.S., Jr. 1980. "Current Trends in College Cheating." *Psychology in the Schools* 17, 4:515-522.

- Barnes, W.E. 1975. "Test Information: An Application of the Economics of Search." *Journal of Economic Education* 7, 1:28-33.
- Barnett, D.C. and Dalton, J.C. 1981. "Why College Students Cheat." *The Journal of College Student Personnel* 22, 6:545-551.
- Beck, L. and Ajzen, I. 1991. "Predicting Dishonest Actions Using the Theory of Planned Behavior." *Journal of Research in Personality* 25, 3:285-301.
- Bernardi, R.A., Metzger, R.L., Bruno, R.G.S., Hoogkamp, M.A.W., Reyes, L.E. and Barnaby, G.H. 2004. "Examining the Decisions Process of Students' Cheating Behavior: An Empirical Study." *Journal of Business Ethics* 50, 4:397-414.
- Bichler, G. and Tibbetts, S.G. 2003. "Conditional Covariation of Binge Drinking with Predictors of College Students' Cheating." *Psychological Reports* 93, 3:735-749.
- Bichler-Robertson, G., Potchak, M.C. and Tibbetts, S.G. 2003. "Low Self-Control, Opportunity, and Strain in Students' Reported Cheating Behavior." *Journal of Crime and Justice* 26, 1:23-53.
- Blackwell, B.S. and Eschholz, S. 2002. "Sex Differences and Rational Choice: Traditional Tests and New Directions." In A.R. Piquero and S.G. Tibbetts (Eds.), *Rational Choice and Criminal Behavior: Recent Research and Future Challenges* 41-63. New York: Routledge.
- Blankenship, K.L. and Whitley, B.E., Jr. 2000. "Relation of General Deviance to Academic Dishonesty." *Ethics and Behavior* 10, 1:1-12.
- Bolin, A.U. 2004. "Self-Control, Perceived Opportunity, and Attitudes as Predictors of Academic Dishonesty." *The Journal of Psychology* 138, 2:101-114.
- Bonjean, C.M. and McGee, R. 1965a. "Undergraduate Scholastic Dishonesty: A Comparative Analysis of Deviance and Control Systems." *The Southwestern Social Science Quarterly* 46, 3:289-296.
- Bonjean, C.M. and McGee, R. 1965b. "Scholastic Dishonesty Among Undergraduates in Differing Systems of Social Control." *Sociology of Education* 38, 2:127-137.
- Borkowski, S.C. and Ugras, Y.J. 1998. "Business Students and Ethics: A Meta-Analysis." *Journal of Business Ethics* 17, 11:1117-1127.
- Bowers, W.J. 1964. *Student Dishonesty and its Control in College*. New York: Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University.

- Bunn, D.N., Caudill, S.B. and Gropper, D.M. 1992. "Crime in the Classroom: An Economic Analysis of Undergraduate Student Cheating Behavior." *The Journal of Economic Education* 23, 3:197-207.
- Burton, B.K. and Near, J.P. 1995. "Estimating the Incidence of Wrongdoing and Whistle-Blowing: Results of a Study Using Randomized Response Technique." *Journal of Business Ethics* 14, 1:17-30.
- Bushway, A. and Nash, W.R. 1977. "School Cheating Behavior." *Review of Educational Research* 47, 4:623-632.
- CAI, The Center for Academic Integrity. 2005. Retrieved on March 20, 2005 from <http://www.academicintegrity.org>.
- Calabrese, R.L. and Cochran, J.T. 1990. "The Relationship of Alienation to Cheating Among a Sample of American Adolescents." *Journal of Research and Development in Education* 23, 2:65-72.
- Canter, R.J. 1982. "Family Correlates of Male and Female Delinquency." *Criminology* 20, 2:149-167.
- Caron, M.D., Whitbourne, S.K. and Halgin, R.P. 1992. "Fraudulent Excuse Making Among College Students." *Teaching of Psychology* 19, 2:90-93.
- Cizek, G.J. 1999. *Cheating on Tests: How to do it, Detect it, and Prevent it*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Clark, J.P. and Tifft, L.L. 1966. "Polygraph and Interview Validation of Self-Reported Deviant Behavior." *American Sociological Review* 31, 4:516-523.
- Clarke, R.V. and Felson, M. (Eds.). 1993. *Routine Activity and Rational Choice: Advances in Criminological Theory, Volume 5*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
- Cochran, J.K., Chamlin, M.B., Wood, P.B. and Sellers, C.S. 1999. "Shame, Embarrassment, and Formal Sanction Threats: Extending the Deterrence/Rational Choice Model to Academic Dishonesty." *Sociological Inquiry* 69, 1:91-105.
- Cochran, J.K., Wood, P.B., Sellers, C.S., Wilkerson, W. and Chamlin, M.B. 1998. "Academic Dishonesty and Low Self-Control: An Empirical Test of a General Theory of Crime." *Deviant Behavior* 19:227-255.
- Coleman, N. and Mahaffey, T. 2000. "Business Student Ethics: Selected Predictors of Attitudes Toward Cheating." *Teaching Business Ethics* 4:121-136.

- Corbett, C. and Simon, F. 1992. "Decisions to Break or Adhere to the Rules of the Road, Viewed from a Rational Choice Perspective." *British Journal of Criminology* 30, 4:537-549.
- Cornish, D.B. and Clarke, R.V. 2002. "Analyzing Organized Crimes." In A.R. Piquero and S.G. Tibbetts (Eds.), *Rational Choice and Criminal Behavior: Recent Research and Future Challenges* 41-63. New York: Routledge.
- Cornish, D.B. and Clarke, R.V. (Eds.). 1986. *The Reasoning Criminal: Rational Choice Perspectives on Offending*. New York: Springer-Verlag New York Inc.
- Coston, C.T.M. and Jenks, D.A. 1998. "Exploring Academic Dishonesty among Undergraduate Criminal Justice Majors: A Research Note." *American Journal of Criminal Justice* 22, 2:235-248.
- Covington, J. 1985. "Gender Differences in Criminality Among Heroin Users." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 22, 4:329-354.
- Crown, D.F. and Spiller, M.S. 1998. "Learning from the Literature on Collegiate Cheating: A Review of Empirical Research." *Journal of Business Ethics* 17:683-700.
- David, P. 1973. "Correlates of Cheating Behavior in a Ghetto Elementary School." In A. Bushway and W.R. Nash, 1977. "School Cheating Behavior." *Review of Educational Research* 47, 4:623-632.
- Davis, S.F., Grover, C.A., Becker, A.H. and McGregor, L.N. 1992. "Academic Dishonesty: Prevalence, Determinants, Techniques, and Punishments." *Teaching of Psychology* 19, 1:16-20.
- Davis, S.F. and Ludvigson, H.W. 1995. "Additional Data on Academic Dishonesty and a Proposal for Remediation." *Teaching of Psychology* 22, 2:119-121.
- Dawkins, R.L. 2004. "Attributes and Statuses of College Students Associated with Classroom Cheating on a Small-Sized Campus." *College Student Journal* 38, 1:116-129.
- Dey, E.L., Astin, A.W., Korn, W.S. and Riggs, E.R. 1992. "The American Freshman: National Norms for 1992." Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA.
- Diekhoff, G.M., LaBeff, E.E., Clark, R.E., Williams, L.E., Francis, B. and Haines, V.J. 1996. "College Cheating: Ten Years Later." *Research in Higher Education* 37, 4:487-502.

- Diekhoff, G.M., LaBeff, E.E., Shinohara, K. and Yasukawa, H. 1999. "College Students in Japan and the United States." *Research in Higher Education* 40, 3:343-353.
- Drake, C.A. 1941. "Why Students Cheat." *The Journal of Higher Education* 12, 8:418-420.
- Durkin, K.F., Wolfe, T.W. and Clark, G. 1999. "Social Bond Theory and Binge Drinking Among College Students: A Multivariate Analysis." *College Student Journal* 33:450-461.
- Eberhardt, D., Rice, N.D. and Smith, L.D. 2003. "Effects of Greek Membership on Academic Integrity, Alcohol Abuse, and Risky Sexual Behavior at a Small College." *NASPA Journal* 41, 1:137-148.
- Eisenberger, R. and Shank, D.M. 1985. "Personal Work Ethics and Effort Training Affect Cheating." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 49, 2:520-528.
- Elis, L. and Simpson, S. 1995. "Informal Sanction Threats and Corporate Crime: Additive Versus Multiplicative Models." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 32, 4:399-424.
- Eskridge, C. and Ames, G.A. 1993. "Attitudes About Cheating and Self-Reported Cheating Behaviors of Criminal Justice Majors and Noncriminal Justice Majors: A Research Note." *Journal of Criminal Justice Education* 4, 1:65-78.
- Eve, R.A. and Bromley, D.G. 1981. "Scholastic Dishonesty among College Undergraduates: Parallel Tests of Two Sociological Explanations." *Youth and Society* 13, 1:3-22.
- Fass, R.A. 1990. "Cheating and Plagiarism." In W. W. May (Ed.), *Ethics and Higher Education* 170-184. New York: Macmillan.
- Feldman, S.E. and Feldman, M.T. 1967. "Transition of Sex Differences in Cheating." In A. Bushway and W.R. Nash, 1977. "School Cheating Behavior." *Review of Educational Research* 47, 4:623-632.
- Ford, R.C. and Richardson, W.D. 1994. "Ethical Decision Making: A Review of the Empirical Literature." *Journal of Business Ethics* 13, 3:205-221.
- Franke, G.R., Crown, D.F. and Spake, D.F. 1997. "Gender Differences in Ethical Perceptions of Business Practices: A Social Role Theory Perspective." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 82, 6:920-934.
- Franklyn-Stokes, A. and Newstead, S.E. 1995. "Undergraduate Cheating: Who Does What and Why?" *Studies in Higher Education* 20, 2:159-172.

- Gehring, D. and Pavela, G. 1994. *Issues and Perspectives on Academic Integrity*, 2nd Edition. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.
- Genereux, R.L. and McLeod, B.A. 1995. "Circumstances Surrounding Cheating: A Questionnaire Study of College Students." *Research in Higher Education* 36, 6:687-704.
- Gilligan, C. 1982. *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Goldsen, R.K., Rosenberg, M., Williams, R.M., Jr. and Suchman, E.A. 1960. *What College Students Think*. Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc.
- Graham, M.A., Monday, J., O'Brien, K. and Steffen, S. 1994. "Cheating at Small Colleges: An Examination of Student and Faculty Attitudes and Behaviors." *Journal of College Student Development* 35, 4:255-260.
- Grasmick, H.G. and Bursik, R.J., Jr. 1990. "Conscience, Significant Others, and Rational Choice: Extending the Deterrence Model." *Law and Society Review* 24, 3:837-862.
- Grasmick, H.G., Bursik, R.J., Jr. and Kinsey, K.A. 1991. "Shame and Embarrassment as Deterrents to Non-Compliance with the Law: The Case of an Antilittering Campaign." *Environment and Behavior* 23, 2: 233-251.
- Greene, A.S. and Saxe, L. 1992. "Everybody (Else) Does It: Academic Cheating." In P.G. Love and J. Simmons, 1998. "Factors Influencing Cheating and Plagiarism Among Graduate Students in a College of Education." *College Student Journal* 32, 4:539-550.
- Haines, V.J., Diekhoff, G.M., LaBeff, E.E. and Clark, R.E. 1986. "College Cheating: Immaturity, Lack of Commitment, and the Neutralizing Attitude." *Research in Higher Education* 25, 4:342-354.
- Hall, T.L. and Kuh, G.D. 1998. "Honor among Students: Academic Integrity and Honor Codes at State-Assisted Universities." *NASPA Journal* 36, 1:2-18.
- Harding, R.W. 1993. "Gun Use in Crime, Rational Choice, and Social Learning Theory." In R.V. Clarke and M. Felson (Eds.), *Routine Activity and Rational Choice: Advances in Criminological Theory* 85-102. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
- Heisler, G. 1974. "Ways to Deter Law Violators: Effects of Levels of Threat and Vicarious Punishment on Cheating." *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 42, 4:577-582.

- Hendershott, A., Drinan, P.F. and Cross, M. 1999. "Gender and Academic Integrity." *Journal of College Student Development* 40, 4:345-354.
- Hetherington, E.V. and Feldman, S.E. 1964. "College Cheating as a Function of Subject and Situational Variables." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 55, 4:212-218.
- Hirschi, T. 1969. *Causes of Delinquency*. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Hollinger, R.C. and Lanza-Kaduce, L. 1996. "Academic Dishonesty and the Perceived Effectiveness of Countermeasures: An Empirical Survey of Cheating at a Major Public University." *NASPA Journal* 33, 4:292-306.
- Houston, J.P. 1986. "Classroom Answer Copying: Roles of Acquaintanceship and Free Versus Assigned Seating." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 78, 3:230-232.
- Houston, J.P. 1976. "Amount and Loci of Classroom Answer Copying, Spaced Seating, and Alternate Test Forms." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 68, 6:729-735.
- Huss, M.T., Curnyn, J.P., Roberts, S.L., Davis, S.F., Yandell, L. and Giordano, P. 1993. "Hard Driven But Not Dishonest: Cheating and the Type A Personality." *Bulletin of Psychonomic Society* 31, 5:429-430.
- Jackson, C.J., Levine, S.Z., Furnham, A. and Burr, N. 2002. "Predictors of Cheating Behavior at a University: A Lesson from the Psychology of Work." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 32, 5:1031-1046.
- Jacobson, L.I., Berger, S.E. and Millham, J. 1970. "Individual Differences in Cheating During a Temptation Period When Confronting Failure." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 15, 1:48-56.
- Jendrek, M.P. 1992. "Students' Reactions to Academic Dishonesty." *Journal of College Student Development* 33, 3:260-273.
- Jendrek, M.P. 1989. "Faculty Reactions to Academic Dishonesty." *Journal of College Student Development* 30, 5:401-420.
- Jenkins, P.H. 1997. "School Delinquency and the School Social Bond." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 34, 3:337-367.
- Jensen, L.A., Arnett, J.J., Feldman, S.S. and Cauffman, E. 2002. "It's Wrong, But Everybody Does It: Academic Dishonesty among High School and College Students." *Contemporary Educational Psychology* 27:209-228.
- Jordan, A.E. 2001. "College Student Cheating: The Role of Motivation, Perceived Norms, Attitudes, and Knowledge of Institutional Policy." *Ethics and Behavior* 11, 3:233-247.

- Josephson Institute of Ethics. 2002. "2002 Report Card: The Ethics of American Youth." Retrieved on April 21, 2005 from <http://www.josephsoninstitute.org/Survey2002/survey2002-pressrelease.htm>.
- Keller, M. 1976. "Academic Dishonesty at Miami." In S.F. Davis, C.A. Grover, A.H. Becker and L.N. McGregor, 1992. "Academic Dishonesty: Prevalence, Determinants, Techniques, and Punishments." *Teaching of Psychology* 19, 1:16-20.
- Kelly, J.A. and Worell, L. 1978. "Personality Characteristics, Parent Behaviors, and Sex of Subject in Relation to Cheating." *Journal of Research in Personality* 12, 2:179-188.
- Kennedy, K., Nowak, S., Raghuraman, R., Thomas, J. and Davis, S.F. 2000. "Academic Dishonesty and Distance Learning: Student and Faculty Views." *College Student Journal* 34, 2:309-314.
- Kerkvliet, J. 1994. "Cheating by Economics Students: A Comparison of Survey Results." *Journal of Economic Education* 25, 2:121-133.
- Kerkvliet, J. and Sigmund, C.L. 1999. "Can We Control Cheating in the Classroom?" *Journal of Economic Education* 30, 4:331-343.
- 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. and Pavela, G. 1988. *Academic Integrity and Student Development: Legal Issues and Policy Perspectives*. Asheville: College Administration Publications, Inc.
- Kleiner, C. and Lord, M. 1999. "The Cheating Game: 'Everyone's Doing It,' From Grade School to Graduate School." *U.S. News and World Report* 127, 20:55-66.
- Klepper, S. and Nagin, D. 1989. "Tax Compliance and Perceptions of the Risks of Detection and Criminal Prosecution." *Law and Society Review* 23, 2:209-240.
- Koenig, H.G., Parkerson, G.R. and Meador, K.G. 1997. "Religion Index for Psychiatric Research." *American Journal of Psychiatry* 154, 6:885-886.
- LaBeff, E.E., Clark, R.E., Haines, V.J. and Diekhoff, G.M. 1990. "Situational Ethics and College Student Cheating." *Sociological Inquiry* 60, 2:190-198.
- LaGrange, T.C. and Silverman, R.A. 1999. "Low Self-Control and Opportunity: Testing the General Theory of Crime as an Explanation for Gender Differences in Delinquency." *Criminology* 37, 1:41-72.

- Lanza-Kaduce, L. and Klug, M. 1986. "Learning to Cheat: The Interaction of Moral-Development and Social Learning Theories." *Deviant Behavior* 7, 3:243-259.
- Lathrop, A. and Foss, K. 2000. *Student Cheating and Plagiarism in the Internet Era: A Wake-Up Call*. Englewood: Libraries Unlimited, Inc.
- Leming, J.S. 1980. "Cheating Behavior, Subject Variables, and Components of the Internal-External Scale Under High and Low Risk Conditions." *Journal of Educational Research* 74, 2:83-87.
- Lipson, A. and McGavern, N. 1993. "Undergraduate dishonesty at MIT: Results of a Study of Attitudes and Behavior of Undergraduates, Faculty and Graduate Teaching Assistants." Massachusetts Institute of Technology. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 368 272).
- Longshore, D., Chang, E., Hsieh, S. and Messina, N. 2004. "Self-Control and Social Bonds: A Combined Control Perspective on Deviance." *Crime and Delinquency* 50, 4:542-564.
- Love, P.G. and Simmons, J. 1998. "Factors Influencing Cheating and Plagiarism Among Graduate Students in a College of Education." *College Student Journal* 32, 4:539-550.
- Luthar, H.K., DiBattista, R.A. and Gautschi, T. 1997. "Perception of What the Ethical Climate is and What it Should Be: The Role of Gender, Academic Status, and Ethical Education." *Journal of Business Ethics* 16, 2:205-217.
- Maramark, S. and Maline, M.B. 1993. *Academic Dishonesty among College Students*. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.
- Marongiu, P. and Clarke, R.V. 1993. "Ransom Kidnapping in Sardinia, Subcultural Theory, and Rational Choice." In R.V. Clarke and M. Felson (Eds.), *Routine Activity and Rational Choice: Advances in Criminological Theory* 179-199. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
- May, K.M. and 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 Student Honor Codes." *Research in Higher Education* 34, 5:647-658.
- McCabe, D.L. 1992. "The Influence of Situational Ethics on Cheating Among College Students." *Sociological Inquiry* 62, 3:365-374.

- McCabe, D.L. and Bowers, W.J. 1996. "The Relationship between Student Cheating and College Fraternity or Sorority Membership." *NASPA Journal* 33, 4:280-291.
- McCabe, D.L. and Bowers, W.J. 1994. "Academic Dishonesty Among Males in College: A Thirty Year Perspective." *Journal of College Students Development* 35, 1:5-10.
- McCabe, D.L. and Trevino, L.K. 1997. "Individual and Contextual Influences on Academic Dishonesty: A Multicampus Investigation." *Research in Higher Education* 38, 3:379-396.
- McCabe, D.L. and Trevino, L.K. 1996. "What We Know about Cheating in College." *Change* 28, 1:28-33.
- McCabe, D.L. and Trevino, L.K. 1993. "Academic Dishonesty: Honor Codes and Other Contextual Influences." *The Journal of Higher Education* 64, 5:522-538.
- McCabe, D.L., Trevino, L.K. and Butterfield, K.D. 2002. "Honor Codes and Other Contextual Influences on Academic Integrity: A Replication and Extensions to Modified Honor Code Settings." *Research in Higher Education* 43, 3:357-378.
- McCabe, D.L., Trevino, L.K. and Butterfield, K.D. 2001. "Dishonesty in Academic Environments: The Influence of Peer Reporting Requirements." *The Journal of Higher Education* 72, 1:29-45.
- McCabe, D.L., Trevino, L.K. and Butterfield, K.D. 1999. "Academic Integrity in Honor Code and Non-Honor Code Environments: A Qualitative Investigation." *Journal of Higher Education* 70, 2:211-234.
- Mears, D.P., Ploeger, M. and Warr, M. 1998. "Explaining the Gender Gap in Delinquency: Peer Influence and Moral Evaluations of Behavior." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 35, 3:251-266.
- Michaels, J.W. and Miethe, T.D. 1989. "Applying Theories of Deviance to Academic Cheating." *Social Science Quarterly* 70:870-885.
- Moffatt, M. 1990. "Undergraduate Cheating." New Brunswick: Rutgers University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 334 921).
- Nagin, D.S. and Paternoster, R. 1994. "Personal Capital and Social Control: The Deterrence Implication of a Theory of Individual Differences in Criminal Offending." *Criminology* 32, 4:581-606.
- Nagin, D.S. and Paternoster, R. 1993. "Enduring Individual Differences and Rational Choice Theories of Crime." *Law and Society Review* 27, 3:467-496.

- Newhouse, R.C. 1982. "Alienation and Cheating Behavior in the School Environment." *Psychology in the Schools* 19, 2:234-237.
- Newstead, S.E., Franklyn-Stokes, A. and Armstead, P. 1996. "Individual Differences in Student Cheating." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 88, 2:229-241.
- Nonis, S.A and Swift, C.O. 2001. "An Examination of the Relationship Between Academic Dishonesty and Workplace Dishonesty: A Multi-Campus Investigation." *Journal of Education for Business* 77, 2:69-77.
- Nonis, S.A. and Swift, C.O. 1998. "Cheating Behavior in the Marketing Classroom: An Analysis of the Effects of Demographics, Attitudes, and In-Class Deterrent Strategies." *Journal of Marketing Education* 20, 3:188-199.
- Nowell, C. and Laufer, D. 1997. "Undergraduate Student Cheating in the Fields of Business and Economics." *Journal of Economic Education* 28, 1:3-12.
- O'Grady, W., Asbridge, M. and Abernathy, T. 2000. "Illegal Tobacco Sales to Youth: A View from Rational Choice Theory." *Canadian Journal of Criminology* 42, 1:1-20.
- Paternoster, R. and Simpson, S. 1993. "A Rational Choice Theory of Corporate Crime." In R.V. Clarke and M. Felson (Eds.), *Routine Activity and Rational Choice: Advances in Criminological Theory* 37-58. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
- Pavela, G. and McCabe, D. 1993. "The Surprising Return of Honor Codes." *Planning for Higher Education* 21, 4:27-32.
- Perry, A.R., Kane, K.M., Bernesser, K.J. and Spicker, P.T. 1990. "Type A Behavior, Competitive Achievement-Striving, and Cheating Among College Students." *Psychological Reports* 66, 2:459-465.
- Pino, N.W. and Smith, W.L. 2003. "College Students and Academic Dishonesty." *College Student Journal* 37, 4:490-500.
- Piquero, A.R. and Tibbetts, S.G. (Eds.). 2002. *Rational Choice and Criminal Behavior: Recent Research and Future Challenges*. New York: Routledge.
- Piquero, A.R. and Tibbetts, S.G. 1996. "Specifying the Direct and Indirect Effects of Low Self-Control and Situational Factors in Offenders' Decision Making: Toward a More Complete Model of Rational Offending." *Justice Quarterly* 13, 3:481-510.

- Pulvers, K. and Diekhoff, G.M. 1999. "The Relationship Between Academic Dishonesty and College Classroom Environment." *Research in Higher Education* 40, 4:487-498.
- Rankin, J.H. and Kern, R. 1994. "Parental Attachment and Delinquency." *Criminology* 32, 4:495-515.
- Rettinger, D.A., Jordan, A.E. and Peschiera, F. 2004. "Evaluating the Motivation of Other Students to Cheat: A Vignette Experiment." *Research in Higher Education* 45, 8:873-890.
- Robbins, C.A. and Martin, S.S. 1993. "Gender, Styles of Deviance, and Drinking Problems." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 34, 4:302-321.
- Roberts, P., Anderson, J. and Yanish, P. 1997. "Academic Misconduct: Where Do We Start?" Paper Presented at the Annual Conference of the Northern Rocky Mountain Educational Research Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 415 781).
- Robinson, E., Amburgey, R., Swank, E. and Faulkner, C. 2004. "Test Cheating in a Rural College: Studying the Importance of Individual and Situational Factors." *College Student Journal* 38, 3:380-395.
- Roig, M. and Ballew, C. 1994. "Attitudes toward Cheating of Self and Others by College Students and Professors." *The Psychological Record* 44, 1:3-12.
- Roig, M. and DeTommaso, L. 1995. "Are College Cheating and Plagiarism Related to Academic Procrastination?" *Psychological Reports* 77, 2:691-698.
- Roig, M. and Neaman, M.A.W. 1994. "Alienation, Learning or Grade Orientation, and Achievement as Correlates of Attitudes Toward Cheating." *Perceptual and Motor Skills* 78, 3:1096-1098.
- Sahr, K. 2005. Personal correspondence with Sahr on February 16, 2005. Kenny@sahr.com.
- Sampson, R.J. and Laub, J.H. 1990. "Crime and Deviance Over the Life Course: The Salience of Adult Social Bonds." *American Sociological Review* 55, 5:609-627.
- Sierles, F.S., Hendrickx, I. and Circle, S. 1980. "Cheating in Medical School." *Journal of Medical Education* 55, 2:124-125.
- Simpson, S.S., Piquero, N.L. and Paternoster, R. 2002. "Rationality and Corporate Offending Decisions." In A.R. Piquero and S.G. Tibbetts (Eds.), *Rational Choice and Criminal Behavior: Recent Research and Future Challenges* 25-39. New York: Routledge.

- Sims, R.L. 1993. "The Relationship Between Academic Dishonesty and Unethical Business Practices." *Journal of Education for Business* 68, 4:207-211.
- Singhal, A.C. 1982. "Factors in Students' Dishonesty." *Psychological Reports* 51, 3:775-780.
- Smith, K.J., Davy, J.A., Rosenberg, D.L. and Haight, G.T. 2002. "A Structural Modeling Investigation of the Influence of Demographic and Attitudinal Factors and In-Class Deterrents on Cheating Behavior among Accounting Majors." *Journal of Accounting Education* 20:45-65.
- Smith, C.P., Ryan, E.R. and Diggins, D.R. 1972. "Moral Decision Making: Cheating on Examinations." *Journal of Personality* 40, 4:640-660.
- Smyth, M.L. and Davis, J.R. 2004. "Perceptions of Dishonesty Among Two-Year College Students: Academic Versus Business Situations." *Journal of Business Ethics* 51, 1:63-73.
- Sokol-Katz, J., Dunham, R. and Zimmerman, R. 1997. "Family Structure Versus Parental Attachment in Controlling Adolescent Deviant Behavior: A Social Control Model." *Adolescence* 32, 125:199-215.
- Spiller, S. and Crown, D.F. 1995. "Changes Over Time in Academic Dishonesty at the Collegiate Level." *Psychological Reports* 76, 3:763-768.
- Stannard, C.I. and Bowers, W.J. 1970. "The College Fraternity as an Opportunity Structure for Meeting Academic Demands." *Social Problems* 17, 3:371-390.
- Stearns, S.A. 2001. "The Student-Instructor Relationship's Effect on Academic Integrity." *Ethics and Behavior* 11, 3:275-285.
- Stevens, G.E. and Stevens, F.W. 1987. "Ethical Inclinations of Tomorrow's Managers Revisited: How and Why Students Cheat." *Journal of Education for Business* 63, 1:24-29.
- Stewart, E.A. 2003. "School Social Bonds, School Climate, and School Misbehavior: A Multilevel Analysis." *Justice Quarterly* 20, 3:575-604.
- Storch, E.A. and Storch, J.B. 2002. "Fraternities, Sororities, and Academic Dishonesty." *College Student Journal* 36, 2:247-252.
- Storch, E.A. and Storch, J.B. 2001. "Organizational, Nonorganizational, and Intrinsic Religiosity and Academic Dishonesty." *Psychological Reports* 88, 2:548-552.
- Straw, D. 2002. "The Plagiarism of Generation 'Why Not?'" *Community College Week* 14, 24:4-6.

- Sutton, E.M. and Huba, M.E. 1995. "Undergraduate Student perceptions of Academic Dishonesty as a Function of Ethnicity and Religious Participation." *NASPA Journal* 33, 1:19-34.
- Sykes, G.M. and Matza, D. 1957. "Techniques of Neutralization: A Theory of Delinquency." *American Sociological Review* 22, 6:664-670.
- Tang, S. and Zuo, J. 1997. "Profile of College Examination Cheaters." *College Student Journal* 31, 3:340-346.
- Taylor, M. 1993. "Rational Choice, Behavior Analysis, and Political Violence." In R.V. Clarke and M. Felson (Eds.), *Routine Activity and Rational Choice: Advances in Criminological Theory* 159-178. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
- Tetzeli, R. 1991. "Business Students Cheat Most." *Fortune* 124, 1:14-15.
- Thorpe, M.F., Pittenger, D.J. and Reed, B.D. 1999. "Cheating the Researcher: A Study of the Relation Between Personality Measures and Self-Reported Cheating." *College Student Journal* 33, 1:49-59.
- Tibbetts, S.G. 1999. "Differences Between Women and Men Regarding Decisions to Commit Test Cheating." *Research in Higher Education* 40, 3:323-342.
- Tibbetts, S.G. 1998. "Differences Between Criminal Justice Majors and Noncriminal Justice Majors in Determinants of Test Cheating Intentions: A Research Note." *Journal of Criminal Justice Education* 9, 1:81-94.
- Tibbetts, S.G. 1997a. "Gender Differences in Students' Rational Decisions to Cheat." *Deviant Behavior* 18, 4:393-414.
- Tibbetts, S.G. 1997b. "Shame and Rational Choice in Offending Decisions." *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 24, 2:234-255.
- Tibbetts, S.G. and Herz, D.C. 1996. "Gender Differences in Factors of Social Control and Rational Choice." *Deviant Behavior* 17:183-208.
- Tibbetts, S.G. and Myers, D.L. 1999. "Low Self-Control, Rational Choice, and Student Test Cheating." *American Journal of Criminal Justice* 23, 2:179-200.
- Tittle, C.R. and Rowe, A.R. 1973. "Moral Appeal, Sanction Threat, and Deviance: An Experimental Test." *Social Problems* 20, 4:488-498.
- Uhlig, G.E. and Howes, B. 1967. "Attitude Toward Cheating and Opportunistic Behavior." *The Journal of Educational Research* 60, 9:411-412.

- Varma, K. and Doob, A. 1998. "Deterring Economic Crimes: The Case of Tax Evasion." *Canadian Journal of Criminology* 40, 2:165-184.
- Ward, D.A. and Beck, W.L. 1990. "Gender and Dishonesty." *The Journal of Social Psychology* 130, 3:333-339.
- Weiss, J., Gilbert, K., Giordano, P. and Davis, S.F. 1993. "Academic Dishonesty, Type-A Behavior, and Classroom Orientation." *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society* 31, 2: 101-102.
- Whitley, B.E., Jr. 2001. "Gender Difference in Affective Responses to Having Cheated: The Mediating Role of Attitudes." *Ethics and Behavior* 11, 3:249-259.
- Whitley, B.E., Jr. 1998. "Factors Associated with Cheating among College Students: A Review." *Research in Higher Education* 39, 3:235-274.
- Whitley, B.E., Jr. and Keith-Spiegel, P. 2002. *Academic Dishonesty: An Educator's Guide*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Whitley, B.E., Jr. and Kost, C.R. 1999. "College Students' Perceptions of Peers Who Cheat." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 29, 8:1732-1760.
- Whitley, B.E., Jr., Nelson, A.B. and Jones, C.J. 1999. "Gender Differences in Cheating Attitudes and Classroom Cheating Behavior: A Meta-Analysis." *Sex Roles* 41, 9/10:657-680.
- Wiatrowski, M.D., Griswold, D.B. and Roberts, M.K. 1981. "Social Control Theory and Delinquency." *American Sociological Review* 46, 5:525-541.
- Williams, K. and Hawkins, R. 1989. "The Meaning of Arrest for Wife Assault." *Criminology* 27, 2:163-181.
- Zuckerman, M. 1994. *Behavioral Expressions and Biosocial Bases of Sensation Seeking*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

VITA

Brooke Anderson Miller was born in Warren, Ohio, on July 5, 1979, the daughter of Gregory Anderson Miller and Sherry Lynne Miller. After completing her work at James E. Taylor High School, Katy, Texas, in 1997, she entered Texas A&M University. She graduated *Magna Cum Laude* and received the degree of Bachelor of Arts in Political Science with a minor in Psychology in December 2001. In September 2003, she entered the Graduate College of Texas State University-San Marcos. She will receive the degree of Master of Science in Criminal Justice in August 2005 and graduate with a 4.00 GPA. Upon graduation, she will move to Cincinnati, Ohio, to begin a Ph.D. program in Criminal Justice at the University of Cincinnati.

Permanent Address: 2810 Silent Spring Creek Drive
Katy, Texas 77450

This thesis was typed by Brooke Anderson Miller.

