

Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty Among Undergraduate Students

by

Hannah E. Anderson

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for Master of Arts in

Psychology

Middle Tennessee State University

August 2022

Thesis Committee:

Dr. Aimee Holt, Chair

Dr. Mary Ellen Fromuth

Dr. Stuart Bernstein

ABSTRACT

The current study examined undergraduate students' perceptions of academic dishonesty in digital and non-digital settings using scenarios. Relevant factors, such as participants' self-reports of integrity and personality constructs, were explored. Perceptions of the scenarios were analyzed using a 2 (dishonest behavior: cheating/plagiarism) by 2 (setting: digital/non-digital) repeated measures design. While a significant interaction effect between the setting type and dishonest behavior regarding pervasiveness was not found, significant main effects for both setting (digital more common than non-digital) and behavior (cheating more pervasive than plagiarism) were found. A significant interaction effect between the setting type and the dishonesty type was found regarding perceptions of labeling. Additionally, a significant main effect was found for dishonesty type regarding perceptions of the student's motivations for engaging in the dishonest behavior. Self-reported integrity was found to be a significant predictor regarding perceptions of the dishonest behavior being viewed as an act of academic misconduct.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables.....	v
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Academic Dishonesty.....	1
Types of Academic Dishonesty.....	2
Cheating.....	2
Plagiarism.....	2
Fabrication.....	3
Facilitating Academic Dishonesty.....	3
The Role of the Internet.....	4
Prevalence of Academic Dishonesty among College Students.....	5
Cheating.....	6
Plagiarism.....	6
Factors that Influence Academic Dishonesty.....	7
Integrity.....	8
Academic Stress.....	10
Personality.....	10
Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty.....	12
Digital Versus Non-Digital Scenario Research.....	13
Integrity Scenario Research.....	15
Summary.....	16
Purpose of the Current Study.....	18
Hypotheses.....	18

Hypothesis 1.....	18
Hypothesis 2.....	18
Hypothesis 3.....	18
Hypothesis 4.....	19
Chapter 2: Methods.....	20
Participants.....	20
Measures.....	20
Scenarios.....	20
Integrity.....	22
Personality.....	22
Procedure.....	23
Chapter 3: Results.....	24
Hypothesis 1.....	24
Hypothesis 2.....	24
Hypothesis 3.....	26
Hypothesis 4.....	27
Chapter 4: Discussion.....	34
Limitations	36
Future Directions.....	37
References.....	39

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. <i>Descriptive Statistics for the Interaction Effect for Items Addressing Labeling</i>	25
Table 2. <i>Descriptive Statistics for the Main Effect for Items Addressing Motivation</i>	28
Table 3. <i>Correlations Between Variables</i>	29
Table 4. <i>Hierarchical Regression for Factors Predicting Perception of Academic Misconduct for Digital Plagiarism</i>	30
Table 5. <i>Hierarchical Regression for Factors Predicting Perception of Academic Misconduct for Non-Digital Plagiarism</i>	31
Table 6. <i>Hierarchical Regression for Factors Predicting Perception of Academic Misconduct for Digital Cheating</i>	32
Table 7. <i>Hierarchical Regression for Factors Predicting Perception of Academic Misconduct for Non-Digital Cheating</i>	33

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Academic dishonesty is a pervasive problem facing schools of all levels but can be especially concerning among the college and university population (Lee et al., 2020). Previous research has shown that the majority of students report engaging in some form of academic dishonesty at least once during their college career (e.g., Burgason et al., 2019; Lee et al., 2020; Peled et al., 2019). Thus it is a worthy endeavor for researchers to seek a better understanding of what academic dishonesty encompasses, what the factors are that influence the behavior, and how the behavior is generally perceived by the college population.

Academic Dishonesty

Academic dishonesty encompasses multiple forms of behavior, although it can be broadly defined as deceptive behavior that occurs during academic activities, such as taking exams, writing papers, and completing homework assignments (e.g., Blau & Eshet-Alkalai, 2015). It can be conceptualized by Pavela's (1997) four domains: (a) cheating; (b) plagiarism; (c) fabrication; and (d) facilitating academic dishonesty. Academic dishonesty also has been largely impacted by the widespread use of digital communication and social network technologies, and any paper devoted to the topic would be remiss to avoid discussing the role of the internet in academically dishonest behaviors (e.g., Blau & Eshet-Alkalai, 2015). Prevalence rates have been worsening over the years, and it is important to understand the extent of the problem among the college sample (e.g., Balbuena & Lamela, 2015; Baran & Jonason, 2020; Pavela, 1997; Peled et al., 2019).

Types of Academic Dishonesty

Pavela (1997) puts forth a conceptual framework for academic dishonesty, which includes the following four domains of behavior: (a) cheating, (b) plagiarism, (c) fabrication, and (d) facilitating academic dishonesty. Each domain covers a variety of behaviors that can be carried out either in a digital or non-digital setting.

Cheating. Cheating involves intentionally using unauthorized study materials or information in any academic exercise (Pavela, 1997). Examples include using notes or an electronic device during a closed-book exam, copying from another student during an exam, taking an exam for another student, preparing answers or writing notes in a blue book before an exam, etc. It can occur as a traditional offense, such as when a student prepares a hand-written cheat-sheet of exam material and uses it during an exam, or as a digital offense, such as when a student downloads materials onto their phone or laptop to use during an exam (Sidi et al., 2019). This category is generally considered the hallmark of academic dishonesty and is a serious offense (Park, 2020).

Plagiarism. Plagiarism involves knowingly using the words or ideas of another person as one's own in any academic assignment (Pavela, 1997). Examples include copying another person's actual words without quotation marks, using information that is not common knowledge without citing a source, presenting another person's ideas in original wording without citing a source, failing to acknowledge collaborators on a project, persuading another student to complete an assignment, etc. The offense is committed if there is no citation or an incorrect citation, whether words are copied word for word, partially rewritten, or completely paraphrased (Middle Tennessee State

University, 2019). It also includes self-plagiarism, when a student submits their own previously completed work without proper citation of its reuse. A traditional offense would involve copying another student's work from their notebook while the digital offense would involve copying another student's work from an online essay forum (Sidi et al., 2019).

Fabrication. Fabrication involves the intentional falsification or creation of any information or citation within an academic assignment (Pavela, 1997). Examples include creating numbers in a data set for an experiment instead of collecting real data, omitting important information or data on reports or presentations, hiding data or using inappropriate scales in charts and graphs, inventing false sources of information, etc. A student may invent personal experiences based off information they read in a printed book for a traditional offense or invent personal experiences based off online information for a digital offense (Sidi et al., 2019). In Blau and Eshet-Alkalai's (2015) study, the participants' ranked fabrication as the most legitimate and acceptable type of academic dishonesty, suggesting that many students may see this behavior as justifiable and not as serious as an offense.

Facilitating Academic Dishonesty. Facilitating academic dishonesty involves intentionally helping, or attempting to help, another student commit an act of academic dishonesty (Pavela, 1997). Examples include sharing questions and answers from an exam or homework assignment, collaborating on schoolwork intended to be individual work, circulating course materials without permission, completing another student's homework or taking an exam for them, etc. It may involve one student passing another

student a hand-written note with exam answers during the exam for a traditional offense or the same student text messaging the other student answers during an exam for a digital offense (Sidi et al., 2019). Research has found that students admit to helping their peers commit acts of academic dishonesty at lower rates than they admit to engaging in the behavior themselves (Blau & Eshet-Alkalai, 2015).

The Role of the Internet

College students in today's digital era are constantly utilizing technological devices such as phones, tablets, and computers to access the internet, which has revolutionized the ease in which the populace can gain information (e.g., Bacon et al., 2020). Technology is now an integral part of the educational system, used extensively by both teachers and students. It also provides students with a tool to potentially commit serious academically dishonest acts. Students suddenly gain access to copy-able articles and essays as well as exam questions and answers (Bacon et al., 2020). The effects have been seen in both plagiarism and cheating behaviors. The nature of online exams tends to lend itself to the easy feasibility of cheating, especially when the students are not being monitored (Burgason et al., 2019). Students themselves have reported a greater likelihood to cheat in an online course, electronic testing being an important determinant in the probability of cheating behavior (Peled et al., 2019). Blau and Eshet-Alkalai (2015) found that plagiarism, also, was much more common in a digital setting versus a non-digital setting. On the other hand, some researchers have found that online learners exhibit less propensity to engage in forms of academic dishonesty when compared to face-to-face learners (Peled et al., 2019). Peled and colleagues (2019) found that course

type had the greatest impact on levels of academic dishonesty in their study, with online learners being significantly less likely to engage in dishonest behaviors. They hypothesize that this could be due to higher levels of motivation and discipline found in students who sign up for online courses. Although online learners may have greater opportunities to commit dishonest behaviors, the common characteristic traits of intrinsic motivation, discipline, and conscientiousness among students who self-select online courses may balance this risk out in the long run. However, the recent global pandemic has removed the choice for many students when it comes to taking courses online and this will affect data on academic dishonesty to come. National Public Radio (2021) reported that many universities were discovering rates of academic dishonesty twice or even thrice the regular amount during the pandemic. Clearly, the effect of technology on academic dishonesty is still an important emerging area of study. Although the technology itself is not causing these behaviors, it is certainly contributing to them (Blau & Eshet-Alkalai, 2015).

Prevalence of Academic Dishonesty among College Students

The rates of prevalence of academic dishonesty in higher education has consistently been disheartening over the years and rates of certain behaviors may be on the rise. Baran and Jonason (2020) report that an overall percentage of 83.7% of students admit to cheating at some point in their college career. It is important to keep in mind that much of the data researchers receive in this area is based on self-report and does not fully capture what is truly happening on a day-to-day basis at colleges and universities. There are also many cheaters who are never apprehended and punished (Park, 2020). But there

can be no doubt that behaviors of academic dishonesty, both cheating and plagiarism, are pervasive in both face-to-face and digital settings (Sidi et al., 2019).

Cheating. The reported prevalence rates for cheating behaviors range from 22% to 67% of student populations (e.g., Balbuena & Lamela, 2015; Baran & Jonason, 2020; Park, 2020; Peled et al., 2019). In a recent study, 22.4% of university students had committed a serious cheating offense by cheating on an exam (Park, 2020). Baran and Jonason (2020) report that 36% of students reported copying from another student's paper during exams at least one time. Another study found that 67% of students reported copying from another student's paper during a test or exam (Balbuena & Lamela, 2015). The rates of cheating behavior in the traditional, face-to-face setting remains worrying, but students themselves generally agree that it is easier to cheat in a digital setting. Peled et al. (2019) found that 73.6% of 121 undergraduate business students admitted it was easier to cheat online. The researchers also found that 24% of 824 business students confessed to cheating on an electronic exam. Another 42% of them confessed that they would have cheated if given the opportunity. A total of 41.1% of students surveyed in a study revealed they had cheated in a specifically online course. These prevalence rates speak for themselves; any instance of committing such a grave offense is highly concerning for educators.

Plagiarism. As far as plagiarism, the reported prevalence rates range from 39% to 80% for different plagiarism behaviors (e.g., Balbuena & Lamela, 2015; Baran & Jonason, 2020; Blau & Eshet-Alkalai, 2015; Park, 2020). A recent study found that 49.2% of a student sample committed the offense by either copying an assignment or

submitting a previously done assignment (Park, 2020). In another recent study, 61% of undergraduate students reported plagiarizing material from a book or other publication without citing their source (Baran & Jonason, 2020). According to Balbuena and Lamela (2015), a reported 39% of students reported that they had copied sentences from a book, magazine, or other physical source without citing it more than once. They also reported a total of 46% of students admitted to copying sentences from a website on the internet without citing it either once or more than once (Balbuena & Lamela, 2015). As mentioned previously, there is some evidence to suggest that plagiarism is much more common in a digital setting than a traditional setting. Blau and Eshet-Alkalai (2015) found that plagiarism was ranked on a Likert scale (1 = *definitely* uncommon to 6 = *definitely common*) as much more common by students in a digital setting ($M = 3.53$) than a non-digital setting ($M = 2.34$). It may be the case that plagiarism is committed as an individual act more commonly in the digital setting and committed with the help of fellow students more commonly in the traditional setting. There are particularly high rates of students facilitating academic dishonesty in their fellow students in this category, with 80% of students in one study reporting that they let another student copy their homework (Balbuena & Lamela, 2015). Baran and Jonason (2020) also found that 57% of the participants in their sample reported allowing another student to copy work. These numbers are highly concerning as well.

Factors that Influence Academic Dishonesty

There are numerous factors that influence a college student's decision to commit an academically dishonest behavior, including age, sex, education level, presence of

honor codes, academic awareness initiatives, morals/beliefs, culture, technology, pressure, etc. (Jiang et al., 2013). These factors themselves may not directly influence the behavior but typically all contribute to each other to increase the likelihood of academic dishonesty. Three variables of particular interest include integrity, academic stress, and personality traits.

Integrity

Integrity refers to an individual's strong sense of honesty and morality, in which morality is an understanding of the distinction between right and wrong (e.g., Blau & Eshet-Alkalai, 2015; Miller et al., 2011; Sidi et al., 2019). Academic integrity implies that students take ownership of their attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors to support the entire academic community in promoting a climate of truthfulness (rather than leaving that responsibility solely to the professors) (Miller et al., 2011). The findings on whether individuals commit less academically dishonest behaviors with higher levels of integrity were varied. In one study, higher scores of academic integrity responsibility were significantly related to lower frequencies of self-reported cheating (Miller et al., 2011). Yet when Jones (2011) directly asked student participants if they would cheat, 41% reported they would not due to personal ethics; when asked if they would plagiarize, 33% reported they would not due to personal ethics. Lee et al. (2020) found a negative mean true-score correlation between morality/honesty and the likelihood of academic dishonesty, asserting that moral standards are personally costly and thus act as barriers to cheating behavior. Another phenomenon to consider is ethical dissonance. Ethical dissonance may occur when students experience conflict between their desire to maintain

their ethical self-image and their desire to commit misconducts in order to achieve academically (e.g., Blau & Eshet-Alkalai, 2015; Sidi et al., 2019). Researchers have found that participants anticipated feeling the most ethical dissonance by violating their academic integrity through digital plagiarism and non-digital cheating behaviors (Blau & Eshet-Alkalai, 2015). Blau and Eshet-Alkalai (2015) also found that the pervasiveness of these behaviors ranked much higher than their perceived legitimacy, suggesting that students still engage in these behaviors despite perceiving them as illegitimate.

Wowra (2007) used an integrity scale to measure how closely the college students in their undergraduate sample held to a moral identity; low scores on the scale indicated that ethics were of low importance to the individual's identity, and high scores indicated a strong commitment to personal moral principles. The 70 students were divided into terciles based on their answers to the Integrity Scale's questions; those in the lower tercile were placed in the expedient group and those in the higher tercile were placed in the principled group. They also answered questions on an Antisocial Behavior Scale, which included a subscale of Academic Cheating. This particular subscale of interest put forth the descriptions of cheating on an exam and cheating on a paper, asking the students to estimate how often they committed these behaviors in the past 5 years on a 9-point Likert scale (0 = *never* to 8 = *several times a day*). The results showed that students in the expedient group reported over the past 5 years engaging in cheating significantly more than students in the principled group, ($t(68) = 4.33, p < .001$). These participants reported cheating more often on exams ($M = 2.48, SD = 1.77$) compared to the principled group ($M = 1.00, SD = 1.35$) and more often on papers ($M = 1.42, SD = 1.50$) than the

principled group did ($M = 0.43$, $SD = 0.87$). This study gives considerable support to the importance of integrity when it comes to academic dishonesty.

Academic Stress

It comes as no surprise that feelings of anxiety are common among members of academically rigorous communities such as colleges and universities. Although most students find ways to cope with this anxiety, there will always be some students who excessively worry about their academic performance, and this can lead to academic dishonesty (e.g., Jiang et al., 2013). High levels of anxiety in students are significantly correlated with high levels of self-reported past cheating (Wowra, 2007). This positive correlation was found in teacher candidates, with academic dishonesty tendencies significantly correlating with levels of test anxiety (Yesilyurt, 2014). In another study, nursing students who demonstrated higher perceived stress showed greater frequency of dishonesty in a clinical setting (Rafati et al., 2020). These findings clearly indicate that stress levels contribute to the decision to commit academically dishonest acts.

Personality

Personality is another important factor to consider when exploring a student's tendency to engage in academic dishonesty (e.g., Fletcher et al., 2020; Lee et al., 2020; Peled et al., 2019). The five factor model (the Big Five) has been extensively used to describe the following five distinct personality traits: (a) neuroticism; (b) extraversion; (c) openness; (d) agreeableness; and (e) conscientiousness (e.g., Lee et al., 2020; Peled et al., 2019). Neuroticism describes an individual's tendency to experience volatile, negative emotional states such as anxiety, insecurity, and guilt. Extraversion describes

individuals who enjoy social situations and who are characterized by high energy, assertiveness, and an outgoing nature. Openness describes individuals who tend to have a curious attitude and embrace new experiences. Agreeableness describes individuals who are likeable, trusting, and warm. Conscientiousness describes individuals who are goal-oriented, organized, and tend to follow norms and rules. In a recent meta-analysis, the largest negative correlation to academic dishonesty was found with conscientiousness, with agreeableness following suit to a slightly lesser extent (Lee et al., 2020). On the other hand, neuroticism has been found to be linked to perfectionism and academic entitlement, two factors that easily foster academic dishonesty (Fletcher et al., 2020). This particular trait is complex, though; high levels of neuroticism tend to be associated with high levels of anxiety, which could spur the student to put forth extra effort to avoid academic failure (i.e., cheat) or spur them to avoid cheating in fear of being caught (Lee et al., 2020). Lee and colleagues (2020) found that extraversion had no significant correlation with academic dishonesty.

Peled et al. (2019) measured motivational orientation, attitude, perceived opportunity, socio-demographic status, and personality factors (using the Big Five Personality Inventory) to see how these factors related to student reports of engaging in academic dishonesty (1 = *very unlikely* to 5 = *very likely*). Results showed that likelihood of academic dishonesty was significantly and negatively correlated with agreeableness ($r = -.17, p < .001$), conscientiousness ($r = -.14, p < .001$), emotional stability ($r = -.10, p < .001$) and openness ($r = -.09, p < .001$). No significant correlation was found with extraversion. Overall, students were less likely to engage in academic dishonesty if they

scored high on agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness, as well as scoring low on neuroticism.

Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty

Previous research has studied college student's perceptions of academic dishonesty through the use of scenarios (e.g., Blau & Eshet-Alkalai, 2015; Jones, 2011; Sidi et al., 2019; Tatum et al., 2018; Yang, 2012). Most of these researchers did not ask the students if they had personally committed an act of academic dishonesty, but instead assessed the students' beliefs and attitudes towards the behavior by having them read and answer questions about fictitious scenarios. A common theme among the findings was an overall student awareness that academically dishonest behaviors were illegitimate; however, they also indicated that they would be unwilling to report the behaviors or stop them from happening (e.g., Blau & Eshet-Alkalai, 2015; Sidi et al., 2019; Tatum et al., 2018). One study in particular found that the students in their sample believed that peers would be more likely to commit the actions than they themselves would be (Yang, 2012).

Students may have been well aware of both the illegitimacy and pervasiveness of these types of behaviors within their school, but opinions on which behaviors are more severe violations still tended to vary (e.g., Blau & Eshet-Alkalai, 2015; Jones, 2011; Yang, 2012). Researchers have found that students rate internet plagiarism as less of an offense compared to face-to-face cheating (e.g., Jones, 2011). However, there seemed to be differing opinions about various aspects of plagiarism; respondents in one study judged the failure to properly cite more harshly than inappropriately assigning authorship credit or falsification of content, even though all of these acts fall under the larger

umbrella of plagiarism (Yang, 2012). Blau and Eshet-Alkalai (2015) found that students exhibited the least ethical awareness for digital plagiarism and nondigital cheating, thus inspiring the focus of the current study. The scenario research of particular interest includes comparisons between digital and non-digital settings and measures of integrity.

Digital Versus Non-Digital Scenario Research

There are a number of past research articles that have explored how digital and nondigital settings affected academic dishonesty perceptions through the use of scenarios (e.g., Blau & Eshet-Alkalai, 2015; Sidi et al., 2019; Tatum et al., 2018). Although findings vary, students in some studies generally perceived plagiarism as the most illegitimate act in digital settings and cheating as the most illegitimate act in the non-digital setting (e.g., Blau & Eshet-Alkalai, 2015; Sidi et al., 2019).

Blau and Eshet-Alkalai (2015) used scenarios to investigate perceptions of all four types of academic dishonesty (cheating, plagiarism, fabrication, and facilitation) in both a digital and non-digital setting. They asked 127 students in eighth grade (13-14 years old) from a large urban public school in Northern Israel to read all eight scenarios and rate on a Likert scale how pervasive they believed the behavior was (1 = *definitely uncommon* to 6 = *definitely common*) as well as how legitimate they believed the behavior was (1 = *definitely not legitimate* to 6 = *definitely legitimate*). An ethical dissonance index score was calculated by finding the difference between the pervasiveness and legitimacy scores. Results showed a positive value for ethical dissonance for all types of academic dishonesty, meaning students perceived the behaviors as both common and illegitimate (i.e., unethical). Students ranked plagiarism

as the most common and unethical in the digital setting ($M = 1.35, p = .000$) and cheating as the most common and unethical in the face-to-face setting ($M = 1.48, p = .002$). These authors noted that digital devices appeared to increase the magnitude of plagiarism offenses but had no effect on cheating and fabrication, which were more common in face-to-face settings.

Sidi et al. (2019) also looked at all four types of academic dishonesty in both a digital and non-digital setting, including 1,055 school-age students from an Israeli school system in their study. Each student read all eight scenarios and responded on a Likert rating scale how common they believed the behavior to be among students in their class (1 = *not at all* to 7 = *always*), as well as how legitimate the behavior seemed to them (1 = *definitely illegitimate* to 6 = *definitely legitimate*). An ethical dissonance index score also was calculated by finding the difference between the pervasiveness and legitimacy scores. Overall, pervasiveness scores were high and legitimacy scores were low, suggesting that students saw the behavior as unethical but still common among the students in their class. Plagiarism was the only dishonesty type in this study that was more common in a digital than a non-digital setting. All of the other dishonest behaviors were typically seen as more legitimate in a digital than the non-digital setting. Interestingly, students anticipated the most ethical dissonance occurring for students who would commit dishonest behaviors in an analog setting, $F(3, 2721) = 232.56, p < .001$.

Tatum et al. (2018) also investigated perceptions of academic dishonesty through the use of scenarios, sampling 928 undergraduate students from a variety of different sized universities (small, medium, and large). Participants were sorted into groups based

on the size of their university as well as if their university enacted classroom honor codes and exam pledges. Participants responded to all eight scenarios depicting typical academically dishonest behaviors (collaborating on an assignment, purchasing a paper from an online source, cheating on an exam, turning in the same paper for two classes, etc.) in a random order. They indicated on a Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*) the degree to which they believed the behavior to be dishonest and the likelihood that they would report the behavior given the rules at their university. The researchers did not find significant results for how students perceived the behaviors, both from differently sized universities, $F(2, 922) = 0.32, p = .72$, and from honor code versus non-honor code institutions, $F(1, 922) = 0.00, p = .99$. Surprisingly, there was little difference in perceptions from students in honor code and non-honor code institutions regarding the likelihood of reporting the behavior, $F(2, 922) = 1.52, p = .22$. The students generally agreed that the behaviors in the scenarios were dishonest, but did not show a willingness to report them.

Integrity Scenario Research

Many of the studies that included scenarios about academic dishonesty also included a measure of ethical integrity (e.g., Blau & Eshet-Alkalai, 2015; Sidi et al., 2019; Wowra, 2007; Yang, 2012). As discussed previously, research seems to point to the assertion that students still commit acts of academic dishonesty even when understanding the behavior's inherent unethical nature (e.g., Blau & Eshet-Alkalai, 2015; Sidi et al., 2019). Ethical dissonance scores in studies by Blau and Eshet-Alkalai (2015) and Sidi et al. (2019) were high for all types of academic dishonesty, implying that

students do understand the ethical conflict that arises when they are considering engaging in these types of acts. The decision to commit an act of academic dishonesty may come down to how closely students endorse a moral identity.

Yang (2012) used a multi-dimensional ethics scale to measure how ethical integrity affected how graduate students perceived three different scenarios of academic dishonesty. The sample of 645 students responded to the multi-dimensional ethics scale, which measured equity, relativism, egoism, utilitarianism, and contractualism. Participants also rated the ethicality of the academic dishonest behaviors (i.e., plagiarism, authorship fraud, and falsification) in scenarios on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = *least unethical* to 7 = *most unethical*). Plagiarism was seen as the most unethical behavior, $F = 21.91, p < .00$, as well as the behavior that violated the most ethical principles, $p < .00$: (a) relativism- behaviors shaped by the student's prevailing culture, $F = 18.76$; (b) egoism- behaviors based on self-interest, $F = 24.56$; (c) utilitarianism- behavior based on greatest good for society, $F = 32.09$; and (d) contractualism- behaviors shaped by personal rules, duties, and religious or social obligations, $F = 38.27$. All three scenario behaviors were seen as only moderately unethical, emphasizing the need for more training in academic integrity at all levels of education.

Summary

The topic of academic dishonesty is always relevant for institutions of higher education, but it is especially important to consider in the wake of the recent global pandemic, which left many students isolated and compelled to engage in digital remote instruction (National Public Radio, 2021). Pavela's (1997) four types of academic

dishonesty, (a) cheating, (b) plagiarism, (c) fabrication, and (d) facilitation, have always varied in regard to prevalence, but are currently of particular interest to analyze within a digital and non-digital setting framework. While prevalence rates are concerning within many face-to-face settings, students have generally expressed that they find it easier to commit dishonest acts in a digital setting, leading to escalating rates of behavior (e.g., Balbuena & Lamela, 2015; Blau & Eshet-Alkalai, 2015; Sidi et al., 2019). There are many other factors that contribute to these types of behavior, as well (e.g., Jiang et al., 2013). A strong sense of moral integrity has been shown to lessen the chances of students engaging in academic dishonest behavior (e.g., Blau & Eshet-Alkalai, 2015; Sidi et al., 2019; Wowra, 2007). Similarly, exhibiting high levels of personality traits such as conscientiousness, agreeableness, and openness and low levels of neuroticism are related to lower rates of academic dishonesty (e.g., Lee et al., 2020; Peled et al., 2019). High levels of anxiety, though, are related to these behaviors occurring more frequently (e.g., Rafati et al., 2020; Wowra, 2007; Yesilyurt, 2014).

Previous scenario research has brought many interesting findings to light regarding students' perceptions of academically dishonest behavior. Researchers discovered that students perceive plagiarism to be the most egregious act within a digital setting and cheating to be the most egregious within a face-to-face setting (e.g., Blau & Eshet-Alkalai, 2015; Sidi et al., 2019). Ethical dissonance scores calculated by both Blau and Eshet-Alkalai, (2015) and Sidi et al., (2019) were significantly high as well, suggesting that students understood the illegitimacy of the behaviors but still perceived them to be common.

Purpose of the Current Study

The purpose of the current study was to examine undergraduate students' perceptions of academic dishonesty, particularly cheating and plagiarism, in digital and non-digital settings. Relevant factors, such as participants' self-reports of integrity and personality constructs were explored as well.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1. It was predicted that there would be an interaction effect between the setting type (digital/non-digital) and the dishonesty type (cheating/plagiarism) regarding perceptions of pervasiveness. Specifically, it was predicted that plagiarism would be perceived as more pervasive in digital settings than in non-digital (on ground class) settings.

Hypothesis 2. It was predicted that there would be an interaction effect between the setting type (digital/non-digital) and the dishonesty type (cheating/plagiarism) regarding perceptions of labeling. Specifically, it is predicted that cheating would be perceived as more as an act of academic misconduct in non-digital (on ground class) settings than in digital settings.

Hypothesis 3. It was predicted that there would be an interaction effect between the setting type (digital/non-digital) and the dishonesty type (cheating/plagiarism) regarding perceptions of the student's motivations for his behavior. Specifically, it was predicted that stress would be perceived as a reason to engage in digital plagiarism more so than digital cheating.

Hypothesis 4. It was predicted that personality factors and personal integrity would predict participants' perceptions of these academic dishonest behaviors (i.e., digital plagiarism, digital cheating, non-digital plagiarism, non-digital cheating) as acts of academic misconduct (i.e., The behavior described in the scenario is an example of academic misconduct).

CHAPTER 2: METHODS

Participants

An online questionnaire was distributed to a sample of undergraduate students from a public, midsized university. The total sample consisted of 44 respondents. Due to a large amount of missing data, one respondent was removed from the data set resulting in a final sample size of 43. The majority of the sample were freshmen (51.2%) and 18 to 19 years-old (51.2%). Regarding gender, 61% of the sample were women and 33% were men. Regarding ethnicity, 72% of the sample self-reported as Caucasian, 12% as Black/African American, and 12% self-reported as *Other*.

Measures

In the present study, measures included the Integrity Scale (Schlenker, 2008), and the Big Five Inventory (BFI, John et al., 2008). Participants also provided their perceptions regarding academically dishonest behaviors using six short scenarios. They were asked to respond to a set of 12 questions posed after the reading each of the six scenarios.

Scenarios

Each participant was presented six scenarios in the guise that they were responding to common cases that go before a student judicial board. The student judicial board directions were adapted from Keller and Wiener's (2011). The four main scenarios focused on two types of academic dishonesty (cheating and plagiarism) in two different settings (digital and non-digital). These four scenarios were adapted from Blau and

Eshet-Alkalai's (2015). There also were two distractor scenarios, which dealt with classroom disruption in a digital and non-digital setting.

The two versions (digital vs. non-digital) of the three types of scenarios (cheating, plagiarism, and classroom disruption) were designed to be parallel. The cheating scenarios described a student who either used a hand-written card with step-by step instructions for solving problems during an on-ground algebra exam (non-digital) or who referred to a webpage with step-by step instructions for solving problems during an online algebra exam (digital). The plagiarism scenarios described a student who, for their English class, either copied an essay from a friend who had previously taken the course (non-digital) or copied an essay he found online (digital) and submitted as his own. For the distractor scenarios, a student was reported to have made loud outbursts that disrupted the professor's instruction and distracted the other students during either an on-ground (non-digital) or Zoom (digital) communications class.

After reading each of the scenario, the participants were asked to respond to a set of 12 questions regarding their perceptions of the behavior depicted within each scenario. The individual items were grouped into three categories: (a) the pervasiveness of the behavior (1 item; e.g., the behavior in the scenario is common among college students at MTSU); (b) labeling and punishment (3 items; e.g., the behavior described in the scenario is an example of academic/student misconduct); (c) motivation for the behavior (8 items; e.g., the student engaged in this behavior because he was under a lot of stress). The eight motivation questions were subdivided into two different categories: (a) dispositional motivation (4 items; e.g., the student engaged in this behavior because they are

manipulative) and (b) situational motivation (4 items; e.g., the student engaged in this behavior because they are under a lot of stress). All 12 questions were answered on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*).

Integrity

The Integrity Scale (Schlenker, 2008) was used to measure the participants' level of commitment to ethical principles. It was composed of 18 items that measure the value placed on principled conduct, the level of commitment to these principles in the face of temptations, and the willingness to rationalize or not rationalize unprincipled conduct. Participants were then asked to rate their agreement to the statements on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*). According to Schlenker (2008) internal consistency reliability for this measure was good ($\alpha = .84 - .90$). Good test-retest reliability also were found at 2 - 5 week intervals, ($r [177] = .82, p < .0001$), and 5 - 12 week intervals, $r (71) = .72, p < .0001$. For the current study, reliability was found to be similar to that reported by the authors of the scale, $\alpha = .84$.

Personality

The Big Five Inventory (BFI, John et al., 2008) was used to measure participants' personality traits. The BFI is based on the five-factor model of personality; it identifies levels of (a) agreeableness, (b) conscientiousness, (c) extraversion, (d) neuroticism, and (e) openness to experience. This measure was answered on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *Disagree Strongly* to 5 = *Agree Strongly*). It consisted of 44 short phrases based on adjectives that have been found to be markers of the five personality factors (John et al., 2008). The test-retest reliabilities for the BFI were reported by the authors to be adequate,

$\alpha = .85$. For the current study, internal consistency reliabilities were evaluated for each scale. Reliability coefficients for conscientiousness ($\alpha = .78$) and openness ($\alpha = .74$) were found to be acceptable for research purposes. Reliability coefficients were found to be in the moderate range for extraversion ($\alpha = .81$), agreeableness ($\alpha = .83$), and neuroticism ($\alpha = .82$).

Procedure

Once IRB approval was obtained (IRB #22-11442Q), the online Qualtrics survey was distributed via email from instructors from the Psychology Department. Once a student decided to activate the online survey, they were provided information about the study. Informed consent was verified through agreement to five questions. Students who did not verify consent were taken directly to an exit page. Once consent was verified, participants were presented with a short list of demographic questions (e.g., age, gender, year in college, race/ethnicity). Participants were then presented with the Big Five Inventory (John et al., 2008). Next, participants viewed the four academic dishonesty and two distractor scenarios in a random order. For each scenario they were asked to answer a series of 12 questions about their perceptions of the behavior depicted in the scenario. Then, they were asked to complete the Integrity Scale (Schlenker, 2008). Finally, they were presented with the demographic questions.

CHAPTER 3: RESULTS

Hypothesis 1

It was predicted that there would be an interaction effect between the setting type (digital/non-digital) and the dishonesty type (cheating/plagiarism) regarding perceptions of pervasiveness. Specifically, it was predicted that plagiarism would be perceived as more pervasive in digital settings than in non-digital (on ground class) settings. A 2 (setting type: digital/non-digital) by 2 (dishonesty type: cheating/plagiarism) repeated measures ANOVA was performed to explore differences in perceptions of pervasiveness. Contrary to the hypothesis, a significant interaction effect was not found, $F(1, 42) = 3.87$, $p = .056$. There was, however, a significant main effect for setting (digital versus non-digital), $F(1, 42) = 8.02$, $p = .007$. Specifically, participants reported that dishonest behavior occurred more frequently in digital ($M = 3.13$, $SE = 0.11$) than non-digital ($M = 2.9$, $SE = 0.11$) settings. Additionally, a main effect was found for behavior, $F(1, 42) = 8.71$, $p = .005$. Participants reported that cheating occurred more frequently ($M = 3.15$, $SE = 0.12$) than plagiarism ($M = 2.87$, $SE = 0.12$).

Hypothesis 2

It was predicted that there would be an interaction effect between the setting type (digital/non-digital) and the dishonesty type (cheating/plagiarism) regarding perceptions of labeling. Specifically, it was predicted that cheating would be perceived as an act of academic misconduct more in non-digital (on ground class) settings than in digital settings. A 2 (setting type: digital/non-digital) by 2 (dishonesty type: cheating/plagiarism) repeated measures MANOVA was performed to explore differences

in perceptions of the three labeling and punishment items. As predicted, a significant interaction effect was found between setting type and behavior for labeling items (Wilks' Lambda = 0.76), $F(3, 40) = 4.25, p = .011$. Because the MANOVA was significant, individual items were analyzed using follow-up ANOVAs. As can be seen in Table 1, cheating in a digital setting was less likely to be viewed as an act of academic misconduct compared to the other three scenario formats for all three questions.

Table 1. *Descriptive Statistics for the Interaction Effect for Items Addressing Labeling*

<u>Variables</u>	<u>Digital Setting</u>				<u>Non-Digital Setting</u>				<u>F</u>	<u>REGWQ</u>
	<u>¹Plagiarism</u>	<u>²Cheating</u>	<u>³Plagiarism</u>	<u>⁴Cheating</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>		
Classmates should tell instructor	3.65	1.04	3.21	1.06	3.56	1.14	3.53	1.08	6.27*	2 < 1,3,4
The behavior is an example of academic misconduct	4.40	0.88	3.70	1.23	4.35	0.95	4.23	0.97	10.81**	2 < 1,3,4
The student should receive an F	3.98	1.23	3.19	1.16	3.86	1.10	3.74	1.09	6.25*	2 < 1,3,4

* $p \leq .05$, ** $p \leq .01$.

In addition to the interaction effect, a significant main effect was found for type of dishonesty (cheating/plagiarism), (Wilks' Lambda = 0.67), $F(3, 40) = 6.63, p = .001$.

Specifically, regarding labeling as an act of academic misconduct, participants viewed the type of dishonest behavior in the scenarios differently, $F(1, 42) = 16.06, p \leq .000$. Particularly, plagiarism ($M = 4.37, SE = 0.13$) was rated as more of an act of academic misconduct than cheating ($M = 3.97, SE = 0.15$). They also viewed whether or not a classmate should tell an instructor in response to the behavior differently, $F(1, 42) = 5.37, p = .025$. Plagiarism ($M = 3.61, SE = 0.16$) was rated more highly in terms of a classmate's obligation to report to an instructor than cheating ($M = 3.37, SE = 0.15$). Additionally, they perceived whether the students should receive an F for engaging in the behavior differently, $F(1, 42) = 16.95, p \leq .000$. Again, plagiarism ($M = 3.92, SE = 0.16$) was rated more highly in terms of the student receiving an F than cheating ($M = 3.47, SE = 0.15$). A significant main effect was not found for setting type (i.e., digital versus non-digital), although it was approaching significance (Wilks' Lambda = 0.83), $F(3,40) = 2.76, p = .054$.

Hypothesis 3

It was predicted that there would be an interaction effect between the setting type (digital/non-digital) and the dishonesty type (cheating/plagiarism) regarding perceptions of the student's motivations for his behavior. Specifically, it was predicted that stress would be perceived as a reason to engage in digital plagiarism more so than digital cheating. For hypothesis 3, a 2 (setting type: digital/non-digital) by 2 (dishonesty type: cheating/plagiarism) repeated measures MANOVA was used to explore differences in perceptions related to the student's motivation. Contrary to the hypothesis, the interaction effect between setting and behavior regarding situational motivators (including stress)

was not significant (Wilks' Lambda = 0.90), $F(4, 39) = 1.11, p = .366$. The interaction effect between setting and behavior regarding dispositional motivators also was not significant (Wilks' Lambda = 0.79), $F(4, 39) = 2.60, p = .051$, although it was approaching significance. Additionally, there were no significant main effects for setting for either situational and dispositional motivators.

Significant main effects were found for dishonesty type (plagiarism/cheating) regarding both situational motivators, [(Wilks' Lambda = 0.55), $F(4, 39) = 8.16, p \leq .000$], and dispositional motivators, (Wilks' Lambda = 0.65), $F(4,39) = 5.31, p = .002$. Because the MANOVAs were significant, individual items were analyzed using follow-up ANOVAs. As can be seen in Table 2, for situational motivators, the instructor not explaining the material/assignment clearly as well as the student's need to make better grades were reported to be higher for reasons to cheat compared to engage in plagiarism. For dispositional factors, the student not being ethical as well as being manipulative were seen as greater motivators for engaging in plagiarism compared to motivators for cheating.

Hypothesis 4

A series of four (one for each scenario) multiple hierarchal regressions were used to explore the relation between personality factors and perception of the behaviors in the scenarios being viewed as an act of academic misconduct. For step 1 of the model, total scores from the Integrity Scale (Schlenker, 2008) were entered into the model. The next steps in the model were based on findings from a meta-analysis from Lee and colleagues (2020). In step 2, total scores for the Agreeableness and Contentiousness subscales of the

Table 2. *Descriptive Statistics for the Main Effect for Items Addressing Motivation*

<u>Variables</u>	<u>Plagiarism</u>		<u>Cheating</u>		<u>F</u>
	<u>M</u>	<u>SE</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SE</u>	
<i>Situational Motivators:</i>					
The instructor did not explain clearly	2.01	0.12	2.81	0.15	25.80***
The student needed to make better grades	3.63	0.13	3.99	0.11	11.93**
The student was under a lot of stress	3.29	0.11	3.99	0.47	2.23
The student was very busy	3.07	0.15	3.04	0.10	0.05
<i>Dispositional Motivators:</i>					
The student is not very ethical	3.54	0.16	3.24	0.16	7.98*
The student is manipulative	3.01	0.14	2.71	0.14	10.27*
The student has probably done this before	3.73	0.12	3.92	0.12	3.90
The student believes they are entitled to a good grade	3.07	0.15	2.93	0.14	2.05

* $p \leq .01$, ** $p \leq .001$, *** $p \leq .0001$.

The Big Five Inventory (BFI, John et al., 2008) were added to the model. In the final step, the Neuroticism, Openness, and Extraversion subscale of the Big Five Inventory (BFI, John et al., 2008) were added to the model. Correlations between predictor variables are reported in Table 3.

Table 3. *Correlations Between Variables*

<u>Variables</u>	1	2	3	4	5
1 Integrity Scale Total ¹					
2. BFI Agreeableness ²	.19				
3. BFI Conscientiousness ²	.30	.42**			
4. BFI Neuroticism ²	.27	-.15	-.25		
5. BFI Openness to Experience ²	.31*	.46**	.44**	-.01	
6. BFI Extraversion ²	.14	.47**	.34*	-.34*	.20

Note. * $p \leq .05$, ** $p \leq .01$; ¹Total scores range 18 – 90, higher scores indicate greater agreement; ²Based on a 5-point Likert scale higher scores indicate greater agreement.

As can be seen in Table 4, the model was statistically significant at each step and the full model explained 49% of the variance in perceptions of digital plagiarism being a form of academic misconduct. Integrity was a statistically significant predictor at each step in the model. None of the personality variables associated with the Big Five theory were significant predictors of digital plagiarism being viewed as an act of academic misconduct after controlling for integrity.

As can be seen in Table 5, the model predicting perceptions of plagiarism in a non-digital setting being viewed as a form of academic misconduct was statistically significant at each step. The full model explained 56% of the variance in these perceptions. As with plagiarism in a digital setting, integrity was a statistically significant predictor at each step in the model. Agreeableness also was a significant predictor,

Table 4. *Hierarchical Regression for Factors Predicting Perception of Academic Misconduct for Digital Plagiarism.*

<u>Predictor Variables</u>	<u>β</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>R^2</u>	<u>ΔF</u>	<u>ΔR^2</u>
Step 1		32.88***	.45		
Integrity Scale Total	.67***				
Step 2		11.24***	.47	0.68	.19
Integrity Scale Total	.66***				
Agreeableness	.15				
Conscientiousness	-.07				
Step 3		5.67***	.49	0.53	.02
Integrity Scale Total	.66***				
Agreeableness	.12				
Conscientiousness	-.08				
Neuroticism	.03				
Openness to Experience	-.06				
Extraversion	.17				

* $p \leq .05$, ** $p \leq .01$, *** $p \leq .001$.

but only in Step 2. None of the other personality variables associated with the Big Five theory were significant predictors of plagiarism in a non-digital setting being perceived as an act of academic misconduct.

As can be seen in Table 6, the model was only statistically significant at Step 1 and Step 2. The model at Step 2 only explained 20% of the variance in perceptions of cheating in a digital setting as being a form of academic misconduct. Integrity was only

Table 5. *Hierarchical Regression for Factors Predicting Perception of Academic Misconduct for Non-Digital Plagiarism*

<u>Predictor Variables</u>	<u>β</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>R^2</u>	<u>ΔF</u>	<u>ΔR^2</u>
Step 1		37.59***	.48		
Integrity Scale Total	.70***				
Step 2		15.80***	.56	3.02	.07
Integrity Scale Total	.65***				
Agreeableness	.28*				
Conscientiousness	-.03				
Step 3		7.34***	.56	0.05	.00
Integrity Scale Total	.65***				
Agreeableness	.27				
Conscientiousness	-.04				
Neuroticism	-.02				
Openness to Experience	.05				
Extraversion	-.01				

* $p \leq .05$, ** $p \leq .01$, *** $p \leq .001$.

a statistically significant predictor at Step 1. At Step 2, Agreeableness was the only statistically significant predictor variable. None of the predictor variables were significant in the full model in Step 3.

As can be seen in Table 7, the model predicting perceptions of cheating in a non-digital setting as being viewed as a form of academic misconduct was statistically significant at each step. The full model explained 41% of the variance in these perceptions. As with plagiarism in both digital and non-digital settings, integrity was a

Table 6. *Hierarchical Regression for Factors Predicting Perception of Academic Misconduct for Digital Cheating*

<u>Predictor Variable</u>	<u>β</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>R^2</u>	<u>ΔF</u>	<u>ΔR^2</u>
Step 1		4.10*	.09		
Integrity Scale Total	.31*				
Step 2		3.17*	.20	2.54	.11
Integrity Scale Total	.25				
Agreeableness	.34*				
Conscientiousness	-.01				
Step 3		2.29	.28	1.33	.08
Integrity Scale Total	.32				
Agreeableness	.33				
Conscientiousness	-.03				
Neuroticism	-.12				
Openness to Experience	-.21				
Extraversion	.18				

* $p \leq .05$, ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$.

statistically significant predictor at each step in the model. None of the personality variables associated with the Big Five theory were significant predictors of cheating in a non-digital setting being perceived as an act of academic misconduct.

Table 7. *Hierarchical Regression for Factors Predicting Perception of Academic Misconduct for Non-Digital Cheating.*

<u>Predictor Variable</u>	<u>β</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>R^2</u>	<u>ΔF</u>	<u>ΔR^2</u>
Step 1		20.96***	.34		
Integrity Scale Total	.59***				
		8.58***	.40	1.91	.06
Step 2					
Integrity Scale Total	.56***				
Agreeableness	.27				
Conscientiousness	-.09				
Step 3		4.10**	.41	0.18	.01
Integrity Scale Total	.57***				
Agreeableness	.26				
Conscientiousness	-.08				
Neuroticism	.02				
Openness to Experience	-.07				
Extraversion	.09				

* $p \leq .05$ **, $p \leq .01$, *** $p \leq .001$.

CHAPTER 4: DISCUSSION

The purpose of the current study was to better understand undergraduate students' perceptions of academic dishonesty, specifically plagiarism and cheating in both an online setting and a face-to-face setting. Regarding pervasiveness, previous research has pointed to the assertion that students find it easier to commit an act of academic dishonesty in a digital setting compared to a non-digital setting (e.g., Blau & Eshet-Alkalai, 2015; Peled et al., 2019). Both cheating and plagiarism have been ranked as more commonly committed in an online setting by students, but overall pervasiveness rates are higher for acts of plagiarism (e.g., Balbuena & Lamela, 2015; Baran & Jonason, 2020; Peled et al., 2019). In line with previous findings, participants in the current study did rate dishonest behavior as occurring more frequently in a digital setting over a non-digital setting. Contrary to the research, the participants rated cheating as occurring more frequently than plagiarism. This could be because the majority of the participants were freshmen and have had more experience in taking tests over writing academic papers.

In regard to the issue of labelling, previous research has suggested that students tend to label on-ground, face-to-face acts of cheating as the most egregious and unethical form of academic dishonesty (Blau & Eshet-Alkalai, 2015). Acts of online plagiarism tended to be viewed as less of an offense than face-to-face cheating (Jones, 2011). Contrary to previous research, participants in the current study rated digital cheating the least harshly when it came to all three labelling items (i.e., the behavior is an example of academic misconduct, a classmate should notify an instructor of the behavior, the student should receive an F for the behavior). While they viewed cheating as the most

pervasiveness behavior, they viewed digital cheating, as the least unethical behavior. This could be because universities typically familiarize students with the consequences of committing an act of plagiarism both orally in classrooms and through course syllabi. It also could be that the participants in the study may have committed acts of cheating themselves and do not view their own behavior as unethical.

Undergraduate students report many different types of motivation for committing acts of academic dishonesty (Jiang et al., 2013). Oftentimes, situational factors (such as busyness, the need to make a better grade, etc.) are cited as motivation for committing acts of academic dishonesty over dispositional factors (such as unethicalness, a manipulative nature, etc.). High levels of academic stress are significantly correlated with higher levels of self-reported past cheating (Wowra, 2007). Interestingly, stress was not found to be significant motivating factor in the current study. The two situational factors that were found to be significant were the instructor not explaining the material/assignment clearly and the need to make better grades. Both of these factors were rated as more motivating for the cheating scenarios over the plagiarism scenarios. The two dispositional factors that were found to be statistically significant were the student not being very ethical and the student being manipulative. Both of these factors were rated as more motivating for the plagiarism scenarios over the cheating scenarios. If the participants completing the study have engaged more frequently in acts of cheating themselves, it makes sense that they would attribute situational factors to the students cheating in the scenarios. The participants did previously rate plagiarism highly on the

labelling items, so it makes sense that they would rate the students completing the acts of plagiarism in the scenarios as not very ethical and even manipulative.

While much previous research has examined how personality factors affect an individual's decision to commit an act of academic dishonesty, less is known about how these variables influence the individuals who are giving their perceptions of this behavior. It was predicted that personality factors and personal integrity would inform the participant's perceptions of the behaviors in the scenarios. Research has shown that a strong sense of moral integrity leads to significantly lower frequencies of self-reported acts of academic dishonesty (Miller et al., 2011). Research also has found that exhibiting high levels of personality traits such as conscientiousness, agreeableness, and openness as well as low levels of neuroticism are related to lower rates of academic dishonesty (e.g., Lee et al., 2020; Peled et al., 2019). Interestingly, personality factors did not play a significant role in informing the participant's perceptions of the academic dishonesty scenarios. Integrity, on the other hand, was a significant predictor in the regression model. In line with previous research, having a strong sense of moral integrity influences how highly the participants rated the behavior as acts of academic misconduct.

Limitations

The findings reported above should be viewed in the light of possible limitations. First, the participants in the study chose to complete this particular survey; the self-selection process may have biased the data, making it less generalizable to the general college population (Yang, 2012). Secondly, the study was completed at a single mid-sized university with a final sample size of 43 participants. The relatively small sample size

may have affected the statistical power, producing different results than if the same study was run across multiple universities or with a larger final sample size (Peled et al., 2019). Third, the current study purposefully focused on student perceptions of academic dishonesty instead of self-report of the behavior, but the results consequently may be affected by the fundamental attribution error (Ungvarsky, 2022). This is a phenomenon where people tend to place more importance on dispositional traits than situational factors when explaining people's behavior. Finally, although the study was anonymous, the sensitivity of the subject matter within an educational institution may still have influenced the student's responses (Lee et al., 2020).

Future Directions

Although the current findings certainly enhance educators' knowledge about student views of academic dishonesty, future research in the subject area is always warranted. While the current study focused on two types of academic dishonesty, cheating and plagiarism, future studies could choose to examine all four types of academic dishonesty in Pavela's framework (Pavela, 1997). The current study failed to address student's perceptions of unintentional forms of academic dishonesty, which may be another type of academic dishonesty that would be interesting to further examine. It is clear that the student described in the scenarios in the current study knows what they are doing, but oftentimes, especially in instances of plagiarism, the student may not realize they are committing an offense (Jiang et al., 2013). There also are other factors that influence academic dishonesty, such as the presence of honor codes (Jiang et al., 2013). The focus of the two-distractor scenarios, classroom disruptions, could be explored

further as well, especially in how students perceive this type of behavior in comparison to academic violations (Keller & Wiener, 2011).

REFERENCES

- Bacon, A. M., McDaid, C., Williams, N., & Corr, P. J. (2020). What motivates academic dishonesty in students? A reinforcement sensitivity theory explanation. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 90(1), 152 – 166. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12269>
- Balbuena, S. E., & Lamela, R. A. (2015). Prevalence, motives, and views of academic dishonesty in higher education. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 3(2), 69–75. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED575015>
- Baran, L., & Jonason, P. K. (2020). Academic dishonesty among university students: The roles of psychopathy, motivation, and self-efficacy. *PloS One*, 15(8), article e0238141. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0238141>
- Blau, I., & Eshet-Alkalai, Y. (2015). The ethical dissonance in digital and non-digital learning environments: Does technology promote cheating among middle school students? *Computers in Human Behavior*, 73(1), 629 - 637. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.03.074>
- Burgason, K. A., Sefiha, O., & Briggs, L. (2019). Cheating is in the eye of the beholder: An evolving understanding of academic misconduct. *Innovative Higher Education*, 44(3), 203–218. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-019-9457-3>
- Fletcher, K. L., Pierson, E. E., Speirs Neumeister, K. L., & Finch, W. H. (2020). Overparenting and perfectionistic concerns predict academic entitlement in young adults. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 29(2), 348 - 357. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-019-01663-7>

- Jiang, H., Emmerton, L., & McKaige, L. (2013). Academic integrity and plagiarism: A review of the influences and risk situations for health students. *Higher Education Research & Development, 32*(3), 369 – 380. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2012.687362>
- John, O. P., Naumann, L. P., & Soto, C. J. (2008). Paradigm shift to the integrative Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and conceptual issues. In O. P. John, R. W. Robins, & L. A. Pervin (Eds), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research, 3rd ed.* (pp. 114 – 158). The Guilford Press.
- Jones, D. L. R. (2011). Academic dishonesty: Are more students cheating? *Business Communication Quarterly, 74*(2), 141 – 150. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1080569911404059>
- Keller, S. R., & Wiener, R. L. (2011). What are we studying? Student jurors, community jurors, and construct validity. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 29*(3), 376–394.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.971>
- Lee, S. D., Kuncel, N. R., & Gau, J. (2020). Personality, attitude, and demographic correlates of academic dishonesty: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 146*(11), 1042 – 1058.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000300>
- Middle Tennessee State University. (2019, August 15). *Academic integrity*.
<https://www.mtsu.edu/provost/academic-integrity.php>
- Miller, A., Shoptaugh, C., & Wooldridge, J. (2011). Reasons not to cheat, academic integrity responsibility, and frequency of cheating. *The Journal of Experimental Education, 79*(1), 169 - 184. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220970903567830>

- National Public Radio. (2021, August 27). *Reports of cheating at colleges soar during the pandemic*. [Radio broadcast transcript] NPR
https://www.npr.org/2021/08/27/1031255390/reports-of-cheating-at-colleges-soar-during-the-pandemic?mc_cid=a827691d14&mc_eid=3e73f9df99
- Park, S. (2020). Goal contents as predictors of academic cheating in college students. *Ethics & Behavior*, 30(8), 628 – 639. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10508422.2019.1668275>
- Pavela, G. (1997). Applying the power of association on campus: A model code of academic integrity. *Journal of College and University Law*, 24(1), 1 - 22.
https://www.heartland.edu/documents/idc/toomuch2_wrk.pdf
- Peled, Y., Eshet, Y., Barczyck, C., & Grinautski, K. (2019). Predictors of academic dishonesty among undergraduate students in online and face-to-face courses. *Computers & Education*, 131(1), 49 - 59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2018.05.012>
- Rafati, F., Bagherian, B., Shahrabaki, P., & Goghary, Z. I. (2020). The relationship between clinical dishonesty and perceived clinical stress among nursing students in southeast of Iran. *BMC Nursing*, 19(1) 1-8, article 39. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-020-00434-w>
- Schlenker, B. R. (2008). Integrity and character: Implications of principled and expedient ethical ideologies. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 27(10), 1078–1125.
<https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.2008.27.10.1078>
- Sidi, Y., Blau, I., & Eshet-Alkalai, Y. (2019). How is the ethical dissonance index affected by technology, academic dishonesty type and individual differences? *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 50(6), 3300 – 3314. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12735>

- Tatum, H. E., Hageman, M. C., Koretke, S. L., & Schwartz, B. M. (2018). College students' perceptions of and responses to academic dishonesty: An investigation of type of honor code, institution size, and student–faculty ratio. *Ethics and Behavior*, 28(4), 302 – 315. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10508422.2017.1331132>
- Ungvarsky, J. (2022). Fundamental attribution error (social psychology). *Salem Press Encyclopedia*.
- Wowra, S. (2007). Moral identities, social anxiety, and academic dishonesty among American college students. *Ethics & Behavior*, 17(3), 303 – 321. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10508420701519312>
- Yang, S. (2012). Ethical academic judgments and behaviors: Applying a multidimensional ethics scale to measure the ethical academic behavior of graduate students. *Ethics & Behavior*, 22(4), 281 – 296. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10508422.2012.672907>
- Yesilyurt, E. (2014). Academic locus of control, tendencies towards academic dishonesty and test anxiety levels as the predictors of academic self-efficacy. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 14(5), 1945–1956. <https://doi.org/10.12738/estp.2014.5.1841>