

An Examination of Academic Integrity Policies, Standards, and
Programs at Public and Private Institutions

Brian Johnson

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Masters of Arts in Education

In

Educational Leadership and Policy Studies

Steve M. Janosik, Chairperson

Denise E. Collins

Gerard J. Kowalski

June 23, 2003

Blacksburg, Virginia

Keywords: Academic Dishonesty, Honor Codes, Academic Integrity

Copyright 2003, Brian M. Johnson

An Examination of Academic Integrity Policies, Standards, and
Programs at Public and Private Institutions

Brian Johnson

Abstract

Academic dishonesty is a major dilemma for institutions of higher learning. Cheating behaviors among students have been documented as early as 1941 when Drake conducted a study that indicated that 23% of students cheated. Since then percentages of students involved in cheating and academic dishonesty have increased. Students are now cheating at an alarming rate as evidenced in a study by McCabe and Trevino (1993) where 52% of 6,000 undergraduate students surveyed admitted cheating on an exam by copying from another student.

The purpose of this study was to analyze the extent to which academic integrity policies, standards, and programs differ by institutional type. Specifically, the study focused on the academic integrity policy of each institution, the promotion of standards, and the academic integrity program.

Data were collected using the Academic Integrity Survey originally developed by Kibler (1993) and modified for use in this study. The survey consisted of 48 questions designed to

measure the differences between academic integrity policies, standards, and programs by institution type.

The findings revealed significant difference in three of the five areas. These findings suggest that private institutions are developing honor code systems, training faculty more, and seeing better results from their academic dishonesty initiatives than private institutions.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Table of Contents.....	iv
List of Tables.....	vi
List of Appendices.....	vii
Chapter One: Introduction.....	1
Academic Integrity Research.....	2
Purpose of the Study.....	6
Research Questions.....	6
Definitions.....	6
Organization of the Study.....	7
Chapter Two: Literature Review.....	8
Academic Integrity Research.....	8
Studies Examining Policies.....	8
Studies Examining Standards.....	10
Studies Examining Programs.....	15
Summary.....	18
Chapter Three: Methodology.....	20
Research Questions.....	20
Sample Selection.....	20
Center for Academic Integrity.....	21
Data Collection Procedures.....	21
Instrumentation.....	22

Validity and Reliability.....	23
Data Analysis Procedures.....	23
Chapter Four: Results.....	25
Changes in Data Collection Procedures.....	25
Description of the Sample.....	26
Results Reported by Research Questions.....	28
Policies.....	28
Standards.....	32
Programs.....	38
Responsibility for Honor Code Development.....	44
Enforcing the Honor Code.....	44
Chapter Five: Discussion and Implications.....	45
Discussion.....	45
Relationship of the Findings to Prior Research.....	49
Implications.....	50
Limitations.....	52
Conclusion.....	53
References.....	55
Appendices.....	59
Resume.....	77

List of Tables

Table 1	Characteristics of the Respondents.....	27
Table 2	Chi-Square Results on Policies for the Academic Integrity Survey.....	29-31
Table 3	Chi-Square Results on Standards for the Academic Integrity Survey.....	33-37
Table 4	Chi-Square Results on Programs for the Academic Integrity Survey.....	40-43

List of Appendices

Appendix A:	Academic Integrity Survey.....	59
Appendix B:	Potential Participation Email Message.....	66
Appendix C:	Reminder Email Message.....	68
Appendix D:	IRB Proposal Request.....	70
Appendix E:	Center for Academic Integrity Proposal.....	73

Chapter One

Introduction

Academic dishonesty is a major dilemma for institutions of higher learning. Cheating behaviors among students have been documented as early as 1941 when Drake conducted a study that indicated that 23% of students cheated. Since then percentages of students involved in cheating and academic dishonesty have increased. Students are now cheating at an alarming rate as evidenced in a study by McCabe and Trevino (1993) where 52% of 6,000 undergraduate students surveyed admitted cheating on an exam by copying from another student.

Students' behavior and ethics are at the center of the cheating behavior. Haines, Diekhoff, Labeff and Clark (1986) found that student immaturity, decreasing commitment to academics, and neutral attitudes toward cheating were major factors in academic dishonesty. Parental behaviors also reinforce negative student behaviors by teaching students that as long as they are not caught, their actions are acceptable (Stevens & Stevens, 1987).

Institutions strive to incorporate ethical principles within the learning process for students. The academic integrity culture of an institution has been found to be the most important variable in determining the amount of cheating on a campus (McCabe & Trevino, 1996). Honor codes exist at many institutions. Other institutions develop academic integrity policies and student conduct guidelines to promote ethical standards and guidelines for the campus community.

If the ethics or culture of an institution affects the amount of cheating that occurs among students, then colleges and universities should strive to develop a culture that discourages academic dishonesty. The development of ethics within an

organization takes time, patience, and a high level of cognitive skill (Fried, 1995). Academic integrity standards, programs, and policies are intended to create an atmosphere of order, fairness, and justice for students to promote ethical decision-making and change the behavior of students (Kuh, Schuh, Whitt & Associates, 1991). Academic integrity policies and honor codes disseminate information to the campus community and do have the desired affect of decreasing cheating (May & Loyd, 1993).

Students cheat for a variety of reasons: stress, opportunity, academic achievement, and personal standards (Barnett & Dalton, 1981). Students feel pressure from parents, faculty, and other students to succeed academically. Stevens' (1984) study indicated that even though students believe they have higher standards than fellow students they cheat because they feel their peers are cheating.

Colleges strive to enhance the lives of students. The goal of liberal education is to create opportunities for students to expand their knowledge. Colleges also promote moral development. Administrators and faculty are responsible for developing students into ethical adults with integrity. The goals of an institution extend far beyond knowledge attainment (Hesburgh, 1985). The values and morals that are learned at college carry over into the future work place of graduates.

Academic Integrity Research

Academic dishonesty has been analyzed in a variety of ways. Researchers have conducted longitudinal studies and studies by gender, culture, religious affiliation, and institutional type. McCabe and Bowers (1994) compared results from studies in 1964 and 1991 to identify cheating behaviors over time. They found that students' attitudes towards cheating are changing with evidence of an increase in unpermitted collaboration and an increase in self-reported cheating on exams.

Academic dishonesty has also been analyzed by gender. Henderschott, Drinan, and Cross (1999) studied academic integrity at a mid-sized, comprehensive, private university. The findings indicated that women have different reasons than men for not cheating such as avoiding cheating out of respect for others. The study also indicated that academic integrity policies and honor codes are more of a deterrent for women than men.

Academic dishonesty is also influenced by institutional culture. On campuses where there is an honor code, instances of cheating are less frequent than on campuses where there are no such codes (Henderschott, Drinan, & Cross, 2000).

Academic dishonesty and honor codes have also been studied at state, public institutions. Hall and Kuh (1998) studied three state-assisted universities that required students to sign an honor code pledge where students participated in the adjudication procedures of the honor system. The results showed that students and faculty hold different views on why students cheat, and student perspectives on cheating directly impact students' decision to cheat (Hall & Kuh, 1998). Students indicated that their reasons for cheating were pressure to get high grades, irrelevant course materials, unsupervised testing conditions, and laziness. Overwhelmingly, faculty felt that students cheated because of their inability to comprehend the material.

In a similar study that focused on honor code and non-honor code environments, McCabe, Trevino, and Butterfield (1999) sampled 31 institutions, 14 institutions had traditional honor code systems and 17 institutions used other types of policies. The study indicated that students from honor code schools discussed academic integrity significantly more frequently, indicating that the presence of an honor code permeated the culture of the institution. Ultimately, students at institutions

with honor codes viewed academic integrity in a much different way than students at non-honor code institutions (McCabe, Trevino, & Butterfield, 1999).

Differences in academic dishonesty by ethnic and religious participation have also been investigated. In a study by Sutton and Huba (1995), African American students and white students did not differ in their perceptions of cheating behaviors and students who were religiously involved were more likely to agree that cheating is never justified.

Institutional type has also been the focus of research. Every institution is different based on mission and two-year or four-year status. The definition of cheating behaviors differed between students and faculty and differed even more by institution type (i.e. public or private) (Hendershott, Drinan, & Cross, 2000). A recent study that sampled students at two private, Catholic institutions showed that students cheated based on situational factors such as needing a better grade, not having enough time to study, and students recognizing an opportunity and deciding to cheat (Graham, Monday, O'Brien, & Steffen, 1994).

Research on academic integrity has been analyzed by gender (Henderschott, Drinan, & Cross, 1999), culture (Henderschott, Drinan, & Cross, 2000), overtime (McCabe & Bowers, 1994), religious affiliation (Sutton & Huba, 1995), and institutional type (Graham, et al. 1994), but research is lacking on comparisons of policies, standards, and programs related to academic dishonesty. Research on academic dishonesty that compares policies, standards, and programs could increase the knowledge base on academic integrity, specifically how each institution is developing policies, promoting the standards of the institution, and the academic integrity program of the institution.

A framework for addressing academic dishonesty was developed by Kibler (1993). The framework specifically addresses academic dishonesty by focusing on the policies, ethos (standards), and programs of an institution. Policies are the written documentation or rules regarding academic integrity. Ethos refers to the value system or standards of an institution. The program of an institution refers to the education, training, or activities that address academic dishonesty. Kibler's (1993) framework served as the guide for this study along with recent research conducted by Bush (2000) using Kibler's framework.

In conclusion, previous literature has examined academic dishonesty in a variety of fashions. The study of academic integrity policies, standards, and programs by institutional type is an area that is underrepresented in the current research on academic integrity. Policies are critical in maintaining and promoting academic integrity. McCabe and Trevino (1993) hypothesized that "academic dishonesty is inversely related to understanding and acceptance of academic integrity policies" (p.526). Academic integrity policies are a crucial part of an institution's role in promoting and maintaining environments that are free from academic dishonesty. The standards of an institution embody the values of the academic community and their importance cannot be understated. McCabe and Trevino (1996) concluded that the ethos (standards) of a community may be the most important factor in determining the level of student cheating on that campus. Academic integrity programs also impact the amount of cheating that occurs. McCabe, Trevino, and Butterfield (1999) found that most students at Honor Code schools feel like they are "part of a moral community that offers significant trust and freedom and has corresponding rules and expectations that must be honored to preserve that trust and freedom" (p. 231). This study was designed to address the gap in the existing literature on academic dishonesty by examining

academic integrity policies, the standards of an institution, and the programs of an institution.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to analyze the extent to which academic integrity policies, standards, and programs differ by institutional type. Specifically, the study focused on the academic integrity policy of each institution, the promotion of standards, and the academic integrity program.

Research Questions

I used the following research questions as a guide for the present study.

1. To what degree do the written policies on academic integrity differ by institutional type?
2. How does the existence of standards, in regards to academic dishonesty, differ by institutional type?
3. How does the academic integrity program (education, training, activities) differ by institutional type?
4. Does responsibility for developing policies, standards, and programs differ by institutional type?
5. Does responsibility for enforcing policies, standards, and programs differ by institutional type?

Definitions

The following definitions were used in the research.

Academic integrity means intellectual and personal honesty in learning, teaching, and research while depending upon clear standards, practices, and procedures of students, faculty, and administration (academicintegrity.org, November 2, 2000).

Ethos refers to the standards or character of a particular institution (Kibler, 1993).

Academic Integrity Policies refers to the "written documentation" that an institution has regarding academic dishonesty (Kibler, p.12, 1993).

Academic Integrity Programs are the "education, training, activities, or programs that address academic dishonesty beyond the existence of a policy" (Kibler, p.12, 1993).

Academic Dishonesty refers to "forms of cheating and plagiarism that involve students giving or receiving unauthorized assistance in an academic exercise or receiving credit for work that is not their own" (Kibler, Nuss, Paterson, & Pavela, p. 25, 1988).

Organization of the Study

The study is organized around five chapters. Chapter One introduced the topic, purpose of the study, the research questions, and the significance of the study. Chapter Two contains a review of literature. Chapter Three describes the methodology of the study which includes the sampling techniques and the procedures for collection and analysis of data. Chapter Four describes the results of the study. The final chapter discusses the results and their implications for future practice, research, and policy.

Chapter Two

Review of Literature

To understand the extent to which academic integrity environments differ by institutional type, I analyzed the literature on academic integrity. The literature was divided into three groups: studies focusing on academic integrity policies, studies focusing on the standards of an institution in regards to academic dishonesty, and studies that examined academic integrity programs. Policies, standards, and programs represent the three variables in the study and provide for a broad examination for the complex subject of academic dishonesty.

For purposes of this study, studies investigating policies examined the written documentation of an institution that directly applies to academic dishonesty. Studies examining standards research perceptions of academic dishonesty by examining attitudes among faculty, administrators, and students. Program studies examine the activities, education, and programs an institution has in place to promote academic integrity.

Studies Examining Policies

Academic integrity policies are the foundation of any academic integrity system. Policy research has examined how universities discourage academic dishonesty through new policies, how policies deter student behavior, and what policies require of students (e.g. peer reporting).

Cole and Conklin (1996) argued that policies are important because students should have to handle the difficult issues that arise by having to follow academic integrity policies. Students, faculty and the entire campus community must embrace academic integrity policies to dramatically decrease academic dishonesty.

In a study of 208 U.S. colleges and universities, Ludeman (1988) surveyed the chief student affairs officer at each institution to determine how institutions have been combating

academic dishonesty through new and existing policies. The majority of institutions (84%) reported having one standard academic integrity policy for every department. Similar to Cole and Conklin's (1996) study, Ludeman discovered that 50% of the schools had policies that clarified the responsibilities of students and faculty in upholding academic integrity. The importance of academic integrity research, policies, and procedures was further justified by the fact that 90% of the institutions indicated that cheating had remained the same or increased compared to 10 years prior. The development of academic integrity policies should involve the entire campus community but in Ludeman's study, student affairs departments were involved in academic integrity policy decision 46% of the time and academic affairs departments were involved 33% of the time.

While studies focusing on academic integrity policies have been somewhat limited, Hollinger and Lanza-Kaduce (1996) focused on the perceived effectiveness of countermeasures used in deterring academic dishonesty. As expected, two-thirds of 1672 students surveyed reported cheating at some point in a 15-week semester. Academic dishonesty countermeasures (e.g., test question scrambling, increased numbers of proctors, etc.) proved to deter some cheating behavior but the true effectiveness of the countermeasures depended upon the institution support of faculty policy enforcement for decreasing academic dishonesty.

A more recent study concerning peer-reporting requirements was conducted by McCabe, Trevino, and Butterfield (2001). Peer reporting requirements have been traditional aspects of academic integrity policies. Recently, schools that have attempted to create honor codes have had negative student reactions concerning the peer-reporting requirement. The study surveyed 31 institutions; 12,100 surveys were distributed with a return rate of 41.4% at noncode schools and 30.9% at code schools.

The survey results indicated significant differences between students at noncode and code schools. Forty-three percent of students at honor code schools indicated that they would report cheating as compared to 13.8% of students at noncode schools (p.40). Students at honor code schools who actually reported the cheating behavior were 7.9%, while 4% students at noncode schools reported.

In summary, university policies can have significant impacts on student dishonesty. Schools with honor codes have less cheating behavior and students report cheating behavior more than schools without honor codes (McCabe, Trevino, & Butterfield, 2001). Research also indicates the need for institutions to involve the entire campus community in the creation of policies instead of depending on one group such as faculty (Ludeman, 1988).

Studies Examining Standards

The term "standard" refers to the ethos of an institution, specifically, the value system or culture of an institution. In relation to academic dishonesty, an institution can develop a community that upholds and respects the standards set forth by the institution (Kibler, 1993).

Student reactions to cheating are considered important elements in the development of academic integrity. Jendrek (1992) conducted a study of 776 students to determine the relationship between witnessing cheating and their attitude toward cheating. The results of the Jendrek study indicated that, "as class standing increased, so did reports of cheating (61.9 % first year students compared to 82.8% senior students)" (p.262). The results also indicated that men were more likely than women to report cheating during an examination while women were twice as likely as men to report observing one instance of cheating (7.7% for men vs. 17% for women). The study also

indicated that a large proportion of students (74%) have observed an incident of cheating.

In a study of 480 students and 48 faculty members at two mid-western colleges, Graham, Monday, O'Brien, and Steffen (1994) found that 90% of students reported cheating at least once. Students also indicated that the top cheating behaviors included looking at notes during a test and arranging to give answers during a test. The research results also indicated that cheating occurred because of situational factors and that students were more likely to cheat when they felt faculty had been unfair. In the same study, faculty were surveyed about current academic integrity practices and policies. Only 64.3% of faculty surveyed had a statement about cheating on their syllabi and more than 78% of faculty had caught a student cheating. The survey results indicated that faculty should receive more training around discouraging and preventing academic dishonesty.

In a similar study about academic integrity climate, Hendershott, Drinan, and Cross (2000) surveyed 6000 students at a private, Catholic university. The results were being gathered to help determine the structure of a new academic integrity program that the university was considering. Students revealed that they did not believe that they should be the monitors of academic integrity. Also, faculty from the university showed signs of varying support for academic integrity initiatives (e.g., placing honor system definitions on their syllabus, discussing academic integrity in the classroom) and ultimately, students felt that administrators should be responsible for any type of honor system. The varying attitudes among students and faculty revealed a lack of ownership for future responsibility of an academic integrity program.

McCabe and Bowers (1994) conducted a longitudinal study in an effort to compare cheating behaviors among male college students. Bowers conducted a study in 1963 of 5,422 students at

99 institutions. McCabe conducted a similar study in 1990 of 6096 students at 31 institutions. McCabe combined the two studies and created a combined sample using the criteria from his study. The combined results of the data revealed that self-reported cheating was lower at honor code schools, students were collaborating on written assignments three times more than in 1963, but overall student cheating had not significantly increased from 1963 levels where Bowers found that 75% of students (N=5000) had cheated at least once (p. 7).

Sutton and Huba (1995) conducted a study to evaluate differences of African American and white students in their perceptions of academic dishonesty while also comparing religious involvement. A 42-question Likert-type survey was distributed to 534 students at a large, mid-western, public university. The study's findings indicated that students who participated more in religious activities, compared to nonreligious students, considered certain activities (e.g., adding improper references to a bibliography and copying sentences without footnoting) as definite forms of cheating. The study indicated that students involved in religious activities (e.g., attendance at church, participation in youth groups, choir, and extent that religion has played in one's life) were more likely to identify certain behaviors as cheating as well as think cheating occurred more frequently at the university than those not involved. Students active in their religion were more likely than non-active students to consider behaviors such as copying a few sentences without footnoting or working in groups without professor authorization as cheating.

Another study by Hendershott, Drinan, and Cross (1999) investigated the role of gender differences and cheating behaviors. A survey was distributed to 532 undergraduate students at a mid-sized, comprehensive, private university. The survey results indicated that females were more likely than

males to be honest in their academic work out of respect for others and that academic integrity policies were more of a deterrent for females than males. Moreover, roughly 30% of males agreed that cheating was a legitimate way to get ahead while only 15% of females agreed.

Faculty and administrator reactions to academic dishonesty have also been researched to address faculty commitment to addressing academic dishonesty. In a 1994 study by Aaron and Georgia, 257 student affairs officers were surveyed concerning their reactions and faculty reactions to student dishonesty. The sample included 100 four-year public institutions, 90 four-year private institutions, and 67 public community colleges. More than 60% of the respondents indicated that faculty handle academic dishonesty on their own as opposed to reporting the violations to the honor or judicial system and 40% of the respondents indicated that faculty did not know the policies concerning academic dishonesty (p. 85). Even though over half of the institutions indicated a commitment to addressing academic dishonesty, academic dishonesty was prevalent across all institutional types (p. 89).

Another focus area of academic dishonesty research has been fraternity and sorority membership. Storch and Storch (2002) surveyed 244 fraternity and sorority members to determine if fraternity or sorority membership affected the frequency of academic dishonesty. Results indicated that males cheated more than females, members of fraternities and sororities had more frequent occurrences of academic dishonesty than non-members, and student involvement in fraternities and sororities increased the number of academic dishonesty incidents (p.249). The study indicated that fraternity or sorority membership affects academic integrity and also suggests that fraternity or sorority members have a "it's only illegal if you get caught mentality" (Storch & Storch, p.250).

Another area of research on academic dishonesty is the relationship between academic dishonesty and the workplace. Student attitudes and beliefs are at the center of academic dishonesty. Beliefs carry over into the workplace and can cause financial damage to corporations. In a recent study, Nonis and Swift (2001) surveyed 1051 undergraduate and graduate business students to determine if there was a relationship between academic dishonesty and workplace dishonesty. The respondents were 52% men, 48% women, 74% undergraduate, and 26% graduate students (p.71). Results indicated that academic dishonesty was more prevalent among younger students and males. With respect to workplace dishonesty, "males were more likely to actually engage in workplace dishonesty than females" (Nonis & Swift, p.74). Data from graduate students indicated that they were less tolerant of cheating behaviors. Overall, the study determined that a high correlation existed among students who cheated at school and at the workplace.

Academic dishonesty is increasingly being viewed as an international problem. Burns, Davis, Hoshino, and Miller (1998) conducted a survey of 228 Japanese students and 210 South African students to determine the levels of academic dishonesty in Japan and South Africa and to compare the data to United States figures. Levels of Japanese student cheating increased from 20.4% in high school to 41.7% in college (p.592). Japanese women admitted to cheating at a rate of 44.9%, compared to Japanese men at 36.9%. Results from the South African student data showed that 13.5% of students cheated in high school while 41.9% cheated in college. South African students behavior was similar to American students: men cheated more than women and self-reported rates of cheating decreased from high school to college (p.593). Japanese student data indicated that women cheated more frequently than men, which is opposite of American trends.

The data from the Japanese and South African students' cheating behavior was lower than American rates of cheating but indicated that academic dishonesty is a global issue. Based on the increase of cheating from high school to college, Japanese and South African students obviously experience similar pressures to succeed in college.

Research on standards related to academic dishonesty has focused on several groups. The areas of focus have looked at student attitudes, faculty perceptions, comparisons of student and faculty perceptions, ethnicity and religious perceptions, Greek students attitudes, and international students beliefs and perceptions.

Studies Examining Programs

Programmatic studies examined the activities, education, and programs in place to promote and uphold academic integrity and prevent academic dishonesty. "Programs" refers to "education, training, or activities that address academic dishonesty beyond the existence of a policy" (Kibler, p. 13, 1993).

Aaron (1992) conducted a study of 175 chief student affairs officers to determine how their institutions handled academic dishonesty. Almost all of the institutions (98%) indicated having some type of guidelines for academic violations (p. 108). The results indicated that student handbooks (79.4%) were the most common educational tool. Other educational methods that were commonly used included school catalogs (42.3%), orientation programs (42.3%) and brochures (30.3%) (Aaron, 1992). Institutions used similar educational programs geared at preventing academic dishonesty, but the results indicated that institutions need to develop alternative educational methods such as peer discussion groups and marketing campaigns in various media outlets on campus.

In 1993, McCabe and Trevino conducted a study to compare academic dishonesty among institutions with and without honor codes. More than 6096 students from 31 institutions returned the survey. The results indicated that student cheating was higher among noncode schools than code schools (p. 531). Student perceptions of peer dishonesty were positively associated with academic dishonesty while academic integrity policies were negatively associated (p. 532). The findings suggested that peers are more likely to determine their behavior by watching their peers and care less about established rules of conduct. Based on the findings, the importance of honor codes and academic integrity programs cannot be denied. Schools with honor codes or academic integrity programs benefit from having established standards for the campus community and also have less students cheating. The more students who learn the policies through the honor code or academic integrity program the greater the chance that students will follow the standards of the academic community.

Continuing on the same research path, McCabe, Trevino, and Butterfield (1999) conducted a qualitative study comparing honor code and non-honor code institutions in an effort to understand students' thoughts on academic integrity. Students from honor code schools discussed the honor code even though they were not prompted, which indicated the impact honor codes have on values, attitude, and behavior of students (p. 216). The authors summarized that "code students sense that they are part of a special community that demands compliance with certain standards in exchange for the many privileges associated with honor codes, such as unproctored exams and self-scheduled exams" (p. 230).

Various pressures such as GPA or financial aid affect students' rationales regarding cheating such as GPA or financial aid. Data from the study indicated that students at honor code schools attempted to rationalize cheating behavior 4.8% of the

time, while students at noncode schools rationalized the behavior 10.5% of the time. Students face many pressures regardless of whether their institution has an honor code. Students at honor code schools appear to accept the academic standards of integrity by not attempting to justify behaviors that go against the institution's academic community.

Hall and Kuh (1998) conducted a similar study to determine the role of academic honor codes at state institutions. Three institutions were sampled and data were collected through focus groups and individual interviews with students. Hall and Kuh (1998) found that independent honor codes do not decrease academic dishonesty because a university must have an institutional culture that promotes academic integrity. The results also indicated that the campus community was divided on why students cheat. Students revealed the following reasons for cheating: pressure to get good grades, non-proctored tests, and laziness. Faculty believed students cheated because of their inability to comprehend the material and student affairs administrators knew cheating was occurring but offered no reasons as to why students cheated. Students at all three institutions indicated that faculty are the primary source for upholding academic integrity.

May and Loyd conducted a 1993 study of 177 students from a large, public institution. The purpose of the study was to determine the effect of the honor code on student cheating and perceptions. Results indicated fewer than 20% of students at an honor code institution reported cheating on an assignment as compared to one-third of students at non-honor code schools (p. 126). Students were also asked to respond to the advantage and disadvantage of having an honor system. The most consistent themes were that honor systems create community and a trusting environment (41% of students) and honor codes improve student freedom and allow for greater expression (24% of students).

Also, students (53%) indicated that the honor system was ineffective because it did not work. Students reasoned that the honor code did not work because not all students followed the honor code, punishments were too harsh and not applicable to minor offenses, and that the honor code was difficult to enforce. Overall, the data from the study supported the conclusion that the "existence of an honor code is associated with increased academic honesty" (p. 128).

Summary

Academic dishonesty is an issue of extreme importance for colleges and universities. Student rates of cheating have been determined to be as high as 90% (Graham, et al., 1994). The study of academic dishonesty has been continual since the mid 19th century. Researchers have analyzed academic dishonesty by conducting studies about the attitudes and perceptions of students, faculty, and administrators (ethos studies). The values of an institution have been studied by researching the academic integrity culture among students, faculty, and administrators. Policy studies have analyzed the academic dishonesty issue by examining the relationship between institutional policies and the impact policies have on students. Honor code versus non-honor code environments have been researched to determine possible differences or similarities of academic dishonesty that occurs at institutions (programmatic studies).

Prevention of academic dishonesty continues to be an important aspect of institutions' philosophies and mission (Stovall, 1989). Cheating remains a significant problem for institutions of all types despite various attempts to understand and control the academic dishonesty problem. The need for continued investigation into academic dishonesty is warranted because of the continued existence of the problem throughout higher education. The purpose of this investigation is to

examine how higher education institutions differ by institutional type and size. The research will fill a void in the literature by comparing the academic integrity policies of public and private institutions, standards of an institution, and the academic integrity program.

Chapter Three

Method

The purpose of this study was to analyze the extent to which academic integrity policies, standards, and programs in relation to academic dishonesty differ by institutional type.

Research Questions

I used the following research questions to guide the present study.

1. To what degree does the written policy on academic integrity differ by institutional type?
2. How do the standards, in regards to academic integrity, differ by institutional type?
3. How does the academic integrity program (education, training, activities) differ by institutional type?
4. Does responsibility for developing standards, policies and programs differ by institutional type?
5. Does responsibility for enforcing standards, policies, and programs differ by institutional type?

Sample Selection

The research questions in the study required a sample of individuals who had current information on policies, standards, and programs at their institution in regards to academic dishonesty. The Center for Academic Integrity is an organization that provides a forum for academic integrity among faculty, students, and administrators (The Center for Academic Integrity, 2003).

I selected universities to be analyzed that are members of the Center for Academic Integrity (CAI). CAI has 320 member institutions with 164 public institutions and 156 private institutions. The CAI membership affiliation includes: 55 religious, 4 medical, 25 community colleges, 286 four year institutions, and 11 high schools. I selected CAI because the membership would be more invested in academic integrity and

would be the most knowledgeable representatives for their institution. I categorized the member institutions of CAI based on institutional type (public v. private) and nature of enrollment (2yr - 4yr). I surveyed the 320 member institutions of the Center for Academic Integrity. This study does not propose that the 320 institutions are a representative sample of higher education.

Center for Academic Integrity. To choose the institutions to be sampled, I contacted the Director of the Center for Academic Integrity for permission to distribute the survey to member institutions of CAI. The process required that I submit a formal proposal to the CAI research review board. The CAI review board approved the research and officially endorsed the study.

Data Collection

Before the study began, I received Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval for the study. I began the research after obtaining permission from the IRB.

I directed the survey to the main member contacts from the CAI member list via email. I chose the main members because of their membership with the Center for Academic Integrity and because of their potential knowledge of academic integrity policies, standards, and programs on their respective campuses . I assumed that the CAI membership would be responsive to participating in the study. I sent an email to the assistant director of the Center for Academic Integrity who forwarded my email to the membership of the Center (Appendix B and C). The email contained a link to the website survey (Appendix A). Once the survey was completed, the respondent clicked the submit button using survey software provided by Virginia Tech. After seven days I sent a reminder email to the assistant director of

the Center for Academic Integrity who then forwarded the email to the membership list. I repeated this step on the 12th day after the initial survey distribution and also added an additional survey link because of server problems with the first survey. On the 15th day after the initial email a reminder email was sent which notified the participants that this was the final chance to take part in the research and that the website would be shut down in three days.

The timing of the survey was a consideration since most university administrators and faculty take annual leave during the summer. I hoped to retrieve data from 93 participants (public and private institutions) for a response rate of thirty percent.

Instrumentation

For purposes of this study, I used a survey called Academic Integrity Survey (AIS) originally developed by William Kibler (1994) and modified by David Bush (2000). I used the AIS to compare academic integrity policies, standards, and programs among the surveyed institutions. The AIS was put online using a web-based survey program. A copy of the AIS is in Appendix A.

The AIS is comprised of four sections. The first section asked information about institution type (public or private/independent) and nature of enrollment (two-year or four-year). I also asked who is responsible for administering the honor system (provost, vice-president for student affairs, faculty, dean of student affairs).

The second section is titled *Policies*. This section has ten questions that focus on the written documentation that addresses an institution's position regarding academic dishonesty.

The third section is titled *Standards*. Respondents were asked 20 questions regarding the promotion of academic integrity values on their campus including written and verbal communication and evidence of practice.

The final section is titled *Program*. This section has 15 questions regarding the education, training, activities, or programs that address academic dishonesty beyond the existence of a policy.

An Associate Professor of Higher Education and Student Affairs reviewed the survey to ensure that the questions were appropriate and instructions were clear. The Associate Professor has expertise in issues related to academic integrity and judicial affairs. I revised the AIS based on suggestions from the review.

Validity and Reliability

An expert review of a survey instrument is one way to establish and enhance the validity of the study. The AIS was reviewed for content by the expert to enhance the validity of the instrument.

No reliability data existed for the instrument developed by Bush (1993) and modified for this study. Instrument reliability was not determined for this study because the study was only administered once to a single group.

Data Analysis Procedures

Data from completed surveys were tabulated within the web-based survey program. Seventy-four surveys were returned through the original link and ten surveys were returned using the additional survey link. The data from the additional link was sent to my email address in raw form. I took the data in raw form and entered into the web-based survey program for consistency. At that point, I took the data in Excel form and coded the survey for analysis. I coded the data into numerical data. For example, a *yes* response was coded as "1" and a *no* response was coded as a "2". A *don't know* response was coded as "2" because I was primarily concerned with "yes" and "no" responses.

Demographic information was also coded numerically in order to perform a Chi-square analysis. For example, a public institution was coded as "1" and private/independent was coded as "2".

The coded information was entered into a statistical software package commonly known as SPSS. After all the surveys were entered into SPSS, I ran a chi-square analysis on the data to determine if any significance existed between public and private institutions. For purposes of this study, I grouped "no" and "don't know" into the same category in SPSS. The research questions were compared by institution type and nature of enrollment.

This chapter described the method, sample selection, data collection, and data analysis procedures used in this study. I used the AIS to gather data about academic dishonesty. Specifically, the study focused on academic integrity policies, standards, and programs.

Chapter Four

Results

The purpose of this chapter is to report the results of the data analysis. I developed this study to examine academic integrity policies, standards, and programs by institution type. The chapter is organized into three sections. The first section describes changes to the original data collection procedures. The second section provides a description of the demographic characteristics of the sample. The final section reports the results of the study. The results are displayed and reviewed in the order of the research questions outlined in Chapter 1.

Changes in Data Collection Procedures

I made three changes to the data collection procedure. First, the original survey was placed online through the web-based software program called Survey Maker. I added another link to an independent website because participants were reporting difficulties with the original link. This alternate questionnaire was written in HTML and posted as a separate URL. Ten surveys were submitted through the alternate link.

Second, the original collection procedure called for two reminder emails to be sent to participants. I sent a third reminder email to increase participation in the study. The third email resulted in an additional eight completed surveys. An additional request to contact non-respondents directly was denied by the Executive Director of the Center for Academic Integrity.

Lastly, I changed the original survey at the suggestion of my thesis committee. The policy section was moved to the second section and the standards section was moved to the third section. The move was made to improve the flow and logic of the survey.

Description of the Sample

A total of 84 surveys were completed by participants. This represented a 28 percent response rate. The demographic characteristics of the sample are summarized in Table 1.

I did not compare enrollment type to the research questions because only five two-year colleges completed questionnaires. I did not want to conduct a chi-square analysis with such a low response rate because it would violate the statistical rule, which states that if 20 percent of cells contain frequencies of less than five, the researcher must interpret the results with caution.

Table 1

Characteristics of the Respondents (N=84)

<i>Characteristics</i>	n	%
<hr/>		
Type of Institution		
Public	38	45%
Private/Independent	45	54%
No answer	1	1%
Nature of Enrollment		
Two-year	5	6%
Four-Year	76	90%
No answer	3	4%
Responsibility for administering the Honor System		
Provost	10	12%
Vice President of Student Affairs	19	23%
Faculty	5	6%
Dean of Student Affairs	20	24%
Other	29	35%
No answer	1	1%

Results Reported by Research Questions

Policies

The first research question focused on the degree to which the written policies on academic integrity differ by institutional type. I conducted a chi-square analysis on the differences between academic integrity policies by institutional type (public or private/independent). The results are described below and in Table 2. A summary of the questions that revealed significant differences follows. The second item in the policies section focused on whether institutions had an honor code. A significant difference was revealed at the .000 level. Respondents from private institutions were much more likely to report that their institutions had an honor code.

The sixth item in the policies section concentrated on student obligations to report others observed committing violations. A significant difference was revealed at the .008 level. Honor codes at private institutions were more likely to contain this requirement.

The tenth item in the policies section focused on an institution's attempt to create clear academic integrity policies that reduce honor violations. A significant difference was revealed at the .005 level. Respondents at private institutions were more likely to hold this view. No significant difference existed at the .05 level for items related to due process, faculty commitment to the honor code, separation of the honor code from the student code of conduct, and defining of prohibited behaviors.

Table 2

Chi-Square Results on Policies from the Academic Integrity Survey

Item		Yes	No	χ^2	df	p
1. <i>Does your institution have campus-wide policies designed to prevent academic dishonesty?</i>						
Institution Type	Public	36 (97%)	1 (3%)	1.36	1	.244
	Private	41 (91%)	4 (9%)			
	Total	77 (94%)	5 (6%)			
2. <i>Does your institution have an honor code?</i>						
Institution Type	Public	11 (30%)	26 (70%)	12.47	1	.000*
	Private	31 (69%)	14 (31%)			
	Total	42 (51%)	40 (49%)			
3. <i>Is the Honor Code separated from your code of student conduct?</i>						
Institution Type	Public	7 (70%)	3 (30%)	.101	1	.750
	Private	20 (65%)	11 (36%)			
	Total	27 (66%)	14 (34%)			
4. <i>Does your Honor Code define prohibited behaviors?</i>						
Institution Type	Public	10 (91%)	1 (9%)	.003	1	.955
	Private	28 (90%)	3 (10%)			
	Total	38 (91%)	4 (10%)			

Table 2 (con't)

Chi-Square Results on Policies from the Academic Integrity Survey

Item		Yes	No	χ^2	df	p
5. Does your Honor Code state the consequences for engaging in prohibited behaviors?						
Institution Type	Public	9 (82%)	2 (18%)	.494	1	.482
	Private	22 (71%)	9 (29%)			
	Total	31 (74%)	11 (26%)			
6. Does your Honor Code obligate students to report others observed committing violations?						
Institution Type	Public	1 (9%)	10 (91%)	6.94	1	.008*
	Private	17 (55%)	14 (45%)			
	Total	18 (43%)	24 (57%)			
7. Are students required to affirm their commitment to the Honor Code in writing?						
Institution Type	Public	5 (46%)	6 (55%)	3.02	1	.082
	Private	23 (74%)	8 (26%)			
	Total	28 (67%)	14 (33%)			
8. Are faculty members required to affirm their commitment to the Honor Code in writing?						
Institution Type	Public	0 (0%)	11 (100%)	1.15	1	.284
	Private	3 (10%)	28 (90%)			
	Total	3 (7%)	39 (93%)			

Table 2 (con't)

Chi-Square Results on Policies from the Academic Integrity Survey

Item		Yes	No	χ^2	df	p
<i>9. Is due process for academic dishonesty cases defined?</i>						
Institution Type	Public	31 (89%)	4 (11%)	2.76	1	.097
	Private	43 (98%)	1 (2%)			
	Total	74 (94%)	5 (6%)			
<i>10. Do you think that your institution's attempt to create clear academic integrity policies on your campus reduces honor violations?</i>						
Institution Type	Public	15 (44%)	19 (56%)	7.73	1	.005*
	Private	33 (75%)	11 (25%)			
	Total	48 (62%)	30 (39%)			

* = significant at the .05 level

Standards

The second research question concentrated on whether the existence of standards, in regards to academic dishonesty, differs by institutional type. I conducted a chi-square analysis on the differences of standards by institutional type (public or private/independent). The results are described below and in Table 3.

A summary of the questions that revealed a significant difference follows. The first item in the standards section focused on whether academic dishonesty was discussed at new student orientation. A significant difference was revealed at the .004 level. Administrators at private institutions were more likely to include this topic in their orientation programs than were their public institution counterparts.

The fifth item concentrated on whether academic dishonesty is discussed at graduate teaching assistant training/orientation. A significant difference was revealed at the .009 level. Those responsible for these orientation programs at public institutions were more likely to discuss academic honesty in graduate teaching assistant training.

The twentieth item in the standards section focused on an institution's attempt to create a sense of values about academic integrity. A significant difference was revealed at the .001 level. Respondents at private institutions were more likely to say their institution was trying to do this.

No significant difference existed at the .05 level for items related to academic dishonesty discussions for faculty/staff in-service training, printed materials on academic dishonesty/integrity, and written information about academic integrity.

Table 3
Chi-Square Results on Standards from the Academic Integrity Survey

Item		Yes	No	χ^2	df	p
<i>Is academic dishonesty discussed at any of the following?</i>						
1. <i>New Student Orientation</i>						
Institution Type	Public	24 (65%)	13 (35%)	8.51	1	.004*
	Private	41 (91%)	4 (9%)			
	Total	65 (79%)	17 (21%)			
2. <i>Beginning of each course</i>						
Institution Type	Public	16 (43%)	21 (57%)	2.94	1	.086
	Private	28 (62%)	17 (38%)			
	Total	44 (54%)	38 (46%)			
3. <i>New faculty/staff training/orientation</i>						
Institution Type	Public	28 (76%)	9 (24%)	.091	1	.763
	Private	32 (73%)	12 (27%)			
	Total	60 (74%)	21 (26%)			
4. <i>Faculty/Staff in-service training</i>						
Institution Type	Public	23 (62%)	14 (38%)	.801	1	.371
	Private	23 (52%)	21 (48%)			
	Total	46 (57%)	35 (43%)			

Table 3 (con't)

Chi-Square Results on Standards from the Academic Integrity Survey

Item		Yes	No	χ^2	df	p
<i>Is academic dishonesty discussed at any of the following?</i>						
5. <i>Graduate teaching assistant training/orientation</i>						
Institution Type	Public	20 (65%)	11 (36%)	6.74	1	.009*
	Private	13 (33%)	26 (67%)			
	Total	33 (47%)	37 (53%)			
<i>Is a statement on academic dishonesty/integrity printed in any of the following?</i>						
6. <i>Faculty/Staff handbook</i>						
Institution Type	Public	23 (64%)	13 (36%)	3.50	1	.061
	Private	37 (82%)	8 (18%)			
	Total	60 (74%)	21 (26%)			
7. <i>Catalog</i>						
Institution Type	Public	27 (75%)	9 (25%)	2.70	1	.100
	Private	40 (89%)	5 (11%)			
	Total	67 (83%)	14 (17%)			
8. <i>Admission application materials</i>						
Institution Type	Public	9 (26%)	26 (74%)	2.36	1	.125
	Private	19 (42%)	26 (58%)			
	Total	28 (35%)	52 (65%)			

Table 3 (con't)

Chi-Square Results on Standards from the Academic Integrity Survey

Item		Yes	No	χ^2	df	p
<i>Is a statement on academic dishonesty/integrity printed in any of the following?</i>						
<i>9. Student Handbook</i>						
Institution Type	Public	33 (89%)	4 (11%)	2.62	1	.106
	Private	44 (98%)	1 (2%)			
	Total	77 (94%)	5 (6%)			
<i>10. Schedule of classes</i>						
Institution Type	Public	6 (17%)	29 (83%)	.022	1	.883
	Private	7 (16%)	37 (84%)			
	Total	13 (17%)	66 (84%)			
<i>11. Course syllabus in every course</i>						
Institution Type	Public	12 (33%)	24 (67%)	.172	1	.678
	Private	17 (38%)	28 (62%)			
	Total	29 (36%)	52 (64%)			
<i>12. Exam booklets</i>						
Institution Type	Public	5 (14%)	30 (86%)	3.81	1	.051
	Private	15 (33%)	30 (67%)			
	Total	20 (25%)	60 (75%)			

Table 3 (con't)

Chi-Square Results on Standards from the Academic Integrity Survey

Item		Yes	No	χ^2	df	p
<i>Is the following information included in written information about academic integrity that is disseminated to students?</i>						
13. <i>Definition of academic dishonesty</i>						
Institution Type	Public	37 (100%)	0 (0%)	1.69	1	.194
	Private	43 (97%)	2 (4%)			
	Total	80 (98%)	2 (2%)			
14. <i>Why academic dishonesty is prohibited</i>						
Institution Type	Public	28 (76%)	9 (24%)	.222	1	.638
	Private	36 (80%)	9 (20%)			
	Total	64 (78%)	18 (22%)			
15. <i>Forms or types of academic dishonesty that are prohibited</i>						
Institution Type	Public	35 (95%)	2 (5%)	.398	1	.528
	Private	40 (91%)	4 (9%)			
	Total	75 (93%)	6 (7%)			
16. <i>Expectations and responsibilities of students</i>						
Institution Type	Public	33 (94%)	2 (6%)	1.27	1	.260
	Private	39 (87%)	6 (13%)			
	Total	72 (90%)	8 (10%)			

Table 3 (con't)

Chi-Square Results on Standards from the Academic Integrity Survey

Item		Yes	No	χ^2	df	p
<i>Is the following information included in written information about academic integrity that is disseminated to students?</i>						
17. <i>Expectations and responsibilities of faculty</i>						
Institution Type	Public	21 (58%)	15 (42%)	2.03	1	.155
	Private	33 (73%)	12 (27%)			
	Total	54 (67%)	27 (33%)			
18. <i>How to report a violation</i>						
Institution Type	Public	25 (69%)	11 (31%)	2.60	1	.107
	Private	38 (84%)	7 (16%)			
	Total	63 (78%)	18 (22%)			
19. <i>Are announcements about efforts to promote academic integrity included in the campus press or other media sources?</i>						
Institution Type	Public	15 (41%)	22 (60%)	.725	1	.395
	Private	22 (50%)	22 (50%)			
	Total	37 (46%)	44 (54%)			
20. <i>Do you think your institutions attempt to create a sense of values about academic integrity reduces honor violations on your campus?</i>						
Institution Type	Public	14 (38%)	23 (62%)	11.40	1	.001*
	Private	33 (75%)	11 (25%)			
	Total	47 (58%)	34 (42%)			

* = significant at the .05 level

Programs

The third research question examined how an institution's academic integrity program (education, training, programs) differs by institutional type. I conducted a chi-square analysis on the differences in programs by institutional type (public or private/independent). The results are described below and in Table 4.

A summary of the questions that revealed a significant difference follows. Item three in the program section focused on whether adjunct faculty received specific training in the area of academic integrity. A significant difference was revealed at the .013 level. Adjunct faculty at private institutions were more likely to receive training.

Item four focused on whether tenure track faculty members received specific training in the area of academic integrity. A significant difference was revealed at the .004 level. Respondents from private institutions trained faculty members in the area of academic integrity more often.

The next significant item in the program section was item six which focused on whether graduate teaching assistants received specific training in the area of academic integrity. A significant difference was revealed at the .022 level. Graduate students at public institutions were more likely to receive academic integrity training than their private institution counterparts.

The fifteenth item concentrated on an institution's effort to deliver programs on academic integrity to students that reduce honor violations. A significant difference was revealed at the .035 level. Private institutions were more likely to have programs geared to reducing academic dishonesty violations.

No significant difference existed at the .05 level for items related to responsibility for reducing honor violations,

training of new faculty members in the area of academic integrity, and academic training initiatives.

Table 4

Chi-Square Results on Programs from the Academic Integrity Survey

Item		Yes	No	χ^2	df	p
1. <i>Is there one office on campus responsible for coordinating efforts to reduce academic dishonesty?</i>						
Institution Type	Public	27 (75%)	9 (25%)	.029	1	.865
	Private	33 (73%)	12 (27%)			
	Total	60 (74%)	21 (26%)			
2. <i>Are seminars/programs/discussion groups on academic integrity offered to students? (i.e. classes, student org.)</i>						
Institution Type	Public	19 (53%)	17 (47%)	.202	1	.653
	Private	26 (58%)	19 (42%)			
	Total	45 (56%)	36 (44%)			
<i>Is training specifically in the area of academic integrity provided to the following?</i>						
3. <i>Adjunct faculty</i>						
Institution Type	Public	4 (11%)	31 (89%)	6.11	1	.013*
	Private	16 (36%)	29 (64%)			
	Total	20 (25%)	60 (75%)			
4. <i>Tenure track faculty members</i>						
Institution Type	Public	8 (24%)	26 (77%)	8.17	1	.004*
	Private	25 (56%)	20 (44%)			
	Total	33 (42%)	46 (58%)			

Table 4 (con't)

Chi-Square Results on Programs from the Academic Integrity Survey

Item		Yes	No	χ^2	df	p
<i>Is training specifically in the area of academic integrity provided to the following?</i>						
<i>5. New faculty members only</i>						
Institution Type	Public	22 (65%)	12 (35%)	1.46	1	.227
	Private	23 (51%)	22 (49%)			
	Total	45 (57%)	34 (43%)			
<i>6. Graduate teaching assistants</i>						
Institution Type	Public	20 (65%)	11 (36%)	5.23	1	.022*
	Private	14 (37%)	24 (63%)			
	Total	34 (49)	35 (51%)			
<i>Does the training include any of the following?</i>						
<i>7. Definitions of academic dishonesty</i>						
Institution Type	Public	27 (79%)	7 (21%)	.974	1	.324
	Private	36 (89%)	5 (12%)			
	Total	63 (84%)	12 (16%)			
<i>8. Prevention Strategies</i>						
Institution Type	Public	27 (79%)	7 (21%)	.066	1	.798
	Private	30 (77%)	9 (23%)			
	Total	57 (78%)	16 (22%)			

Table 4 (con't)

Chi-Square Results on Programs from the Academic Integrity Survey

Item		Yes	No	χ^2	df	p
<i>Does the training included any of the following?</i>						
<i>9. Strategies for handling violations</i>						
Institution Type	Public	27 (82%)	6 (18%)	1.11	1	.292
	Private	37 (90%)	4 (10%)			
	Total	64 (87%)	10 (13%)			
<i>10. Sanctions that may be imposed</i>						
Institution Type	Public	29 (85%)	5 (15%)	.300	1	.584
	Private	33 (81%)	8 (19%)			
	Total	62 (83%)	13 (17%)			
<i>11. Are students actively involved in developing standards pertaining to academic integrity?</i>						
Institution Type	Public	19 (53%)	17 (47%)	3.41	1	.065
	Private	32 (73%)	12 (27%)			
	Total	51 (64%)	29 (36%)			
<i>12. Are students actively involved in enforcing standards pertaining to academic integrity?</i>						
Institution Type	Public	26 (70%)	11 (30%)	.601	1	.438
	Private	35 (78%)	10 (22%)			
	Total	61 (74%)	21 (26%)			

Table 4 (con't)

Chi-Square Results on Programs from the Academic Integrity Survey

Item		Yes	No	χ^2	df	p
13. <i>Are faculty members involved in developing standards pertaining to academic integrity?</i>						
Institution Type	Public	31 (86%)	5 (14%)	.005	1	.942
	Private	39 (87%)	6 (13%)			
	Total	70 (86%)	11 (14%)			
14. <i>Are faculty members actively involved in enforcing standards pertaining to academic integrity?</i>						
Institution Type	Public	34 (92%)	3 (8%)	.476	1	.490
	Private	43 (96%)	2 (4%)			
	Total	77 (94%)	5 (6%)			
15. <i>Does the effort to deliver programs on academic integrity to students on your campus reduce honor violations?</i>						
Institution Type	Public	10 (27%)	27 (73%)	4.44	1	.035*
	Private	22 (50%)	22 (50%)			
	Total	32 (40%)	49 (60%)			

* = significant at the .05 level

Responsibility for Honor Code Development

The fourth research question focused on responsibility for developing policies, standards, and programs. Items 11 and 13 in the program section were directly related to developing policies, standards, and programs. No significant difference existed at the .05 level for either item.

Enforcing the Honor Code

The fifth research question focused on responsibility for enforcing policies, standards, and programs. Items 12 and 14 in the program section were directly related to enforcing policies, standards, and programs. No significant differences were found.

The results and their implications for future practice and research are discussed in Chapter Five.

Chapter Five

Discussions and Implications

This study examined the extent to which academic integrity policies, standards, and programs differed by institutional type. Specifically, the study focused on institutional policies, standards, and programs in relation to academic dishonesty.

This chapter describes the results of the study in four sections. In the first section I discuss the findings of the study reported by the research questions. In the next section I compare the results of this study to findings from previous research. In the third section I discuss implications of the findings for future research, practice, and policy. Finally, some conclusions are drawn.

Discussion

The first research question examined the academic integrity policies of higher education institutions. Participants responded to 10 items about policies. The 10 survey items were directly related to the honor code, student and faculty commitment to the honor code, and direct reduction of violations related to policies.

Private universities indicated having an honor code system much more frequently than public universities. These findings are interesting because the CAI has approximately 164 private institution members and 156 public institution members. The findings might suggest that private institutions have developed honor code systems more frequently than public institutions. It might also suggest that administrators, faculty, and students have more flexibility with implementing or creating honor codes than public institutions. Thus, private institutions establish honor systems more frequently than public institutions.

The research also indicated that honor codes at private institutions obligate students to report cheating more than public institutions. Around 55 percent of private institution

respondents indicated requiring students to report cheating as compared to 9 percent of public institutions. Religious affiliation might be a factor in the obligation of students to report cheating. The size of the private institution might be another factor in the requirements of the institution's students to the honor code.

The research results indicated that 75 percent of private institution respondents believe their attempt to create clear academic integrity policies has reduced academic dishonesty. Around 44 percent of public institutions responded "yes" to the same question. These findings suggest that administrators or faculty at private institutions are more positive about the outcomes of the academic integrity policies on campus. The evidence of more positive feelings about the impact of academic integrity policies might correlate to the high number of private institutions with honor codes. The existence of an honor code might lead to more positive attitudes towards the effectiveness of such a code. Also, honor codes at private institutions seem to require students to commit to the honor code and report cheating more frequently than public institutions with honor codes. These two facts may generate a more positive feeling towards honor systems because students are encouraged in a more systematic way to behave honestly.

The second research question examined the standards of an institution in relation to academic dishonesty. Participants responded to 20 items related to training sessions, printed materials, written information, and marketing efforts.

The discussion of academic dishonesty at new student orientation was the first significant finding. Around 91 percent of private institutions discussed academic dishonesty at new student orientation compared to 65 percent of public institutions. This difference might be related to the type of orientation session at private institutions with Honor Codes.

Also, many private institutions offer pre-orientation sessions. The pre-orientation sessions might be more in-depth and allow for expanded discussion of academic dishonesty. Institution size may be a factor in the amount of time allotted for academic dishonesty discussions. Smaller, private institutions may be able to spend more time with incoming students on academic dishonesty education. The research also revealed that training programs at public institutions discussed academic dishonesty with graduate teaching assistants more frequently than at private institutions. This finding might be explained by the fact that public universities might employ more graduate teaching assistants than private institutions.

The research findings did not reveal any significant differences with academic dishonesty in printed materials. Also, results did not reveal any significant findings between public and private/independent institutions' written information about academic dishonesty. This is an important finding since it reveals that public and private institutions have no significant differences in the availability or types of written information on academic dishonesty.

Private institution participants did indicate that their institutions' attempts to create awareness about the institutional values surrounding academic dishonesty did reduce honor violations. Around 75 percent of private institutions responded "yes" when asked about this as compared to 38 percent of public institutions. This might be explained by the relatively smaller size of private institutions and their ability to have more frequent discussions about academic dishonesty within the campus community.

These findings echo the findings from the first research question. Private institutions indicate more often that their attempts to prevent academic dishonesty are succeeding than do public institutions. This would suggest that the existence of

honor codes and the importance of the honor code at private institutions has an impact on the academic integrity culture. Another key aspect of the ability of private institutions to feel good about the accomplishments might be associated with the institution size and the religious affiliation of the institution. Private, religious institutions might instill a positive view of the culture among the university community because of the inherent ethics that exist at such institutions.

The third research question examined the programs of an institution in relation to academic dishonesty. Participants responded to 15 items related to academic dishonesty training and delivery of academic dishonesty programs.

Training in the area of academic integrity revealed significant findings. Respondents from private institutions indicated that training exists for adjunct faculty at a rate of 36 percent compared to 11 percent of respondents from public institutions. Respondents from private institutions also indicated that there are training programs for tenure track faculty members in 56 percent of the cases as compared to 24 percent of respondents from public institutions. However, 65 percent of respondents from public institutions reported training graduate teaching assistants, compared to 37 percent from respondents at private institutions.

These findings are interesting because they suggest that private institutions train adjunct faculty and tenure track faculty more comprehensively regarding academic integrity than public institutions. The difference in training might be a factor in the positive outlook on academic dishonesty prevention among faculty and staff at private institutions. Private institutions might instill the importance of preventing academic dishonesty or the honor code culture in a more comprehensive manner than public institutions because of the institution size and the ability for the campus community to interact more often.

Another survey question asked participants if they feel their efforts to deliver programs on academic integrity to students reduce honor violations. Private institutions indicated "yes" around 50 percent while public institutions responded similarly 27 percent of the time.

Once again, this suggests that respondents from private institutions feel more positive about efforts to reduce academic dishonesty. This may be associated with the high rate of existence of honor codes at private institutions. Private institutions might also do a better job of training adjunct faculty and tenure track faculty on the importance of academic dishonesty prevention.

Relationship of the Findings to Prior Research

Prior research on academic dishonesty has been analyzed by gender (Henderschott, Drinan, & Cross, 1999), culture (Henderschott, Drinan, & Cross, 2000), religious affiliation (Sutton & Huba, 1995), and institutional type (Graham, et al. 1994), and longitudinally (McCabe & Bowers, 1994). The purpose of this study was to expand the research and examine the differences between academic integrity policies, standards, and programs by institutional type.

Some of the results of this study do corroborate some previous academic dishonesty research. The current study looked at three institutional variables: policies, standards, and programs. The comparison was between public institutions and private institutions, which makes comparisons with other studies difficult because most academic integrity research focuses on one type of institution.

Kibler's (1994) study served as the basis for this study. In Kibler's study he looked at the presence of honor codes at public and private institutions. The results indicated that a few more private institutions had honor codes compared to public institutions. The results of the present study

corroborate these findings but point to a significant difference between public and private institutions.

Kibler (1994) examined academic integrity policies among public and private institutions. The results revealed that both types of institutions have a high amount of policy dissemination to faculty, staff, and students. The present study revealed similar findings.

Implications for Future Practice, Research, and Policy

The present study was significant for future practice, policy, and research. In terms of practice, several constituencies might benefit from the study. One group includes academic affairs officers. The results of this study provided academic affairs officers with information about the degree to which institutions of varying types use standards, policies, or programs to promote or educate the community about academic integrity policies.

The study is also beneficial for student affairs staff. The results of the study provided information about academic integrity from public and private institutions. Student affairs staff could use the findings of the study to compare their institution's policies, standards, and programs to others of their institution type. Comparing this information might lead to a better approach for educating students about academic integrity in various environments, such as residence life.

Faculty could also benefit from the findings of the study. The results of the study provided faculty with information about other institutions' training programs. Faculty could use this information to assess their institution's approach to training faculty and staff to academic integrity.

The present study also had significance for future research. For example, this study examined the existence of policies, and programs of academic integrity among various institutions. Future studies might examine how institutions

develop the culture or ethos of academic integrity over time. A study such as this might show how a relationship between academic integrity policies and religious affiliation influences an academic community, for example. Also, a future study might examine the process institutions have used to develop academic integrity policies. Such a study would expand the knowledge of policy development in relation to academic integrity and provide a potential framework for development of academic integrity policies. Specifically, research could be done on student and faculty involvement in developing and enforcing academic integrity and how such involvement impacts the overall attitudes of the community towards academic integrity. This study also examined the types of programs institutions have in place for educating, promoting, and training the academic community about academic integrity. Future studies might examine specific institutional programs by institutional type. Such a study might provide specific information about institutional programmatic approaches towards academic integrity by examining religious affiliation or governance structure. This information may yield a framework or model for developing successful programs.

Finally, the study was significant for future policy. The results provided policymakers with information about the existence of standards, academic integrity policies, and academic integrity programs from various institutions. Policymakers might use this information when considering ways to develop future policy regarding academic integrity. For example, policymakers might use the data to determine if further examination of public or private institutions might benefit in the analysis of their institutions policy.

The study also provide information that could be used for assessing policies. The information that the study examines within the framework of standards, policy, and program will

provide policymakers with the potential tools for developing a specific assessment model for their institution.

The study will also provide information about the standards, policies, and programs that private and public institutions use to educate and implement academic integrity. The results will provide state education boards with data comparing academic integrity standards, policies, and programs between private and public institutions. The information could lead to further research on the approach taken by private and public institutions, specifically which approach might impact academic dishonesty the most.

Limitations

As with all research, the present study had some limitations. The first dealt with the sample. All the institutional participants were chosen based on their affiliation with the Center for Academic Integrity. The sample was a convenient sample with an interest in academic dishonesty issues. This might limit the results of the study because it is not an overall sample of higher education in general.

Another limitation was the timing of the survey. The timing of the survey was scheduled to begin in late May and end by June 9th. The response rate of the survey was low compared to researcher estimates. Initial projections for the return rate were 40 percent because of endorsement from the CAI. Unfortunately, the actual response rate ended up being 27 percent. The rate of return did exceed previous CAI surveys by 11 percent. It is not clear why members of this association do not respond to requests to participate in sponsored research efforts.

The sample may not accurately represent all types of colleges and universities because only 320 institutions are represented in the membership of the Center for Academic Integrity. The study is limited because institutional type is

defined as public or private and two-year or four-year, which limits the comparable data. A more in-depth study might have a broader sample and compare institutions by Carnegie Classification.

Another limitation of the study is the instrument. The instrument was created using a framework for addressing academic integrity. The framework was developed as a means of assessment for administrators. The framework was modified into the format of a survey for the purpose of this study. It is possible that the framework used may impact the data in some unforeseen manner. The framework might not be applicable to the institution chosen and result in incomplete surveys.

Conclusion

Although the survey had limitations, the study did reveal some interesting findings on the type of institution relative to academic integrity policies, standards, and programs.

Prior research had examined policies, standards, and programs but this study went a step further by analyzing the results for significance by employing a chi-square analysis. The differences revealed that individuals at private institutions feel much better about the results academic dishonesty policies, standards, and programs have on the campus community. These results also point to the notion that private institutions are taking a lead in developing policies, standards, and programs related to decreasing the amount of academic dishonesty on campus.

This study lays the groundwork for more studies into the dynamics of academic dishonesty and institution type. Administrators, faculty, and students must continue to investigate the issues surrounding academic dishonesty. The technology and resources available to students are growing exponentially. With these changing times, educators must

continue to investigate academic dishonesty from all angles.
Hopefully, this study has benefited that end.

References

Aaron, R. M. (1992). Student Academic Dishonesty: Are collegiate institutions addressing the issue? *NASPA Journal*, 29, 107-113.

Aaron, R. M. & Georgia, R. T. (1994). Administrator perceptions of student academic dishonesty in collegiate institutions. *NASPA Journal*, 31, 83-90.

Barnett, D. C. & Dalton, J. C. (1981). Why college students cheat. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 22, 545-551.

Burns, S. R., Davis, S. F., Hoshino, J., & Miller, R.L. (1998). Academic dishonesty: A delineation of cross-cultural patterns. *College Student Journal*, 32, 590-596.

Bush, D. (2000). *An examination of how selected colleges and universities promote student academic integrity*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia.

Cole, S. & Conklin, D. (1996). Academic integrity policies and procedures: Opportunities to teach students about moral leadership and personal ethics. *College Student Affairs Journal*, 15, 30-39.

Drake, C. (1941). Why students cheat. *Journal of Higher Education*, 12, 418-420.

Fried, J. (1995). *Shifting Paradigms in Student Affairs*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America/American College Personnel Association.

Graham, M. A., Monday, J., O'Brien, K., & Steffen, S. (1994). Cheating at small colleges: An examination of student and faculty attitudes and behaviors. *Journal of College Student Development*, 35, 255-260.

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

Hall, T. L., & Kuh, G. D. (1998). Honor among students: Academic integrity and honor codes at state-assisted universities. *NASPA Journal*, 36, 2-16.

Hendershott, A., Drinan, P. F., & Cross, M. (1999). Gender and academic integrity. *Journal of College Student Development*, 40, 345-354.

Hendershott, A., Drinan, P., & Cross, M. (2000). Toward enhancing a culture of academic integrity. *NASPA Journal*, 37, 587-597.

Hesburgh, T. M. (1985). The role of the academy in the nuclear age. In J.B. Bennet & J.W. Peltason (Eds.), *Contemporary Issues in Higher Education: Self-regulation and the ethical roles of the academy* (pp. 247-266). New York: Macmillan.

Hollinger, R. C. & Lanza-Kaduce, L. L. (1996). Academic dishonesty and the perceived effectiveness of countermeasures: An empirical survey of cheating at a major public university. *NASPA Journal*, 33, 292-306.

Jendrek, M. P. (1992). Students' reactions to academic dishonesty. *Journal of College Student Development*, 33, 260-273.

Kibler, B. (1993). A Framework for Addressing Academic Dishonesty from a Student Development Perspective. *Naspa Journal*, 31, 8-18.

Kibler, W. L. (1994). Addressing academic dishonesty: What are institutions of higher education doing and not doing? *NASPA Journal*, 31, 92-101.

Kibler, W., Nuss, E., Paterson, B., and Pavela, G. (1988). *Academic integrity and student development: Legal issues and policy perspectives*. Asheville, NC: College Administration Publications.

Kuh, G., Schuh, J., Whitt, E., and Associates. (1991). *Involving colleges: Successful approaches to fostering student learning and personal development outside the classroom*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ludeman, R. B. (1988). A survey of academic integrity practices in U.S. higher education. *Journal of College Student Development, 29*, 172-173.

May, K. M. & Loyd, B. H. (1993). Academic dishonesty: The honor system and student's attitudes. *Journal of College Student Development, 34*, 125-129.

McCabe, D. L., & Bowers, W. J. (1994). Academic dishonesty among males in college: A thirty year perspective. *Journal of College Student Development, 35*, 5-10.

McCabe, D. L. & Trevino, L. K. (1993). Academic dishonesty, honor codes, and other contextual influences. *Journal of Higher Education, 64*, 522-538.

McCabe, D. L. & Trevino, L. K. (1996). What we know about cheating in college: Longitudinal trends and recent developments. *Change, 28*, 28-33.

McCabe, D. L., Trevino, L. K., & Butterfield, K.D. (1999). Academic integrity in honor code and non-honor code environments. *The Journal of Higher Education, 70*, 211-234.

McCabe, D.L., Trevino, L.K., & Butterfield, K.D. (2001). Dishonesty in academic environments: The influence of peer reporting requirements. *The Journal of Higher Education, 72*, 29-45.

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

Stevens, G. (1984). Ethical inclinations of tomorrow's citizens: Actions speak louder. *Journal of Business Education, 59*, 147-152.

Stevens, G. & Stevens, F. (1987). Ethical inclinations of tomorrow's managers revisited: How and why students cheat. *Journal of Education for Business, 63*, 24-29.

Storch, E. A. & Storch, J.B. (2002). Fraternities, Sororities, and academic dishonesty. *College Student Journal*, 36, 247-252.

Sutton, E. M. & Huba, M. A. (1995). Undergraduate student perceptions of academic dishonesty as a function of ethnicity and religious participation. *NASPA Journal*, 33, 19-32.

The Center for Academic Integrity 2002, Kenan Institute for Ethics Duke University. Information Retrieved June 10, 2002, from <http://www.academicintegrity.org>.

Appendix A
Academic Integrity Survey

Academic Integrity Survey

Directions: Please indicate whether your institution engages in the activity discussed in the statement by checking the appropriate box. When you are finished select the SUBMIT button to send your data. All information gathered with this survey will remain anonymous. Your name, position, or institution will not be identified in your response. Thank you for your participation in this study.

If you have questions about this research, you may contact Brian Johnson (brjohns6@vt.edu).

Background

1. Type of Institution

Public Private/Independent.

2. Nature of Enrollment:

2yr 4yr

3. Who is responsible for administering the Honor System?

Provost Vice President for Student Affairs Faculty
 Dean of Student Affairs Don't Know

Policies

4. Does your institution have campus-wide academic policies designed to prevent academic dishonesty?

Yes No Don't Know

5. Does your institution have an Honor Code?

Yes No Don't Know

If no or don't know, please proceed to question 12.

6. Is the Honor Code separated from your code of student conduct?

Yes No Don't Know

7. Does your Honor Code define prohibited behaviors?

Yes No Don't Know

8. Does your Honor Code state the consequences for engaging in prohibited behaviors?

Yes No Don't Know

9. Does your Honor Code obligate students to report others observed committing violations?

Yes No Don't Know

10. Are students required to affirm their commitment to the Honor Code in writing?

Yes No Don't Know

11. Are faculty members required to affirm their commitment to the Honor Code in writing?

Yes No Don't Know

12. Is due process for academic dishonesty cases defined?

Yes No Don't Know

13. Do you think that your institution's attempt to create clear academic integrity policies on your campus reduces honor violations?

Yes No Don't Know

Standards

Is academic dishonesty discussed at any of the following?

14. New student orientation Yes No Don't Know

15. Beginning of each course Yes No Don't Know.

16. New faculty/staff training/orientation Yes No Don't Know

17. Faculty/Staff in-service training Yes No Don't Know

18. Graduate teaching assistant training/orientation Yes No Don't Know.

Is a statement on academic dishonesty/integrity printed in any of the following?

19. Faculty/staff handbook Yes No Don't Know.

20. Catalog Yes No Don't Know

21. Admissions application materials Yes No Don't Know

22. Student handbook Yes No Don't Know

23. Schedule of classes Yes No Don't Know

24. Course syllabus in every course Yes No Don't Know

25. Exam booklets Yes No Don't Know

Is the following information included in written information about academic integrity that is disseminated to students?

26. Definition of academic dishonesty Yes No Don't Know.

27. Why academic dishonesty is prohibited Yes No Don't Know.

28. Forms or types of academic dishonesty that are prohibited Yes No Don't Know.

29. Expectations and responsibilities of students Yes No Don't Know.

30. Expectations and responsibilities of faculty Yes No Don't Know.

31. How to report a violation Yes No Don't Know.

32. Are announcements about efforts to promote academic integrity included in the campus press or other media sources?

Yes No Don't Know.

33. Do you think your institution's attempt to create a sense of values about academic integrity reduces honor violations on your campus?

Yes No Don't Know.

Program

34. Is there one office on campus responsible for coordinating efforts to reduce academic dishonesty?

Yes No Don't Know.

35. Are seminars/programs/discussion groups on academic integrity offered to students (i.e. classes, student organizations)?

Yes No Don't Know.

Is training, specifically in the area of academic integrity provided to the following?

36. Adjunct faculty Yes No Don't Know.

37. Tenure track faculty members Yes No Don't Know.

38. New faculty members only Yes No Don't Know.

39. Graduate teaching assistants Yes No Don't Know.

Does the training include any of the following?

40. Definitions of academic dishonesty Yes No Don't Know

41. Prevention strategies Yes No Don't Know

42. Strategies for handling violations Yes No
 Don't Know

43. Sanctions that may be imposed Yes No Don't Know.

44. Are students actively involved in developing standards pertaining to academic integrity?

Yes No Don't Know.

45. Are students actively involved in enforcing standards pertaining to academic integrity?

Yes No Don't Know.

46. Are faculty members involved in developing standards pertaining to academic integrity?

Yes No Don't Know.

47. Are faculty members involved in enforcing standards pertaining to academic integrity?

Yes No Don't Know.

48. Does the effort to deliver programs on academic integrity to students on your campus reduce honor violations?

Yes No Don't Know.

Appendix B
Potential Participation Email Message

Brian Johnson, a Student Affairs graduate student, and Steve Janosik, Associate Professor, are conducting a research project to determine the extent to which academic integrity policies, standards, and programs differ by institutional type. Specifically, the study focuses on academic integrity policies, promotion of standards, and the academic integrity program of each institution.

This research has been reviewed and endorsed by the Center for Academic Integrity. Such endorsements of research that solicits our membership are supported only in cases where, in the opinion of the CAI Board, such research will substantially further our knowledge base on academic integrity issues. Members receiving this survey are encouraged to complete and return it.

The survey will take approximately 6 minutes to complete. Neither your identity nor the institutions identity will be identified when you submit your responses. We hope that you respond immediately to this request. The link to the survey is below.

<https://survey.vt.edu/survey/entry.jsp?id=1052397489299>

Thank you in advance for your participation in this study.

Regards,

Brian Johnson

Steve Janosik

Appendix C
Reminder Email Message

Brian Johnson, a Student Affairs graduate student, and Steve Janosik, Associate Professor, are conducting a research project to determine the extent to which academic integrity policies, standards, and programs differ by institutional type.

Approximately 15 percent of the sample has completed the survey; thank you to those who have already responded. Only the membership of the Center for Academic Integrity has been asked to participate. Because the sample is small, your participation is crucial to the success of this research project.

This research has been reviewed and endorsed by the Center for Academic Integrity. Such endorsements of research that solicits our membership are supported only in cases where, in the opinion of the CAI Board, such research will substantially further our knowledge base on academic integrity issues. Members receiving this survey are encouraged to complete and return it.

The survey will take approximately 6 minutes to complete. Neither your identity nor the institutions identity will be identified when you submit your responses. We hope that you respond immediately to this request. The link to the survey is below.

<https://survey.vt.edu/survey/entry.jsp?id=1052397489299>

Thank you in advance for your participation in this study.

Regards,

Brian Johnson

Steve Janosik

Appendix D
Institutional Review Board Proposal Request

Proposal Request

An examination of academic integrity policies, standards, and programs at public and private institutions.

Brian Johnson, Graduate Student

Steve Janosik, Thesis Chair and Faculty Advisor

Justification of the Project

The purpose of this study was to analyze the extent to which academic integrity standards, programs, and policies differ by institutional type. Specifically, the study focused on the promotion of standards, the academic integrity program, and the academic integrity policy of each institution.

The study will contribute to research in the area of academic integrity. Specifically, the study will examine academic integrity standards, programs, and policies by institutional type to determine if a significant difference or similarity exists.

Procedures

The research targets administrators with significant knowledge of academic integrity at their institution. The Center for Academic Integrity has been asked to endorse the project. The main purpose for involving the Center for Academic Integrity is to survey the membership of the Center in an effort to collect data from administrators and faculty with knowledge of academic integrity standards, policies, and programs at their respective institution.]

The membership of the Center for Academic Integrity will represent administrators and faculty, both male and female. An email will be sent to the membership of the Center for Academic Integrity detailing the study with a link for participants to complete the survey on an anonymous website. The survey can be

completed within 7 minutes. Upon completion of the survey, participants submit the information which is forwarded to an email account established for the research.

Risk and Benefits

The study presents no risk to participants. The collected data is completely anonymous.

The study benefits the academic community and the Center for Academic Integrity because the data further explores the significance or non-significance of institution type in relation to academic integrity standards, policies, and programs.

Confidentiality/Anonymity

As stated earlier, the data will be collected through the use of a website. The link to the survey website will be sent directly to members of the Center for Academic Integrity. The survey is completely anonymous with no identifiers or codes. The only identifiers will be institution type: public or private, and nature of enrollment: 2yr or 4yr.

Appendix E
Center for Academic Integrity Proposal

Center for Academic Integrity
Proposal Request

Title

An examination of academic integrity standards, policies, and programs at public and private institutions.

Investigators

Brian Johnson, Graduate Student, Virginia Tech
Steve Janosik, Thesis Chair and Faculty Advisor,
Virginia Tech

Justification of the Project

The purpose of this study was to analyze the extent to which academic integrity standards, programs, and policies differ by institutional type. Specifically, the study focused on the promotion of standards, the academic integrity program, and the academic integrity policy of each institution.

The study will contribute to research in the area of academic integrity. Specifically, the study will examine academic integrity standards, programs, and policies by institutional type to determine if significant differences or similarities exist.

The framework developed by Kibler (1993) served as the guide for this study along with recent research conducted by Bush (2000), who used Kibler's framework.

Procedures

The research targets administrators and faculty with significant knowledge of academic integrity at their institution. The Center for Academic Integrity has been asked to endorse the project.

The main purpose for involving the Center for Academic Integrity is to survey the membership of the Center in an effort to collect data from administrators and faculty with knowledge of academic integrity standards, policies, and programs at their respective institution.

The membership of the Center for Academic Integrity will represent administrators and faculty, both male and female. An email will be sent to the membership of the Center for Academic Integrity detailing the study with a link for participants to complete the survey on an anonymous website. The survey can be completed within 7 minutes. Upon completion of the survey, participants submit the information which is forwarded to an email account established for the research.

Risk and Benefits

The study presents no risk to participants. The collected data is completely anonymous.

The study benefits the academic community and the Center for Academic Integrity because the data further explores the significance or non-significance of institution type in relation to academic integrity standards, policies, and programs.

Confidentiality/Anonymity

As stated earlier, the data will be collected through the use of a website. The link to the survey website will be sent directly to members of the Center for Academic Integrity. The survey is completely anonymous with no identifiers or codes. The only identifiers will be institution type: public or private, and nature of enrollment: 2yr or 4yr.

Conclusion

The Center for Academic Integrity is being asked to consider this proposal for endorsement. If approved, the survey will be distributed to the membership through the prescribed channels of the organization. The survey is hosted on an external website. Upon completion of the survey, respondents can submit the information which will then be forwarded to the investigators email. The survey should require no more than 7 minutes to complete and is completely anonymous.

References

Kibler, B. (1993). A Framework for Addressing Academic Dishonesty from a Student Development Perspective. *Naspa Journal*, 31, 8-18.

Bush, D. (2000). *An examination of how selected colleges and universities promote student academic integrity*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia.

Brian M. Johnson

bjohn6@luc.edu

1134 W. Loyola Ave Box 5
Chicago, IL 60626

Education

Master of Arts in Higher Education and Student Affairs
Virginia Polytechnic and State University
Blacksburg, VA May 2003

Bachelor of Science in Child Development
East Carolina University
Concentration: Family Relations and Community Development
Greenville, NC December 1996

Student Affairs Experience

Student Success Programs Coordinator - Graduate Assistant

Office of the University Provost, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA May 2002-Present

- Prepared communications about the Student Success Programs for the university community
- Oversaw management of the projects in conjunction with the principal investigators
- Analyzed, summarized, and communicated mid-year and final reports for the Student Success Projects
- Managed the annual budget of \$250k; evaluated and approved spending requests
- Provided support for other projects as assigned by the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs

Graduate Intern

Department of Student Affairs, Washington and Lee University, Lexington, VA July-August 2002

- Served as liaison between Dean of Freshmen Office and the Community Service Coordinator for registration of incoming freshmen attending service learning pre-orientation programs
- Coordinated the summer communication process for incoming students attending pre-orientation programs
- Assisted with all aspects of the pre-orientation programs for incoming freshmen
- Created electronic documents for participating students, a checklist for communication, and registration protocols for pre-orientation programs
- Evaluated Peer Tutoring Guide

Graduate Assistant – Assistant Resident Director

Pritchard Hall, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA August 2001-May 2002

- Live-in graduate position responsible for 1100 students
- Trained, supervised, and evaluated 29 Resident Advisors (RAs)
- Advised Pritchard Hall Council and monitored budget of \$500
- Interpreted and enforced university policies and conducted disciplinary and mediation meetings
- Assisted in teaching Introduction to Residence Education class for New Resident Advisors
- Served on area community development committee
- Participated in crisis management duty rotation for campus of approximately 9,000 residents
- Chair of Group Process Committee for RA selection

Intern – Dean of Students Office

East Carolina University, Greenville, NC December 1995 – May 1996

- Assisted in judicial administrative hearings and shadowed Assistant Dean for the entire semester
- Developed a judicial sanction program for students
- Assisted Associate Dean of Students with undergraduate honor system selection
- Monitored students under judicial sanction

Resident Advisor

East Carolina University, Greenville, NC August 1993 – May 1996

- Coordinated programs to enhance the involvement of residents within the community
- Enforced policies and procedures for the university
- Acted as a liaison between students and faculty of the university
- Participated in on-call duty within residence hall
- Served on RA selection committee

Other Student Affairs Experience

Virginia Tech University, Blacksburg, VA

- Chief Justice of the Graduate Honor System. Summer 2002 – Present
- Commission on Graduate Studies and Policies- Committee Member. 2002-2003
- President of the Association for Student Development. January 2002-December 2002
- Investigator for Graduate Honor System. Spring 2002
- Committee Chair for group interview process in RA selection
- Facilitator for IRE (Introduction to Residence Education)

East Carolina University, Greenville, NC

- President of ECU Ambassadors. August 1995 - May 1996
- Vice President of ECU Ambassadors. August 1994 - May 1995

Professional Experience

Relationship Sales Manager

First Union National Bank, Charlotte, NC July 1998 - July 2001

- Loan officer for small business customers
- Assisted clients with cash management and deposit products
- Developed overall growth of client base
- Provided customer service to all clients of First Union
- Exceeded personal and corporate goals every month

Resident Manager

Ronald McDonald House, Greenville, NC January 1997 - July 1998

- Supervised hourly staff and volunteers who worked at the house
- On call 24 hours to handle emergencies at the house
- Liaison between hospital and medical school for purpose of relaying information to families
- Provided quality service and needs assessment to residents of the house

Conferences Attended

2002 International Conference of the Center for Academic Integrity, Charlottesville, VA

2002 Graduate Student and Faculty Forum, Clemson, SC

NASPA 2002 Rising to the Challenge of Change, Boston, MA

Presentations

"Graduate Honor System" International Graduate Student Orientation, August 2002, January 2002

"Graduate Honor System" Departmental Orientation Sessions for the University Community, August 2002

"Interpersonal Communication" Virginia Tech Spring Leadership Conference, April 2002

Honors and Awards

Appointed Chief Justice of the Graduate Honor System by University President, Fall 2002

Campus Advisor of the Month for September 2001, Virginia Tech National Residence Hall Honorary

Inducted as member of National Residence Hall Honorary Spring 2002, Virginia Tech