

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY, ACADEMIC SABOTAGE, AND MORAL DISENGAGEMENT  
IN HIGHER EDUCATION

by

DAVID MATTHEW AURICH

NATHANIEL BRAY, COMMITTEE CHAIR  
JENNIFER JONES  
CLAIRE MAJOR  
STEVE THOMA  
WAYNE URBAN

A DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy  
in the Department of Educational Leadership,  
Policy, and Technology Studies  
in the Graduate School of  
The University of Alabama

TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA

2012



## ABSTRACT

Academic cheating has firmly established itself as a mainstream practice by students in higher education (Bertram Gallant, 2008; Callahan, 2004). Much of the current academic integrity research has focused on the methods employed by students to cheat (Davis, Drinan, & Bertram Gallant, 2009; Eberhardt, Rice, & Smith, 2003; Higbee & Thomas, 2002), institutional responses to cheating (Aurich 2010, 2011), and the connection between cheating and student moral development (Stephens, Young, & Calabrese, 2007; Whitley, 1998). While these efforts are laudable, there exists a gap in knowledge on lesser-known forms of academically deviant behavior, such as academic sabotage. This dissertation is unique in that it proposes to be the very first of its kind. Although well documented through anecdotal evidence, to date, academic sabotage has gone without any deliberate research efforts or empirical evidence that establishes the phenomenon in higher education.

This dissertation establishes academic sabotage as a phenomenon in higher education. In this study, I first develop theoretical assumptions and frameworks while simultaneously exposing the lack of literature on the topic of academic sabotage. The results of these efforts combine to provide a better understanding of the previously under-studied phenomenon of the academically deviant behaviors known as academic sabotage. I then provide explanations of the research methodology and design, survey instrument, and data analyses that are used in this study. The expectations for this dissertation

are twofold. First, I expect the results produced by this study to confirm the existence of academic sabotage in higher education. Second, I posit that that the information produced by this dissertation will provide practical knowledge for students, faculty, and staff to combat forms of academically deviant behavior, such as cheating and sabotage.

This study aims to contribute to the body of literature on academic integrity and student moral development in higher education. The information contained in this dissertation should be used to inform policy, practice, and future research on academic integrity, academic sabotage, and student civility in higher education.

## DEDICATION

When I was a boy of 14, my father was so ignorant I could hardly stand to have the old man around. But when I got to be 21, I was astonished at how much the old man had learned in seven years.”

-Mark Twain

I would like to dedicate this dissertation to my father, Dr. Lynn Wayne Aurich, who has been unwavering in his support of my academic pursuits over the last three years. Without his love, patience, and guidance through this process, none of this would be possible. There were many days . . . many, many days, where I thought of cashing in the chips, but was always encouraged by him to “stay the course.”

Dad: My how far you and I have come. Writing this dissertation, until this point, has been the easy part. Condensing the immense amount of love and respect I have for you into a page or two is now the tough part. It is nearly impossible for me to shrink down such a “big” man in my eyes to such a “small” space as a dedication page.

Throughout my academic career I have had many great teachers. I have had people invest in me as a person, as a student, and as a budding academic. While many of these people have had a profound impact on my life, you are, and always will be, the greatest teacher I have ever had. Some lessons you were trying to teach me, I chose to learn the hard way. Others have been a team effort, the biggest of which was this dissertation and the growth it has inspired in me.

Dad, you are my hero. I have come to know the sacrifices that you and Mom have made for me throughout my life and it inspires me to do the same for others. You are the standard of tough yet unconditional love, spiritual solidarity, selfless sacrifice, and sidesplitting humor. I can only hope that my life is an example of your influence. You and Mom have raised me well. Rest easy. And to paraphrase Twain, I'm amazed at what you have learned in the last few years!

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There are so many people that have invested in me over the last three years that deserve mention. One thing I have certainly learned through this process is that I could not have done any of this alone. Each of you has contributed to my personal, professional, and academic development over the course of my time at The University of Alabama. I would like to acknowledge those of you who have done the most. First, I would again like to recognize the support and love afforded to me by my family. To Mom and Dad: Thank you. I simply cannot say that enough. Thank you for your steadfast emotional and spiritual support, without which, I would not be who I am today. I am excited about the next chapter of my life and being able to share it with both of you. I pray that I make both of you proud. I would also like to thank my sister, Susan. I have learned so much from you and simply could not ask for a better big sister. I love you very much and am so proud of you. I am happy that you can share in the excitement of the completion of my doctorate and am excited for you as you begin your journey toward a profession in the medical field. Who knew the Aurich kids would do so well?

I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge the members of my dissertation committee. These faculty members have been excellent examples of professionalism, tough love, and support during my career at The University of Alabama.

First, I would like to thank Dr. Nathaniel Bray for agreeing to serve as my dissertation chairman, mentor, and now colleague. Your passions for education and research serve as my inspiration to continue my own efforts in the field of higher education. I appreciate your guidance through this process and especially for the critiques you offered along the way. I am now confident in my abilities as a researcher and educator, and am honored that you have taught me how to be a good steward of the academy.

I would like to thank Dr. Wayne Urban for his mentorship during my time at Alabama. Dr. Urban, you are a pillar of the higher education community and I feel honored to have had the pleasure of your council. I would consider myself lucky if my career contributes merely a fraction of what your career has for the field of higher education. I look forward to continuing our friendship in the future.

I would also like to thank Dr. Claire Major for challenging my capabilities during coursework and especially during the dissertation phase. I admire your creative approach to teaching and appreciate your sense of humor, which many times, helped me get through some pretty tough days. Through your influence, I have learned how to blend my own passions for creativity, humor, and research into a teaching style that complements a quality doctoral program at a premier research institution.

I also want to thank Dr. Jennifer Jones for showing me how to combine the academic affairs brain with the student affairs heart. I am so thankful that you invested in me as a student, but more so as a person upon my arrival in Tuscaloosa. I feel privileged to have gotten to know you before you left Alabama, and on more than one occasion, have mentioned to the new



graduate students that they are really missing out on your presence. I especially appreciate your involvement on my committee from a distance. This is a true testament to your passion for student success and growth. You and Dr. David are two very special people to me for so many reasons. I appreciate your tough love during my time at Alabama and look forward to keeping in touch for years to come.

Finally, I would like to thank Dr. Steve Thoma for his immeasurable contributions to my study. I am constantly humbled by your experience. I am honored to have such a “giant” in the field of moral development research as one of my committee members. Your comments on the research instrument were invaluable and added to the quality of the study itself. You always challenged me to think about what my study would do, what it would say about the phenomenon of academic sabotage, and what kind of contribution it would make to the field. You taught me the value of valuing my own work and for this I am eternally grateful.

There are a number of people who assisted in the data collection phase of my dissertation who deserve recognition. I would like to thank the Associate Dean of Students at the Law School, Jenelle Marsh, for her guidance during the inception of this project during the summer of 2011. Without her collaboration, this study would not have been possible. I would also like to thank Associate Dean of Students Chad Tindol, who assumed responsibility for my study after Dean Marsh. Dean Tindol provided insight into the social and academic cultures at the Law School, without which, my study would not have been as successful as it was. Finally, I am forever indebted to David F. Miller, J.D., and Caitlin H. Graham, J.D., who assisted me in

recruiting participants for my study. If it were not for the persistence of these two, I would surely still be hovering around 50 responses.

A special mention goes to my good friend Dr. J. Kirk Ring at Wichita State University who helped coach me through the data analysis portion of this study. Kirk, we have known each other for what seems like forever and I will always consider myself the fourth Ring brother. I am so thankful that a few years ago, you challenged me to not settle for less. You made me dig deep and encouraged me as I made my decision to abandon the comforts of full-time employment and return to the Spartan lifestyle of a full-time doctoral student. Our friendship has flourished over the last three years and I am excited that I am now a part of “the club.” Thank you for your support.

A very special thanks goes to Sherri Edwards, who served as the editor for this dissertation. To Sherri: I cannot express my thanks enough to you. Your levels of professionalism and patience were matched only by the speed with which you returned the (what seemed liked) multiple drafts of my manuscript. It was an absolute pleasure to work with you. You made me feel like I was important and the compliments you gave my work were much appreciated. I am certainly a satisfied customer!

I would like to acknowledge all of those Higher Education masters and doctoral students who have put up with me over the last three years. All of you made life in Tuscaloosa fun over the last year and I am honored to call all of you my friends. Make the most of your time at Alabama; it escapes too quickly.

To the future Drs. Mary Lee Caldwell, Chad Clark, and Shayne Gervais, I thank you. To Mary Lee: I value our friendship so much and am excited to see you move through your dissertation process. I will not say it is an easy task, but I will say that it is worth it in the end. You are a credit to the field of student affairs and I wish you the best of luck. To Chad: Chad, I knew you even before moving to Tuscaloosa, and that made my transition so much easier. You have become a close friend who shares my often-twisted sense of humor and commitment to student development. You are on the cusp of finishing up, so push hard. I wish you, Mallory, and Harper all the best. To Shayne: There simply is not enough room to give you the credit you so much deserve for seeing me through the last three years. It seems like just yesterday that we met, discovered our mutual love for cycling, and hit the open roads, logging thousands of miles while solving all of the world's problems. I am honored that you have chosen to invest in me and can only hope that I return the favor.

Over the course of my time at Alabama, I would have surely cracked if it were not for my triathlon "family": Kendrick Gibson, Chad Williamson, Hallie Blunck, Stephen Rumble, and Stephen Hammond. All of you have pushed me to achieve physically, but also academically. I am so thankful that all of you have been in my corner during my time in Tuscaloosa. Writing a dissertation is similar to endurance sports, except for the lack of finisher's medals and spandex! To Kendrick: Thank you. Thank you for encouraging my efforts to live a more active and healthy lifestyle--and for bearing with me over the last semester or so--as I have had to dedicate most of my time to this dissertation. I wish you, Sara, and Toby all the best, and look forward to the future.

To all of my friends whom I have fallen out of touch with during my time in Tuscaloosa, who have endured the unreturned phone calls, sparsely worded emails, or my absence from weddings, births, or other life events, I thank you. Now, my time is my own. I look forward to resuming a “normal” lifestyle and picking back up where we left off when I returned to school in 2009.

Finally, to my closest friend, Austin P. Clancy, J.D., I thank you for giving me the idea for this dissertation. If it were not for you and your stories from law school that piqued my interest in academic sabotage, I would surely still be searching for a dissertation topic. I am so thankful for the support and encouragement that you, Lauren, and Liam have afforded me during my time at Alabama. Despite being an LSU fan, which is your only downfall, you are family to me.

## CONTENTS

ABSTRACT .....	ii
DEDICATION .....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	vi
LIST OF TABLES .....	xv
LIST OF FIGURES .....	xvii
1 INTRODUCTION .....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	4
Purpose and Significance of the Study .....	7
Impetus for the Study.....	8
Study Design and Overview of Methodology .....	11
Organization of the Dissertation .....	13
2 LITERATURE REVIEW .....	14
History of Cheating and Academic Integrity Research in Higher Education .....	15
History of Academic Integrity Research.....	16
Current Context of Cheating in Higher Education .....	18
Faculty and Student Perceptions of Cheating .....	20
Types of Behaviors .....	24
Demographic Variables and Personal Characteristics .....	28
Honor Codes .....	30
Moral Neutralization of Behavior .....	32

Corporate Sabotage/Workplace Deviance .....	35
Nature of Workplace Sabotage .....	36
Types of Behavior.....	39
Cheating versus Sabotage/Targets .....	41
Proposed Path Model of Academic Sabotage .....	44
Moral Development .....	46
Kohlberg's Theory of Moral Development .....	47
Bandura and Moral Disengagement.....	50
Application of Moral Development to Academic Sabotage .....	54
Summary .....	55
3 METHODS .....	58
Research Questions .....	58
Overall Approach and Rationale.....	59
Site Selection .....	61
Participant Selection .....	61
Access .....	62
Ethical Considerations .....	63
Instrumentation .....	65
Data Collection .....	68
Data Analysis .....	69
Delimitations of the Study .....	69
Assumptions.....	70
Summary .....	70

4	RESULTS .....	72
	Frequencies of Demographics.....	72
	Sabotage Vignette .....	75
	Sabotage Items .....	79
	Non-sabotage Behaviors/Academic Moral Disengagement .....	87
	Honor Code Items .....	93
	Moral Disengagement Items .....	102
	Exploratory Factor Analysis .....	112
	Summary .....	117
5	CONCLUSIONS.....	120
	Discussion of Results .....	121
	Study Appraisal.....	124
	Limitations .....	129
	Contributions to Literature.....	131
	Suggestions for Research, Policy, and Practice .....	133
	Suggestions for Research.....	133
	Suggestions for Policy .....	136
	Suggestions for Practice.....	136
	Concluding Remarks.....	138
	REFERENCES .....	141
	APPENDICES:	
	A LAW STUDENT HONOR CODE .....	151
	B EXPERIENCES OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION STUDENTS SURVEY.....	169

## LIST OF TABLES

1	Gender Distribution of Participants .....	73
2	Distribution of Participant Academic Classification .....	74
3	Distribution of Participant Age Groups .....	74
4	Sabotage Vignette Means and Standard Deviations .....	75
5	Sabotage Vignette T test for Gender.....	76
6	Demographics for Academic Classification, Means and Standard Deviations, Sabotage Vignette.....	77
7	ANOVA Results for Academic Classification, Sabotage Vignette .....	77
8	Demographics for Age Groups, Means and Standard Deviations, Sabotage Vignette.....	78
9	ANOVA Results for Age Group, Sabotage Vignette .....	78
10	Academic Sabotage Items, Occurrence, and Seriousness Means and Standard Deviations....	79
11	Sabotage Items T test for Gender.....	81
12	Means and Standard Deviations for Academic Classification, Sabotage Items .....	82
13	ANOVA Results for Academic Classification, Sabotage Items .....	83
14	Age Categories Means and Standard Deviations for Sabotage Items.....	84
15	ANOVA Results for Age Categories, Sabotage Items .....	85
16	Non-sabotage Behaviors/Academic Moral Disengagement Means and Standard Deviations .....	87
17	Non-academic Sabotage Behaviors/Academic Moral Disengagement T test for Gender .....	88
18	Non-sabotage Behaviors/Academic Moral Disengagement by Academic Classification, Means and Standard Deviations.....	90



19	ANOVA Results for Academic Classifications, Non-sabotage Behaviors/Academic Moral Disengagement Items .....	91
20	Non-sabotage Behaviors/Academic Moral Disengagement Items by Academic Classification, Means and Standard Deviations.....	92
21	ANOVA for Age Categories, Non-sabotage Behaviors/Academic Moral Disengagement Items.....	93
22	Honor Code Items, Means and Standard Deviations .....	94
23	T test for Gender, HC Items.....	96
24	Academic Classification, HC Items, Means and Standard Deviations .....	98
25	ANOVA Results for Academic Classification, HC Items .....	99
26	Age Categories, HC Items, Means and Standard Deviations .....	100
27	ANOVA Results for Age Categories, HC Items .....	101
28	Moral Disengagement Items, Means and Standard Deviations .....	103
29	Moral Disengagement Items, T test for Gender.....	104
30	Academic Classification, Moral Disengagement Items, Means and Standard Deviations....	106
31	ANOVA Results for Academic Classification, Moral Disengagement Items .....	108
32	Age Categories, Moral Disengagement Items, Means and Standard Deviations .....	109
33	ANOVA Results for Age Categories, Moral Disengagement Items .....	111
34	Exploratory Factor Analysis, Sabotage Items.....	113
35	Summary of Research Questions .....	118

## LIST OF FIGURES

1. Proposed path model of sabotage in an academic setting.....	45
--	----

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

If this keeps up, we're going to have accountants who can't add, doctors who don't know an appendix from a gallbladder, and veterinarians who can't tell a Chihuahua from a large rat. (Morse, 2006, p. 2)

Academic cheating, in one form or another, has seemingly persisted since the inception of the higher education system in America (Bertram Gallant, 2008; Davis, Drinan, & Gallant, 2009). Over the past several decades, rates of students who admit to cheating have risen, according to some reports, to rates as high as between 50-90% (Chapman, Davis, Toy, & Wright, 2004; Graham, Monday, O'Brien, & Steffen, 1994; Schmelkin, Gilbert, Spencer, Pincus, & Silva, 2008). These rates reflect what some researchers are now calling the "cheating epidemic," which has hit the American higher education system (Baker, Berry, & Thornton, 2008; Bertram Gallant & Drinan, 2006a; Kisamore, Stone, & Jawahar, 2007; McCabe & Pavela, 2000; Papp & Wertz, 2005).

Cheating scandals in higher education routinely make national headlines. Such were the cases for the University of Central Florida in 2010 where over 200 students cheated on a business exam, the United States Naval Academy where over 130 students cheated on an engineering exam in 1994, and at the University of Minnesota in 1999, where it was revealed that athletic staff members had written term papers for members of the men's basketball team. Despite higher education's best efforts at curbing these behaviors, cheating persists. The

prevalence of these deviant behaviors challenges the notion that one purpose of higher education is to develop moral and ethical leaders (Bertram Gallant, 2008; Callahan, 2004). The persistence of these behaviors also validates statements made by Hersh and Schneider (2005) that accuse higher education's commitment to the moral and ethical development of its students as symbolic, yet empty.

The news about academic integrity is not all bad, however. The study of cheating in higher education has spawned an entire specialized field in the body of scholarly work. Although the sheer percentage of students who admit to cheating is staggering, a number of studies have made significant, empirically-based contributions that aid in the efforts of many academic integrity professionals, such as university faculty and administrators, to confront the phenomenon of cheating in higher education. A number of studies have found that faculty and students differ in their definitions, perceptions, and tolerance of cheating behaviors (Brimble & Stevenson-Clarke, 2005; Chapman et al., 2004; Hard, Conway, & Moran, 2006; Miller, Shoptaugh, & Parkerson, 2008). Other studies have found that there has been a shift in the methods employed by students to cheating, because of the rise of technology (Stephens, Young, & Calabrese, 2007; Trenholm, 2007). Some qualitative integrity research has shown how members of the campus community make sense of cheating (Jaeger & Thornton, 2007; Kibler, 1993a, 1993b, 1994; Mahaffey, 2010). Organizational responses to cheating such as the use of honor codes have been linked to lower incidences of cheating as well (Aurich, 2011; Bertram Gallant & Drinan, 2006b, 2008; Connelly, 2009; Hendershott, Drinan, & Cross, 2000; Hudd, Apgar, Bronson, & Lee, 2009).

Despite the wealth of research that exists on the topic of academic integrity, little is known about the phenomenon of academic *sabotage*. The concept of academic sabotage suggests that unlike “traditional” cheating, these acts are suffered *at the hands of other students*. And, unlike the “victimless crime” mentality toward traditional acts of cheating, academic sabotage *does* have intended victims--other students. Until now, only anecdotal evidence pointed to the existence of these practices. Initial searches for scholarly literature on academic sabotage using research databases such as JSTOR, Project Muse, and ERIC yielded no results. In an effort to broaden this search, the researcher employed the use of Google, and using the same search term (“academic sabotage”), discovered an online syllabus for a graduate level Higher Education Law class at Virginia Tech University.

Academic sabotage is purposeful vandalism directed against any academic endeavour or equipment. It includes, but is not limited to, the destruction or theft of written material, laboratory or field experiments, equipment used in teaching or research, or computer files or programs. Unauthorized tampering with computer programs or systems shall constitute a violation. Academic sabotage includes deliberately crashing or attempting to crash a computer system or the use of files intended to cause or actually causing computer systems to behave atypically, thereby impeding another person’s or group’s efforts. In particular, knowingly infecting any system with a virus, worm, time bomb, trap door, Trojan horse, or any other kind of invasive program shall be considered a serious violation. Note that violations under this category may also lead to University judicial action or to criminal suits charged by the University. (*Constitution of the Graduate Honor System*, Virginia Tech University, 1991, p. 3)

The mere existence of this definition is crucial to the current study for two key reasons. First, despite the lack of supporting empirical evidence, acts of academic sabotage apparently *do* exist in higher education. And second, the institution has defined, and prohibited, the behaviors.

The current study proposed to empirically validate the existence of academic sabotage and differentiate instances of sabotage from the more traditional or mainstream acts of cheating,

such as plagiarism or cribbing. Furthermore, this study proposed to situate the decision to engage in or excuse these behaviors by using multiple theories of moral development. Often seen as the “front line” in combating student cheating, university faculty (as well as administrators) will gain an understanding of the developing nature of cheating in higher education as well as how to address violations of academic integrity that may have been previously undefined. Armed with the knowledge produced by this study, institutions will be able to proactively address and manage these behaviors through comprehensive accountability and educational programs such as honor codes and ethics classes.

To introduce the concept of academic sabotage and its current level of importance to the field of higher education, the organization of this chapter is as follows (a) statement of the problem, (b) purpose and significance of the study, (c) impetus for the study, (d) study design and overview of methodology, and (e) organization of the dissertation.

### Statement of the Problem

Current research tells us that nearly every student in the American higher education system today has had at least one experience with cheating (Boehm, Justice, & Weeks, 2009; Brent & Atkisson, 2011; Crown & Spiller, 1998; Kohn, 2007), whether as a cheater themselves, or knowing someone who has cheated. Cheating no longer has the stigma attached to it as it did decades ago, due in part to the social acceptance of the benefits of dishonest behavior (Callahan, 2004). To illustrate this point, one only has to perform simple searches on Google and YouTube. Using the search phrase “how to cheat in college and not get caught,” Google returns a staggering 73,900,000 hits; the search phrase “academic integrity,” when entered into the Google

search engine, returns a mere 4,110,000 (www.google.com). Similar searches on the popular online video site YouTube return 24,100 hits (“how to cheat”) and 897 hits (“academic integrity”), respectively (www.youtube.com). Although these statistics are not empirically based, they demonstrate how truly mainstream cheating behaviors have become.

Another factor related to cheating that deserves mention is how cheating is portrayed in films that are popular with high school and college-aged students. Over the last several decades, countless films have depicted the college years as the “party that never ends,” with little to no emphasis on the actual academic experience. Recently, numerous college movies have promoted a distorted view of academic integrity. Films like “P.C.U” show the recycling of term papers. “The Perfect Score” follows a group of students who plan to steal a copy of the SAT test in order to perform better. “Slackers” details the intricacies of a cheating ring who use prepared Blue Books and “ringers” (professional test takers). Newer films in the college genre, such as “Old School,” “The Social Network,” and “Accepted” depict cheating through technological methods, such as the use of radio signals and inner ear monitors, Facebook, and the use of computer scanners to produce fake admissions letters, respectively. Students who view these films develop skewed expectations of the academic experience of college. Cheating has been romanticized by these films, and skirting academic policies is seen as fun and exciting. This portrayal combined with the perception that other students are cheating (Chapman et al., 2004; Miller et al., 2008), as well as the tolerance of cheating behaviors (Brimble & Stevenson-Clarke, 2005; Hudd et al., 2009), reinforces the notion that academically deviant behavior has become the norm on many campuses.

Cheating sustains the cat and mouse game between faculty and students. Cheating also perpetuates the development of resistant subcultures (Butz & Ripmeester, 1999), which effectively undermine healthy relationships among campus constituent groups through a lack of shared trust. Some studies have suggested that students who cheat are not only likely to cheat again, but are more likely to excuse the cheating behaviors of others (Brimble & Stevenson-Clarke, 2005; Chapman et al., 2004; Hudd et al., 2009). The academy then is no longer seen as a community of scholars, but instead as a fractured system supported by the selfish endeavors of its members. In a competitive climate fuelled by the win at all costs mentality described by Callahan (2004), individuals might engage in behaviors they know to be wrong, such as sabotage, yet quickly justify using techniques of moral disengagement. In part, this study explored how cheating and academic sabotage behaviors present themselves in post-undergraduate professional degree programs and how moral disengagement shapes the academic climate of these programs.

Academic cheating is a real threat to the sanctity, integrity, and value of higher education. As noted by Morse (2006), if cheating in higher education is not confronted, institutions will produce graduates with no real knowledge, skills, or moral code. Studies have shown that students agree that cheating is wrong (Hughes & McCabe, 2006; McCabe, 1992), yet an overwhelming majority of students continue to participate in the behavior regardless of knowing that the behavior is wrong (Brent & Atkisson, 2010; Zelna & Bresciani, 2004). Confronting the behavior then, becomes a group effort. According to Mahaffey (2010), “reducing the instances of academic dishonesty has to be an institutional imperative, supported by all members of the academic community and reflected through conduct policies and



procedures,” (p. 4). Ensuring integrity of scholarship is therefore not solely the effort of the faculty, but instead a collaboration between academic affairs, student affairs, and all members of the campus community.

### Purpose and Significance of the Study

The purpose of this study is to explore the phenomenon of academic sabotage in higher education through the use of various theories of moral development and moral disengagement. This study extended previous research findings related to academic integrity and cheating, but sought to add a substantial contribution to the body of literature by exploring previously unstudied cheating behaviors.

First and foremost, this study aims to substantiate the overwhelming anecdotal evidence that practices of academic sabotage do exist in higher education. Given the lack of research on the particular topic of academic sabotage, this study sought to break new ground by investigating these developing types of academically deviant behaviors. The findings from this study should benefit both academic policymakers and practitioners, as the first step to managing any type of behavior is to define the components of the behavior itself. While multiple studies have produced invaluable data related to cheating, none have done so by approaching the topic from the angle of academic sabotage.

A secondary purpose of this study was to explore the decision-making processes employed by students who engage in or excuse the types of behaviors that constitute academic sabotage. Numerous studies have explored the link between student moral development and cheating. While this study was not ground breaking in this regard, the use of cognitive moral

development theories helps shed light on how students interpret, process, and, in some cases, justify these behaviors. Examination of these items can also provide insight into the attitudes toward these experiences, as shared by a group of students.

Previous studies have shown that the use of comprehensive accountability programs, such as honor codes are effective at curbing cheating behaviors (Aurich, 2010; Bertram Gallant & Drinan, 2006a; Hendershott et al., 2000; McCabe & Trevino, 1993, 2002). The success of these honor codes, at least in some measure, can be attributed to the depth and breadth of the code itself. Exhaustive lists of prohibited behaviors are typically included in honor codes. And although defining behaviors does not preclude their occurrence, doing so helps to establish those accepted forms of academic conduct and those which are not. Failing to define behaviors at all, like academic sabotage behaviors, potentially provides the dreaded gray area in which these practices can flourish. The results of this study should be used to enhance current honor codes, which in theory would subsequently reduce occurrences of sabotage type behaviors.

### Impetus for the Study

The inspiration for this study stemmed from the combination of anecdotal testimonials relayed to the author by personal acquaintances and from the apparent lack of literature on the subject. In an effort to provide support for the current study, testimonials have been included in this section to describe acts of academic sabotage.

Early in my 1L year, I remember a professor explaining to us the benefits and pitfalls of using “poop,” which are essentially pre-made study guides procured from another student. At first, everyone was reading all of the assignments or at the very least skimming them, but after a few weeks the sheer quantity of reading became pretty difficult to manage. People started forming study groups to tackle all of the material.

What I started to notice were students who were not in the same study group or social circles with the exact same study guides--kind of like some sort of inner circle, black market for the “good stuff,” meaning the good quality study guides. At one point I remember being in the library and a student that very few people liked because of his “gunner” persona approached and offered to trade some materials for the following day’s reading. A few people agreed and traded materials with him. The next day in class, it became evident that these briefs and notes supplied by the “gunner” were *completely* off base. The professor attempted to ask questions about the material, but the students who had relied on the “traded” materials were unable to respond. They were promptly expelled from class for being unprepared. After this happened, the “gunner” raised his hand and began reading his own prepared brief, which I could tell was not the same brief he had handed out. This was one of the first cases of out and out dishonesty amongst peers that I experienced. The other instances were more passive, like people simply hoarding materials from individual study group members in order to make a better grade. This happened to me personally--members of my study group withheld information from me on multiple occasions and consequently, managed to make a better grade on the test than I did. When all of this started happening, I started to wonder how, if we as future lawyers were supposed to uphold integrity and justice, then how could all of these people be so damn dishonest in their academic life. (Patrick, attorney, age 31)

Many years ago when I pursued my doctorate in Clinical Psychology, our professors would give the weekly reading assignments, which consisted of numerous journal articles and various books that were on reserve in the library. After only a week or two, some of my classmates and I began to see a pattern emerge in which many of the assigned journals and books could not be found in the library. We soon ascertained that a couple of fellow classmates were going to the library immediately after class, copying the articles and books, and then hiding them where they could not be located by the rest of us. Their reasoning was that, by having the assigned information and withholding it from the rest of us, they would have the advantage on the exams. This situation reached its zenith when these students were told to “cease and desist” (and even physically threatened) by some of our more “assertive” classmates. I have reflected back on these experiences many times over the years and it has become clear that this type of sub-rosa cheating had a very deleterious impact on class unity and morale. It intensified anxiety and fear of failure. Moreover, it created a level of anger that is rarely seen among highly intellectual doctoral students that can have an absolutely devastating impact on those students who value fairness, justice, hard work, and equality. (Wayne, Clinical Neuropsychologist, age 67)

When Hurricane Katrina hit, the law students displaced from Tulane and Loyola ended up at LSU. I was a student at Tulane Law School. By this time, LSU was already three weeks into their semester. The LSU professors were great to us, very welcoming and accommodating, which was great considering it had been a pretty traumatic experience leaving New Orleans after the storm. The professors told us to get notes from the LSU

students because the materials we had missed during the first three weeks of classes would be on the exams, and that the LSU students would be happy to help us during our time of transition. What actually happened was a different story altogether. The LSU kids quickly “circled the wagons” against myself and the other non-LSU students. They refused to share notes or materials with us from the first three weeks, because they were afraid that we would mess up their curve. I had a friend who told me that an LSU student had made remarks to her one night in the library that the LSU students had come to an agreement to “do whatever it took” to make sure that the Tulane and Loyola kids didn’t get better grades than the LSU kids, because this wasn’t “their school.” It was pretty difficult to hear this, because we (meaning the Tulane students) hadn’t ever done anything to provoke this behavior--we wanted to be lawyers just like they did . . . our only “fault” is that we got into a better law school than them. We suspected jealousy was a big reason that the LSU students refused to help us. What ultimately happened is that their unwillingness to help us backfired on them. We (mostly Tulane students) made it our mission to get the higher grades in every possible class, which we did. Looking back on it now, I realize that we didn’t exactly take the high road--we sort of passively aggressively got back at them for not helping us, which I guess perpetuated the cycle. (Hannah, attorney, age 34)

If we learned one thing in the first two years of medical school, it was that you couldn’t do it alone. Classmates who helped to explain something to you or gave you helpful study material or studied with you in a group was sometimes the only way you survived. A “gunner” was often more of a loner. I feel like we heard about gunners from the beginning of medical school . . . those students willing to sacrifice anything and everything to get the grade and be at the top and look better than everyone else. While some people secretly pride themselves on the title, most of my medical school class would probably view it as a derogatory adjective. He or she would ask a question of the course director about information on a test or for general clarification and then proceed to not share this information with their classmates so that everyone could benefit. I think the gunners became more apparent and detrimental during the clinical years (years 3 and 4) in the hospital. For instance, if two medical students are both assigned to a surgery service the “gunner” would often try to get all the “important” cases in order to have more face time with the attending surgeons than the other students. To the other medical student who is trying to get experience and exposure as well, this type of behavior not only came across as “kiss ass” but it can legitimately hurt his/her opportunity to learn. At other times on the ward services, this type of student (the gunner) would find out information from an upper level resident or attending about where and what time the students might need to be in a particular place for a meeting or lecture. By not sharing this information with the other students, the gunners looks to the attendings and residents like the only student who cares or is trying hard. . . . Once you got the label or people suspected you of being a “closet gunner” or an outright gunner or . . . my favorite . . . a “sniper” (we might have made that term up ourselves) the label pretty much stuck. (Allie, 4th year medical student, age 27)

These testimonials were critically important to the construction of this study. Although these accounts were not empirically based, testimonials like these often lead to scholarly research in order to substantiate their validity. And although some of these experiences are separated by institution, program type, educational discipline, and, in some cases, by many years, these testimonials illustrate that the practices of academic sabotage are not only alive and well in higher education, but that these behaviors may well have been deeply entrenched there for many years. As mentioned earlier, despite accounts like the ones described in this section, no substantial body of literature exists on this topic. Therefore, the impetus for this study was deeply rooted in a sincere desire to break new ground in educational research as well as to make a significant contribution to the body of literature on academic integrity.

### Study Design and Overview of Methodology

Research into academically deviant behavior comes with inherent limitations. Two of the greatest concerns are participant response rate and truthfulness of responses. Given the nature of the behaviors being studied, Miller et al. (2008) warned researchers against this response bias, noting that students are prone to underreport behaviors in the “self” that might warrant reprimand. These authors framed their study by asking participants to report cheating behaviors in their friends instead of their own practices. The findings from their study showed that students who reported about their own cheating behavior had a lower mean score ( $M = 4.07$ ) than when reporting on the cheating behaviors of their peers ( $M = 6.20$ ; Miller et al., 2008). This study operated on a similar framework, which is discussed in detail in Chapter 3.

Despite Miller et al.'s (2008) warning against response bias, prior literature points to the use of questionnaires as a positive means to measure deviant behaviors (Harding, Carpenter, Finelli, & Passow, 2004; Nonis & Swift, 2001). Both of these studies noted that ensuring anonymity is paramount to successful data collection when using questionnaires to investigate deviant behavior. The current study used the suggestions made by these studies by making use of an anonymous online survey. Use of an online survey may add to the comfort level of participants, or the "disinhibition," which Suler (2004) explained as when people "say and do things in cyberspace that they wouldn't normally say and do in the face-to-face world" (p. 321). Specifically, people offer up sensitive information about themselves, or others, because there is an inherent sense of anonymity afforded by the internet. For this reason, the current study used an online questionnaire for collection of participant responses.

Participants in this study were asked to complete an online questionnaire consisting of the Attitudes on Academic Behaviors Scale (author), Carroll's (2009) scale of moral disengagement, and a vignette scenario describing an act of academic sabotage (author). Scores generated from the Attitudes on Academic Behaviors Scale were compared to scores from the Moral Disengagement Scale, using age, gender, academic classification, and vignettes score as variables.

The researcher hypothesized that acts of academic sabotage do exist in professional education programs in higher education--specifically, that these behaviors do exist in professional programs, but that students are unaware that they pose a threat to the academic integrity of the institution or reputation of the program. In addition to this hypothesis, the researcher also makes the claim that students will attempt to operate outside the boundaries of

their own moral development when confronted with these behaviors, supporting the notion that students insist that cheating is wrong, yet engage in the behavior anyway (Stephens et al., 2007). Finally, the researcher hypothesized that students will engage any one (or more) of the eight mechanisms of moral disengagement as described by Bandura (2002) when confronted with justifying acts of academic sabotage.

### Organization of the Dissertation

The first chapter of this dissertation introduced the problem of cheating in higher education; stated the purpose, significance, and impetus for the current study; described the methodology and research questions; provided context of key terms and phrases; and listed both limitations and assumptions. The second chapter of this dissertation reviews literature from the research fields of academic integrity, workplace sabotage, moral development, and moral disengagement. The methodology for this study, including research questions, overall approach and rationale, site selection, participant selection and access, data collection, data analysis, and limitations are discussed in chapter 3. Chapter 4 presents the findings of this study. The final chapter of this dissertation presents a discussion of the findings produced by this study as well as the implications for policy and practice, and suggestions for future research.

## CHAPTER 2

### LITERATURE REVIEW

Most academic cheating does, in fact, go unpunished. (Callahan, 2004, p. 229)

This chapter provides an organizational schema for the current study by reviewing existing literature germane to the proposed research questions, methods, and conceptual framework. Various research texts (see Calabrese, 2006; Cooper, Hedges, & Valentine, 2009; Creswell, 2009; Hart, 1998) suggest that the literature review provides an analysis of prior research while simultaneously exposing gaps in the literature as a means of justification for the current study. Because little prior research exists on the topic of academic sabotage, this study is unique in that the literature reviewed for this study originates from three different disciplines: education, business, and psychology. Calabrese (2006) noted that dividing a review into sections that correspond with major themes found in the literature provides readers with a logical framework for understanding the nature of the problem being studied. Therefore, this chapter has been subdivided into sections that correspond to each discipline. In addition to these sections, the history of cheating in American higher education is discussed, as is the conceptual framework for this study.



## History of Cheating and Academic Integrity Research in Higher Education

The history of academic integrity in the American academy demonstrates that the misconduct of students in their academic work is a perennial problem that survives the annual reconfiguration of the student body. (Bertram Gallant, 2008, p. 27)

It is questionable whether academic misconduct is any more prevalent today that it was at any other point in history. It appears that cheating has always been perceived as a problem in colleges and universities, although as the student population grew and diversified, tolerance of academic misconduct as simple adolescent misbehaviour weakened and institutions began to experience a moral panic around the perception of a cheating culture in the student body. (Bertram Gallant, 2008, p. 28)

Cheating has plagued American higher education since the founding of the first institutions in the country. Over the past several decades, however, greater attention has been paid to academic integrity, partially in response to the growing concern toward the moral decay of our society. Given the current accountability movement in postsecondary education, integrity in scholarship at the undergraduate, graduate, and even professional (faculty) level(s) has come under intense scrutiny. Callahan's (2004) book, *The Cheating Culture*, provides insight into, as the subtitle of the book suggests, "Why more Americans are doing wrong to get ahead."

Few efforts have been made to provide a comprehensive examination of the history of cheating in higher education. One notable exception though, is Bertram Gallant's (2008) monograph entitled "Moral Panic: The Contemporary Context of Academic Integrity." This monograph provides a thorough history of cheating in American higher education and includes definitions of behavior, organizational responses to cheating, and discussions of contextual factors framed through periods of time beginning with the 1760s. Bertram Gallant's treatment of the topic is exhaustive and serves as the seminal piece of historical literature in academic integrity research.

While Bertram Gallant's (2008) efforts are laudable, only one reference to "sabotage" type behaviors can be found in her monograph:

In his book *Campus Shock*, Lamont (1979) reported that students did not stop at old-fashioned cheating behaviors such as cribbing and copying. The overly competitive environment led students to steal books and examinations and to rip pages out of library books and journals to secure an advantage over competing students. (p. 25)

This mention of sabotage behaviors, although it appears to be somewhat of an aside or afterthought in Bertram Gallant's work, is important for three reasons. First, the notation of these behaviors establishes a presence of the phenomenon in higher education. Second, Bertram Gallant (2008) referred to these behaviors as "rather unique to the 1970s" (p. 25), suggesting that these types of academic improprieties occurred only during this particular timeframe. And lastly, Bertram Gallant's (2008) mention of Lamont's (1979) work is important because the trail of academic sabotage research seems to start, and end, with Lamont.

### *History of Academic Integrity Research*

As a research discipline, the study of academic integrity in higher education can be considered fairly new when compared to other research topics. Topics such as higher education governance, policy and finance, institutional and organizational culture, and educational philosophy and pedagogy, as research fields, are well-established in the literature. Some of these topics, such as higher education policy, educational pedagogy, and governance have dedicated journals that promote research and literature in those fields, like the *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, the *Journal of College Teaching and Learning*, and the *Journal of*

*Academic Administration in Higher Education*, respectively. Although the field of academic integrity research spans nearly 70 years, the movement is still without its own academic journal.

Some of the earliest studies on academic integrity, such as Drake (1941), Bowers (1964), and Hetherington and Feldman (1964) described the issue of cheating by using a demographic variable approach. Drake's (1941) study was administered to 126 students at a women's college, which inherently limited the generalizability of his findings. Hetherington and Feldman's (1964) effort captured data using a mere 78 students and found that 46 of the participants (~59%) had cheated at least once during their college career. Although these early studies contributed to the growing body of literature on academic integrity, the scope in which the findings could be applied was rather limited.

Unlike earlier single site initiatives, Bowers' (1964) study was larger and more aggressive in scope. A multi-site investigation spanning almost 100 campuses and involving nearly 5,000 participants, Bowers' effort serves as one of the benchmark studies in the field of academic integrity research. The results from this study showed that nearly three-fourths of participants had engaged in acts of cheating such as using crib sheets, unauthorized collaboration on assignments, or copying off another student's test (Bowers, 1964). Bowers' multi-site study helped pave the way for future wide-scale studies.

Another multi-site investigation, and one that has had a lasting impact on the integrity research community, is McCabe and Trevino's (1993) seminal work on academic honor codes. In their study, the authors compared cheating behaviors of students at institutions with an honor code to those at non-code schools. Data collected from 6,096 participants showed a strong

correlation between lower incidence of cheating and the presence of an honor code. Contextual variables, such as the student's comprehension of academic integrity policies, the possibility of being caught, consequences associated with being held accountable, and the student's perception of cheating behavior in peers, were all significantly correlated to academic misconduct (McCabe & Trevino, 1993).

Perhaps, however, the largest contribution of McCabe and Trevino's (1993) study was the resulting establishment of the Center for Academic Integrity (CAI). According to its website ([www.academicintegrity.org](http://www.academicintegrity.org)), CAI was established in 1992 after a group of academic integrity research professionals had assembled to discuss the findings of McCabe and Trevino's (1993) study. Currently, CAI is housed out of Clemson University and serves to "foster the development of research, services, and products that promote the standards and practices of academic integrity" ([www.academicintegrity.org](http://www.academicintegrity.org)). While academic integrity, as a research field, is still without its own scholarly journal, the CAI serves as a clearinghouse for current research, assessment techniques, best practices, and idea sharing among those committed to accountability in education.

### Current Context of Cheating in Higher Education

You enter into a Code of Ethics with the University, not with each other. (*The Social Network*, 2010)

Cheating represents a threat to the value, integrity, and reputation of higher education. Books like Callahan's (2004) *The Cheating Culture* and Twenge and Campbell's (2009) *The Narcissism Epidemic* suggest that modern day society is selfish, egotistical, overly competitive,

and obsessed with success. Cheating then is seen as a means to an end; violation of social and ethical norms becomes the rule and not the exception. As the popular saying goes, “If you ain’t cheatin’, you ain’t tryin’!”

Higher education, while promoted by some to be a “virtuous” pursuit, is still susceptible to cheating. Within the last year alone, institutions have suffered scandals related to academics (Talbert, 2010), athletics (*The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 2010), student recruitment (Anderson, 2011), grade inflation (Mangan, 2011), administration (*The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 2011), and even in the use of technology (Zou, 2011). Unfortunately, articles related to cheating seem to appear with shocking regularity in publications like *Inside Higher Ed* and *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, sometimes several times per month. In October 2011 alone, five articles related to academic cheating appeared in *Inside Higher Ed*, while four articles appeared in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.

Also infectious to current educational culture is the student as the consumer mentality. In an expose’ published by *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, writer-for-hire “Ed Dante” (a.k.a., The Shadow Scholar) detailed his thriving business of providing original academic papers to paying students. Says Dante, using a sense of cynicism and even mockery,

You’ve never heard of me, but there’s a good chance that you’ve read some of my work. I’m a hired gun, a doctor of everything, an academic mercenary. My customers are your students. I can promise you that. Somebody in your classroom uses a service that you can’t detect, that you can’t defend against, that you may not know exists. (Dante, 2010, p. 1)

Dante, and many like him, are cashing in on the combination of the hypercompetitive, success driven culture of academia as well as the willingness of students to circumvent the rules for producing original work.

The body of literature on academic integrity has grown significantly over the past several decades. In order to provide context for this study, literature has been reviewed in an effort to “make connections between the parts” (Hart, 1998, p. 110). While reviewing cheating literature for this study, five themes emerged (a) faculty and student perceptions of cheating, (b) types of behaviors, (c) demographic variables and personal characteristics, (d) honor codes (HCs), and (e) moral neutralization of behavior. These themes help to make connections, identify similarities in research methods, and expose gaps in research literature.

### *Faculty and Student Perceptions of Cheating*

Recent research has addressed the disparity between perceptions held by faculty and perceptions held by students (see Brimble & Stevenson-Clarke, 2005; Chapman et al., 2004; Hard et al., 2006; Higbee & Thomas, 2002; Hudd et al., 2009; Miller et al., 2008; Schmelkin et al., 2008). For the purpose of this study, the term “perceptions” refers to the assumptions held by faculty and students alike to the frequency, type, and severity of cheating that occurs. To gain a proper understanding of the gap between faculty perceptions and student perceptions of cheating, each group is considered separately.

Current research by Brimble and Stevenson-Clarke (2005), Hard et al. (2006), and Higbee and Thomas (2002) attempts to address how faculty members perceive cheating behaviors among students. In their study, Brimble and Stevenson-Clarke (2005) administered questionnaires to both faculty and students across four different institutions (a total of 1,206 students and 190 faculty). The aim of the study, according to the authors, was to “investigate the extent to which perceptions of dishonesty are shared between students and staff” (p. 19). These

findings suggest that faculty view acts of academic dishonesty to occur more frequently and with greater severity than students do. In addition, the authors noted a divergence in attitudes toward penalties for offenses, where faculty were in favor of harsher penalties while students were not in favor of similar penalties (Brimble & Stevenson-Clarke, 2005).

Hard et al. (2006) focused on the role of faculty in modeling behavior to reduce cheating. The authors did admit, however, that such a role requires a mutual understanding of cheating by both faculty and students. Using descriptive statistics, the researchers show that 65.2% of student participants admit to engaging in unauthorized collaboration on assignments and that 70.5% of faculty have accused a student (or group of students) at least once of submitting unoriginal material for a grade. Behaviors that garnered the lowest percentage rates of student respondents were unauthorized acquisition of test materials prior to the exam (8%), purchasing term papers (8.2%), and passing off non-original work for grading (11%). For faculty, the lowest response rates were 11.1% (unauthorized acquisition of materials prior to a test), 13.8% (selling or lending papers to another student for submission), and 18.9% (purchasing papers for submission as original work) (Hard et al., 2006).

Higbee and Thomas's (2002) study provided faculty and student participants with a list of 25 proposed cheating behaviors, including acts like "changing laboratory results to reflect what the results should have been," "copying lecture notes from a friend," "including an article in a reference list when only reading the abstract," and "turning in the same paper for two different courses during different quarters" (p. 42). Of these 25 behaviors, students considered over half of them (14/25, or 56%) to be cheating, while faculty disagreed. While Higbee and Thomas's list

was not exhaustive, the results show the large discrepancy between faculty and student perceptions of cheating.

Because the phenomenon of academic sabotage has been largely understudied, students may be engaging in academically dishonest actions without faculty being aware of the trend. Higbee and Thomas's (2002) study supports this notion and adds to it that "students are receiving mixed messages" (p. 48.) when it comes to what is, and what is not, acceptable academic behavior. Faculty are merely one part of the equation, however. Students themselves are prone to skewed perceptions of cheating behaviors.

According to Chapman et al. (2004), 85% of their sample agreed that six of the seven items listed as cheating behaviors in the study were in fact, cheating. While this number is high, 75% admitted they had cheated previously and would probably cheat again in the future. The authors also attempted to debunk the excuse given by students of "everyone is doing it" by measuring rates of cheating in peers compared to the self (student). As a result, Chapman et al. (2004) "found that students greatly overestimated the amount their peers would cheat compared to their own behavior. . . the high frequency cheaters are substantially more likely to believe that others are cheating" (p. 246).

Much like Chapman et al.'s (2004) study, Miller et al. (2008) measured frequency of cheating by asking participants to report on the behaviors of classmates whom they consider close friends. Samples of cheating behaviors were given (5 total) to respondents, who then asked to report on how frequently their peers engaged in these activities. Participants were also asked to divulge how often they had personally engaged in these activities. Not surprisingly, the results



of Miller et al.'s study overwhelmingly pointed to the practice that students tend to overestimate how often their peers cheat. For the given cheating scenarios, 27.1% admitted to getting answers to a test from a friend who had previously taken the test, and reported that 41.1% of peers had done the same; 9.4 % had copied from another student during an exam, but reported that 18.2% of peers had done likewise; 1.4% had submitted papers generated by paper mills, while a reported 8.4% of peers had done likewise; 2.4% admitted to plagiarizing from another student's paper, but reported that 17.2% of friends did the same; 18.6% of participants acknowledged they had used fabricated excuses (like a doctor's excuse) to get an extension on assignments and reported that 32.3% of their classmates had done the same (Miller et al., 2008).

Schmelkin et al. (2008) found that a discrepancy in perceptions held by students and faculty actually contributes to cheating behavior. Specifically, students in this study felt that cheating exists on two levels, papers vs. exams, and that rules should be different for each of these levels, while faculty focused more on the seriousness of the offense. Given this lack of understanding, this study suggested that students are often held to different standards by different faculty members. The authors also suggested that when cheating goes unreported, cheating subcultures are "inevitably reinforced" (p. 604).

Each of these studies contributes pieces to the overall picture of how perceptions of cheating differ between students and faculty in higher education. Brimble and Stevenson-Clarke (2005) found a difference in attitudes toward penalties for cheating. Hard et al. (2006) found differences between students and faculty in which behaviors were considered serious offenses. Higbee and Thomas (2002) also added to the literature on differences in definitions by noting

that faculty disagreed with what students excused as non-cheating behaviors. Chapman et al. (2004) and Schmelkin et al. (2008) both found that discrepancies between perceptions of what are and what are not cheating behaviors do little to discourage future behaviors.

As current research has shown, there exists a disparity between what students perceive as cheating and what faculty perceive as cheating (Brimble & Stevenson-Clarke, 2005; Chapman et al., 2004; Hard et al., 2006; Higbee & Thomas, 2002; Hudd et al., 2009; Miller et al., 2008; Schmelkin et al., 2008). Bertram Gallant (2007) suggested that these disparities may constitute “gaps in institutional values . . . as well as value gaps between faculty and students” (p. 392). The studies reviewed in this thread have attempted to bridge that gap between not only students and faculty, but between institutional rhetoric and practice. This study seeks to add to this body of literature by attempting to clarify what students and faculty *think* is happening to what is *actually* happening.

### *Types of Behaviors*

One challenge to academic integrity research is the broad definition applied to the behaviors that actually constitute cheating. Given the diverse nature of higher education, definitions of cheating (can) vary from campus to campus. Recently, efforts by Baker et al. (2008); Higbee and Thomas (2002); Hudd et al. (2009); and Rakovski and Levy (2007) have been made to provide comprehensive lists of the behaviors that constitute academic dishonesty. As higher education has evolved so too have the methods employed by students to cheat.

Cheating has evolved over the last several decades, especially with the rapid growth of technology-based learning (Baker et al., 2008; Stephens et al., 2007). While the internet has

made cheating more accessible to students, efforts in academic integrity research still tend to focus on the same types of behaviors with little attention paid to gray areas. These similarities present both advantages and disadvantages to integrity research. With many current studies focusing on behaviors like plagiarism, stealing exams, or purchasing papers online, a wealth of data is produced and applied to a wider service. On the opposite side, little attention has been given to those behaviors that perhaps escape definition, such as sabotage.

In their study, Hudd et al. (2009) provided respondents with a list of 18 cheating behaviors ranging from “asking for help with ideas for a paper” (p. 154) to “falsifying lab or research data” (p. 155). Students were then asked to rank each offense on a scale from “not cheating” to “minor violation” to “major violation.” Ranking highest in the “major violation” category (above 90%) were (a) plagiarism using internet sources, (b) copying word for word from a source and turning it in as one’s own work, (c) turning in another’s work as your own, and (d) using a paper purchased from a website (Hudd et al., 2009). In a similar study, Rakovski and Levy (2007) found that students considered serious violations to be (a) taking an exam for someone, (b) asking someone to take an exam for you, (c) purchasing a paper, (d) forging university documents, (e) obtaining answers from someone else during the exam (i.e. hand signals), (f) using crib sheets, (g) stealing a test, and (h) plagiarism (p. 476). Considered less serious violations were (a) collaborating on homework or take-home exams when individual work is specified, (b) handing in the same work for two classes, (c) inappropriately using a tutor or writing center, (d) studying from someone else’s notes, (e) failing to report a grading error, (f) not contributing a fair share to a group project, (g) delaying an exam or paper submission due to a false excuse, (h) studying from a test from a prior semester, and (i) padding a bibliography

(p.477). The findings from Rakovski and Levy's study show the wide spectrum of what constitutes cheating behaviors.

In addition to a student population, faculty members were also surveyed as a part of Higbee and Thomas's (2002) study involving the ambiguity of definitions related to cheating. The findings from this study suggest that faculty and students tend to generally agree on what behaviors are, and are not, considered cheating. According to these authors, the two groups agreed that actions such as changing lab results, recycling papers during the same academic term, and asking test contents all constituted cheating (Higbee & Thomas, 2002). Conversely, discussing a paper with a friend, writing papers using the same research, studying old exams, and purchasing notes as supplemental materials were all considered non-cheating behaviors (Higbee & Thomas, 2002).

Two findings presented by Baker et al. (2008) supported the impetus of this study. While the authors addressed common cheating behaviors like plagiarism, fabrication, and using crib sheets, the two additional behaviors of "damaging library materials" and "failing to contribute a fair share to a group project or letting others do more work" were explored. Seventy-three percent of participants cited "damaging library materials" as not serious cheating. A striking 90% of participants felt that failure to contribute equally to a group was not serious cheating (Higbee & Thomas, 2002). Within the context of academic sabotage, these two behaviors have been discussed, at least anecdotally, and were considered "serious" offenses by those who have experienced them.

Vandehey, Diekhoff, and LaBeff (2007) suggested that defining cheating will continue to present problems, because cheating (and associated acts) are being defined in *broader terms* than

in the past. According to the authors, “this lack of consistency makes interstudy comparisons difficult and may distort estimates of the incidence of academic dishonesty across time” (p. 476). This notion acknowledges the difficulties of studying behaviors whose definitions are fluid and often contextually based that are inherent with integrity research. Although the term “cheating” continues to evolve in higher education, efforts to define the behavior are no less important and should be continued.

While current research has shown that students display a general lack of understanding of what constitutes cheating behavior, Zelna and Bresciani (2004) found that students actually *want* cheating behavior to be defined as well as *monitored* by faculty. Data showed that participants favored having clearly defined academic integrity policies as well as comprehensive education for the university community on these policies. In addition, while the vast majority of students (approximately 90%) admitted to cheating at least once during the previous academic year, only a mere 7% said that they had reported the incident. While this number is quite low, these findings suggest that regardless of behavior, students, in fact, desire for cheating to be defined and confronted.

If current research has told us anything about cheating, it is that a concrete, transferable, and unanimously agreed upon list of behaviors still eludes researchers. The types of cheating behaviors seem to change within each strand of research, leaving interpretation of what constitutes cheating up to the individual investigator. The question can be asked then of “are we catching the same problems using different nets?” What integrity research still lacks are efforts that explore activities that occur in the gray area, yet continue to escape definition and subsequently control. This study sought to address these needs.

### *Demographic Variables and Personal Characteristics*

Since the inception of integrity research, numerous efforts have been made to create a “profile” of the student cheater, using demographic variables and personal characteristics such as age, gender, academic year, organizational membership (such as fraternities and sororities), competition, and academic achievement (Angell, 2006; Bernardi, Metzger, Bruno, Hoogkamp, Reyes, & Barnaby, 2004; Davis et al., 2009; Eberhardt, Rice, & Smith, 2003; Kisamore et al., 2007; Mayhew, Hubbard, Finelli, Harding, & Carpenter, 2009; Stone, Jawahar, & Kisamore, 2009; Whitley, Nelson, & Jones, 1999; Whitley & Spiegel, 2002). When considered separately, arguments have been made by researchers and practitioners that despite the plethora of data, there still exists a lack of consistency in the findings of these studies. When combined, however, these findings have helped dispel “myths” that portray the student who cheats as one who is lazy and unmotivated, desperate, or one of poor academic performance.

*Age.* The age of a student has long been used as a variable to predict cheating. Using this variable, many studies posit that older students refrain from cheating more often than younger students (Kisamore et al., 2007; McCabe & Trevino, 1997; Vandehey et al., 2007; Whitley, 1998). Research using the variable of age has been criticised for several reasons. Given the rise of non-traditional age college students returning to the classroom, as noted by Kisamore et al. (2007) and Vandehey et al. (2007), data collected at institutions who serve large populations of older students may present skewed findings. While these studies suggest a limitation to using age as a variable, similar concerns can be raised regarding using only traditional age college students for research. Cheating, as a phenomenon, does not discriminate on the basis of age.

While some of the data related to age is controversial, the generally accepted sentiment in the literature is that the age of the student *does* play into the decision to cheat. Both McCabe and Trevino (1997) and Whitley (1998) conducted multi-site investigations and both found that older students tended to cheat less frequently than younger students. This notion is supported in student development literature and complements Kohlberg's theory of moral development, which would suggest that a person is less likely to engage in actions like cheating as they grow older. For the purpose of this study, age was used as a variable.

*Gender.* Much like the variable of age, the variable of gender has garnered the attention of integrity researchers for decades. Several studies exploring cheating using the variable of gender have produced mixed results (Allmon, Page, & Roberts, 2000; Kisamore et al., 2007; McCabe & Trevino, 1997; McCabe, Trevino, & Butterfield, 2002; McCabe, 2007; Whitley et al., 1999). Despite the popularity of exploring cheating using gender as a variable, there have been contradictions in the findings within the body of literature. Some research, such as McCabe and Trevino (1996) and Whitley et al. (1999), suggested that gender, like age, has little to no connection to the propensity to cheat in college. However, McCabe and Trevino (1997) found that male students were more likely to engage in acts of cheating than females, while Kisamore et al. (2007) failed to support the hypothesis that gender was related to frequency of cheating. Bucking the trends again is McCabe's (2007) supposition that female students are engaging in cheating activities at nearly the same rates as their male counterparts. Based on the propensity of evidence produced by these studies, this study operates on the assumption that cheating rates between male and female students will be similar.

## *Honor Codes*

Academic honor codes (HCs) have long been used to discourage cheating at institutions of higher education. Some of the oldest American universities such as the University of Virginia (UVA), William and Mary (W&M), Harvard, and Vanderbilt have prided themselves on their HCs and the strong tradition of trust between faculty and students. Use of HCs has grown over the past several decades and coincides with the accountability movement that is sweeping higher education (Rezaee, Elmore, & Szendi, 2001). Since McCabe and Trevino's (1993) seminal study on HCs, scores of research efforts have been made that complement and extend our understanding of academic HCs (Bertram Gallant & Drinan, 2006a, 2006b; Boehm et al., 2009; Hall & Kuh, 1998; McCabe, Butterfield, & Trevino, 2003; McCabe & Pavela, 2000; McCabe & Trevino, 1993, 1997; McCabe et al., 2002; Rezaee et al., 2001).

An important distinction within the honor code literature must be made. Institutions like UVA, W&M, Harvard, and Vanderbilt employ "traditional" HCs. Characteristics of traditional HCs include unproctored exams, honesty pledges, and student run judicial processes (McCabe & Trevino, 2002). Some institutions, such as Mississippi State University, employ a "modified" HC, which leaves the use of pledges and unsupervised exams to the discretion of the instructor (McCabe & Pavela, 2000). Modified HCs have become popular with institutions and focus on the promotion of integrity through the "community of scholars" approach.

Much of the work on academic HCs has focused on the presence of policy as a deterrent to cheating behavior. As noted by Hall and Kuh (1998) "acts of academic dishonesty do not occur in a vacuum, but in an environment marked by competing and sometimes conflicting values and desires" (p. 3). Honor code research conducted by McCabe et al. (2002) and McCabe



et al. (2003) explored the effectiveness of HCs. In 2002, the authors showed that cheating is highest at institutions without HCs, moderate at schools with modified HCs, and lowest on campuses with traditional HCs (McCabe et al., 2002). Later in 2003, the authors found that HCs significantly influenced the behaviors and attitudes of faculty members, and that the behaviors and attitudes of faculty among HC schools and non-HC schools are significantly different (McCabe et al., 2003).

Other research has shown that HCs are often considered symbolic and do little to actually discourage cheating. In their study, Vandehey et al. (2007) indicated that students and faculty agree that HCs “capture a favorable sentiment toward honesty” (p.472). Yet in their study, 57.4% of students admitted to cheating, despite the presence of an HC (Vandehey et al., 2007). While these findings are troubling, they are not all uncommon in HC research.

Trends in HC research present sometimes opposite and contradictory sentiments. Overall, research has shown that HCs (traditional and modified) are effective at discouraging cheating behaviors on campuses. Studies like Hendershott et al. (2000) and Zelna and Bresciani (2004) tell us that there is a strong desire, mostly from students, to have cheating behaviors defined and confronted by way of an HC or similar integrity policies. However, data have shown that despite student support for academic integrity, there is another strong sentiment, that of leniency, to be shown to students if they are caught cheating (Stephens et al., 2007; Zelna & Bresciani, 2004). It becomes clear then, that students appear to say one thing, but actually want another in terms of academic accountability.

The site of the current study employs a comprehensive modified HC, adopted first in 1986 (see Appendix A). With nearly 30 years passing since its inception, this study operated under the assumption that the HC had fully saturated into the academic culture of the Law School. While this is admittedly a broad assumption, prior research tells us that modified HCs do help to control cheating and academically dishonest behavior. Missing from the proposed site's HC, however, are any mentions of sabotage type behavior, as defined by this study.

### *Moral Neutralization of Behavior*

According to Vandehey et al. (2007), “neutralization” of cheating behaviors suggests that a student understands the concepts of cheating, engages in the behavior anyway, and, if caught, attempts to deflect blame and avoid guilt. Literature discussed in previous sections has offered clues as to who cheats, why, organizational responses such as HCs, and student and faculty perceptions. Research reports that explore the ways that students justify cheating behaviors then deserve mention.

Empirical research produced by Anderman and Murdock (2007); Austin, Simpson, and Reynen (2005); Brent and Atkisson (2011); Bruhn, Zajac, Al-Kazemi, and Prescott (2002); Hudd et al. (2009); Murdock and Stephens (2007); Stephens et al. (2007); and Vandehey et al. (2007) has explored both how and why students justify cheating behavior. As mentioned earlier, although students agree that cheating should be defined and monitored, data suggest that there is also desire for the justifications for cheating to be not only understood, but accepted by others

(Zelna & Bresciani, 2004). This thread within the literature complements components of the conceptual framework for this study including moral disengagement and moral development.

Students who cheat tend to employ neutralization techniques more often than students who do not cheat (Stephens et al., 2007; Vandehey et al., 2007). Both of these studies, as well as a study conducted by Brent and Atkisson (2010), used the work of Sykes and Matza (1957) to frame their work. Sykes and Matza (1957) developed five techniques that individuals use to neutralize or minimize personal involvement in acts that may be viewed as unethical by others: (a) denial of responsibility, (b) denial of injury, (c) denial of the victim, (d) condemnation of the condemners, and (e) appeal to higher authorities. According to Murdock and Stephens (2001), “neutralizing strategies can be seen as excuses or accounts of bad behavior (p. 235).

In their study, Vandehey et al. (2007) explored neutralization scores among cheaters and non-cheaters using 11 statements. These statements began with the signal phrase “Jack should not be blamed for cheating if . . .” (p. 473) and included the following responses: (a) the course material is too hard, (b) he is in danger of losing his scholarship, (c) he doesn’t have time to study, (d) the instructor doesn’t seem to care, (e) the instructor acts like his/her course is the only one, (f) his cheating isn’t hurting anyone, (g) everyone else in the room seems to be cheating, (h) the people sitting around him made no attempt to cover their papers, (i) his friend asked him to help him/her cheat, (j) the instructor left the room, and (k) the course is required (p. 473). Total neutralization scores for cheaters (i.e., those agreeing with these statements) were 47.44, while the scores for non-cheaters (i.e., those not agreeing with these statements) were lower at 41.39 (Vandehey et al., 2007). Adding validity to this effort was the fact that the authors had conducted

the same study in 1984 and 1994 (study conducted again in 2004, published in 2007). The total neutralization scores were consistently higher for cheaters when compared to non-cheaters over the span of the 20-year study.

Brent and Atkisson's (2011) work further extended the concepts of Sykes and Matza by adding subcategories within each technique. In their study, *denial of responsibility*, *denial of injury*, and *condemning the condemners* ranked as the top three techniques used by students to neutralize cheating behavior. One theme that emerged from the data was that of differing justifications for acts of "in-class cheating versus out-of-class cheating," which complements similar prior findings presented by Rakovski and Levy (2007). Rakovski and Levy's (2007) work suggested that students wanted in-class acts of cheating to be differentiated from out-of-class acts of cheating and for both to be taken into account when deciding on appropriate punishment.

The literature on neutralizing attitudes confirms that college students admit to knowing that cheating is wrong, yet they cheat anyway and then attempt to justify their actions when caught. This thread within the literature is not without its critiques. Specific critiques, and one that especially helps to frame this study, is the neutralization technique that suggests that cheating "doesn't hurt anyone" (Vandehey et al., 2007) or that cheating is a "victimless crime." While "traditional" cheating may lack an intended target, acts of academic sabotage have a very real target: other students.

This section reviewed current trends and topics in academic integrity research including (a) faculty and student perceptions of cheating, (b) types of behaviors, (c) demographic variables and personal characteristics, (d) traditional and modified honor codes, and (e) moral

neutralization of behaviors. What the literature has told us is that there is a large discrepancy between what faculty considers to be cheating behaviors and what students consider to be cheating behaviors and the frequency of those behaviors. Further complicating this is the difficulty in providing concrete definitions and comprehensive lists of cheating behaviors, in some cases because of the changing composition of students in higher education. We also have the advantage of research data regarding the effectiveness of honor codes in combating cheating on campuses. Finally, research has shown that while students admit that cheating is wrong, academically deviant behaviors continue to happen and to be justified.

The wealth of research that exists confirms that cheating is, in fact, a serious issue facing higher education. No longer can academic affairs practitioners claim that cheating “is not their problem.” Likewise, student affairs practitioners cannot ignore behaviors displayed by students while in the classroom. While integrity research has produced invaluable findings that have informed both policy and practice, few efforts have been made to move past the current trends in research. This study seeks to do just that by exploring the previously unstudied phenomenon of academic sabotage.

### Corporate Sabotage/Workplace Deviance

Sabotage can target an individual, a unit, or the whole organization. (Giacalone, Riordan, & Rosenfeld, 1997, p. 121)

Given the lack of research describing academic sabotage, literature exploring the phenomenon of sabotage in the workplace has been included for review. This was done for three reasons. First, the phenomenon of workplace deviance has been well-documented and lends

itself to the development of the conceptual framework for this study (Analoui, 1995; Crino, 1994; DuBois, 1979; Robinson & Bennett, 1995; Terris, 1985). Second, the patterns of behavior and justifications displayed by those who engage in workplace sabotage are strikingly similar to the behaviors displayed by those who engage in proposed acts of academic sabotage, such as stealing, not contributing a fair share of work in a group setting, and hoarding materials (Giacalone & Rosenfeld, 1987). Finally, literature exists that explores the relationship between academic cheating and workplace deviance (Grimes, 2004; Harding et al., 2004; Lawson, 2004; Nonis & Swift, 2001; Ogilby, 1995; Sims, 1993). As the current study is exploratory in nature, it is important to review prior literature that has attempted to make connections between sets of behaviors that are similar in nature, yet contextually different.

As a research discipline, workplace deviance, much like academic integrity, is relatively new to academic circles. The literature exploring workplace deviance became popular in the 1980s while cheating literature's popularity began to climb in the 1990s. Each topic, although contextually different (corporate vs. academic) seems to blend into one another, perhaps because of the very nature of the behaviors being explored. This section includes (a) brief overview the nature of workplace sabotage, (b) types of behaviors, (c) discussion and comparison of targets in both academic cheating and workplace sabotage, and (d) pathway model describing the decision-making process of a student choosing to engage in academic sabotage.

### *Nature of Workplace Sabotage*

Much like the efforts made by integrity researchers to describe the nature of behaviors, sabotage scholars have made similar attempts to catalogue characteristics of dishonest behaviors

in the workplace. Early efforts to explore workplace sabotage, including Crino (1994), Dubois (1979), Giacalone and Rosenfeld (1987), and Robinson and Bennett (1995), produced some of the first descriptions of the phenomenon. These studies also managed to construct the very field of sabotage research through choices of research questions, methodology, and data analysis. Similar to cheating research, sabotage researchers cite difficulties to access because of the deviant nature of behavior being studied and the unwillingness of participants to divulge potentially incriminating information about themselves or others (Analoui, 1995; Giacalone & Rosenfeld, 1987).

Early research conducted by Giacalone and Rosenfeld (1987) described workplace sabotage as “any behavior by a payroll employee which is intended to inflict a production or profit loss for the targeted organization” (p.367). Using this broad definition, the authors surveyed 38 employees at an electrical factory in the Northeast. An interesting tactic used by these authors was the use of a former plant employee to help author survey items. A total of 29 items were listed as a result of this collaboration. According to the findings produced by Giacalone and Rosenfeld (1987), the top five sabotage behaviors were (a) calling upon the Union to intervene, (b) carrying out management directives to the letter, (c) doing “personal work” on company time with company tools and supplies, (d) punching someone else’s timecard or the reverse, and (e) creating work slow-downs (e.g., slow up feed and speed machine rates, go “looking for parts,” sitting in the men’s room) (p. 374). At first glance, these actions appear somewhat benign and even passive aggressive. Robinson and Bennett (1995) classified these actions as “organizational deviance,” where employee behaviors are directed toward the company or organization itself instead of toward other employees.

Crino (1994) added that workplace sabotage is

Behavior intended to damage, disrupt, or subvert the organization's operations for the personal purpose of the saboteur by creating unfavorable publicity, embarrassment, delays in production, damage to property, the destruction of working relationships, or the harming of employees or customers. (p. 312)

Crino's (1994) work used a mixture of anecdotal evidence, newspaper and media accounts, and empirical research to propose motivations for deviant behavior in the workplace. The motivations for sabotage that emerged from Crino's (1994) data were (a) to make a statement or send a message; (b) to prevent or encourage corporate change; (c) to establish personal worth to others, or be the center of attention; (d) to gain a competitive advantage over co-workers; (e) to gain revenge against management or co-workers; (f) to have an impact in a large and faceless bureaucracy; (g) to satisfy a need to destroy, to seek thrills; (h) to avoid responsibility for failure, or to avoid work; (i) for personal gain; and (j) to vent personal anger created by nonwork problems and frustrations. Crino (1994) further noted that regardless of the severity, target, or frequency of an act of workplace sabotage, the action in itself compromised organizational integrity and strained relationships between co-workers. Acts of sabotage targeting other employees are defined as "interpersonal sabotage" (Robinson & Bennett, 1995).

Despite noble efforts to describe the nature of workplace sabotage, Duffy, Ganster, and Pagon (2002) tell us that a solid definition still escapes researchers because sabotage behaviors can be interpreted differently by different people. Although the nature of workplace sabotage appears fluid, previous research has been able to hone in on the concepts of the intent, targets, and motivations for sabotage. Although these items are not central tenets of this study, integrity researchers would be well advantaged to explore these concepts when applied to the academic



realm. This study sought to establish the presence of the phenomenon of academic sabotage in higher education, not its motives, intent, or targets

### *Types of Behavior*

Because prior research is scant on the phenomenon of sabotage in academia, this study draws heavily on the work of Giacalone and Rosenfeld (1987) in the development of the list of behaviors that constitute academic sabotage violations. The current study bases descriptions of acts of academic sabotage on this list. As mentioned earlier, the authors presented participants with 29 distinct behaviors that constituted workplace sabotage, as defined by a former employee of the organization. These actions included the following:

- Creating “down time”
- Doing “personal work” on company time with company tools and supplies
- Leaving bodily waste in areas not designated to be toilets
- Carving poetry on bathroom walls
- Using “Loctite” glue to freeze up tool lockers and clothes lockers
- Using “Blueing dye” to redecorate car interiors, clothes, finished products, windows, phones, etc.
- Pouring steel shot into auto gas tanks, flattening tires, etc.
- Punching someone else’s time card or the reverse
- Stealing to compensate for low pay, poor job/conditions, get back at the boss/company
- Creating work slowdowns (e.g., slow up feed and speed machine rates, go “looking for parts,” sitting in the men’s room)
- Going to the clinic to get away
- Greasing, bluing or otherwise booby-trapping the foreman’s personal/work property
- Switching paper work around or “losing” it
- Snipping wires on machines or changing them around to put the machine down
- Altering the dimensions or specs on the goods produced
- Passing defective work/parts onto the next station
- “Getting lost” for periods of time; leaving company property while on the clock to do personal errands
- Calling upon the Union to intervene
- Setting up the foreman to get him/her in trouble
- Attempting to scare foreman/supervisor into quitting or getting a transfer
- As a group, slowing down work output to get foreman in trouble/fired/transferred

“Forgetting” to turn a valve, flip a switch, etc. to damage a machine or work product  
Turning on a machine and walking away, knowing it will crash  
Altering the time on the punch clock  
Pulling the fire alarm, bomb threats  
Carrying out management directives to the letter  
Taking tools and supplies home as “fringe benefits”  
Pushing feeds and speeds too fast so as to wreck the job or shut down the machine  
Throwing time cards away (p. 312)

For the purpose of this study, five behaviors listed by Giacalone and Rosenfeld (1987) have been adapted and expanded into nine questionnaire items. When applied to an academic setting, the types of sabotage listed above might take on the following descriptions (Giacalone & Rosenfeld’s types listed first, then followed by a proposed type of academic sabotage):

Switching paperwork around or “losing it”--stealing, hiding, defacing, mutilating, or mishandling academic journals or materials for the purpose of hindering academic pursuits;

Passing defective work/parts onto the next station--purposely passing off incorrect materials, such as study guides, to group members;

Snipping wires on machines or changing them around to put the machine down--uploading computer viruses to crash a classmate’s computer thereby hindering academic pursuits;

Stealing to compensate for low pay, poor job/conditions, get back at the boss/company--stealing notes, books, or materials from classmates or teachers in an effort to “stabilize” an uncontrollable situation or retaliate; or

Altering the dimensions or specs on the goods produced--altering information for group projects, withholding information or knowledge that would be beneficial to group mates or colleagues.

While this list admittedly lacks breadth in terms of scope and application, the types of behaviors chosen were done so intentionally. Based on the anecdotal evidence presented by former law students, these five behaviors appear to be the methods most frequently used by students to sabotage the academic pursuits of classmates. Also, not all of Giacalone and Rosenfeld's (1987) behaviors were transferable to academia. Studies that have addressed the relationship between academic cheating and workplace deviance focus more on acts such as employee theft and lying and their relation to previous instances of academic cheating by that particular employee (Harding et al., 2004; Nonis & Swift; 2001). The current study sought to establish the existence of sabotage practices in higher education. Because the current study appeared to be one of the first to address this topic, the decision was made to only use a small number of sabotage behaviors in the research instrument.

#### *Cheating versus Sabotage/Targets*

A particularly interesting theme that emerged from sabotage literature is the notion of *targets*. As discussed earlier, targets of sabotage behaviors can be placed into two categories: interpersonal or organizational (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). This distinction provides a fundamental difference between cheating, which is often seen as a "victimless crime," and sabotage. Sabotage, by its very nature, has to have an intended target (Ambrose, Seabright, & Schminke, 2002; Anderson & Pearson, 1999; Douglas & Martinko, 2001; Duffy, Ganster, & Pagon, 2002).

Ambrose et al. (2002) suggested that "sabotage explicitly focuses on doing harm whereas deviance focuses on violating norms" (p. 951). As part of their research, Ambrose et al. focused

on the relationship between injustice (organizational or personal) and targets of sabotage behaviors. Results of the study showed that saboteurs targeted the organization itself when the perceived injustice originated from upper management (i.e., those “untouchable” co-workers such as bosses or supervisors), while individuals or co-workers were targeted as a means of “restoring equity” (p. 953) among the workforce itself (Ambrose et al., 2002). These findings prove interesting when applied to the academic realm.

As discussed earlier, many institutions of higher education employ HCs as a means of promoting ethical academic behavior on campus (McCabe et al., 2003; McCabe & Pavela, 2000). Therefore, HCs can be considered the “norm(s)” for academic conduct. When deviant behavior occurs, such as cheating, these norms are violated. Behaviors that constitute forms of academic sabotage present an entirely new dimension to academic integrity by adding an “obvious intent to harm” (p. 455), as described by Anderson and Pearson (1999).

Lesser forms of workplace deviance, such as workplace incivility (Anderson & Pearson, 1999) and social undermining (Duffy et al., 2002), have also been explored. Although far less destructive than acts of sabotage, these lesser behaviors are still critically important to consider when constructing a conceptual framework for academic sabotage. Although incivility and undermining are unique phenomena, there is a great deal of overlap between the two with regards to definition, forms, and context.

Anderson and Pearson (1999) illustrated how incivility differs from other workplace behaviors. The broad range of behaviors offered by the authors includes the following:

Incivility: “low-intensity deviant behavior with ambiguous intent to harm;”

Aggression: “deviant behavior with intent to harm;”

Violence: “high intensity, physically aggressive behavior;”

Deviant behavior: “antisocial behavior that violates norms;” and  
Antisocial behavior: “behavior that harms organization and/or members.” (p. 456)

Using these descriptions, acts of academic sabotage would be considered aggressive antisocial behavior, because the very nature of the subversive acts intends to harm. Although general incivility is passive aggressive in nature, the authors contend that if incivility goes unchecked, it can escalate into a predatory relationship where employees prey on targets with the ultimate goal of harming another employee (Anderson & Pearson, 1999).

Evidence produced by Duffy et al. (2002) furthers the idea of workplace incivility by adding the dimensions of “direct actions” and “withholding.” Direct actions, by definition, are intentional. The idea of “withholding” is also intentional and suggests that employees can undermine relationships, for example, by failing to contribute equally to a project, and when confronted about the behavior, attempt to “conceal its true nature” (p. 333). The authors solidify their definition for social undermining by offering the following: “Social undermining refers to behavior intended to hinder, over time, the ability to establish and maintain positive interpersonal relationships, work-related success, and favorable reputation” (p. 332). The elements of Duffy et al.’s (2002) definition add to the idea that academic sabotage, as an undermining activity, works to destroy interpersonal relationships between students, academic success of sabotage targets, and the overall reputation of quality and integrity of an academic program.

The literature reviewed in this section has shown that acts of workplace sabotage present challenges not only to items like productivity and organizational efficiency, but also to the very relationships held between members of the organization. While academic cheating often challenges the sacred trust of respect and honor between faculty and students, academic sabotage

positions itself to challenge not only the faculty/student relationship, but the student/student relationship as well. At stake, then, are the very nurturing and developmental academic classroom environments that faculty themselves work so hard to promote. Because academic sabotage has been largely understudied, and thus rarely defined, these compromised academic climates may have already thoroughly entrenched themselves into academia.

### *Proposed Path Model of Academic Sabotage*

Using the workplace deviance literature produced by Ambrose et al. (2002); Analoui (1995); Anderson and Pearson (1999); Douglas and Martinko (2001); Duffy et al. (2002); and Giacalone and Rosenfeld (1987), a proposed path model of academic sabotage has been developed. Though not yet empirically tested, Figure 1 displays this model, which describes factors and/or triggers that might lead a student to engage in academic sabotage.



*Figure 1.*

Proposed model of sabotage in academic setting.

proposed model explains steps taken student to

engage in academic sabotage. The directionality of this model flows in a clockwise manner.

This section reviewed current themes and trends in the area of workplace sabotage research including (a) nature of sabotage, (b) types of behavior, (c) targets, and (d) incivility and social undermining. A proposed path model of academic sabotage was also given. The selection of this body of literature was done so intentionally. With no prior research on the topic of academic sabotage available for comparison, an attempt was made to establish the phenomenon of sabotage in non-academic domains. Current research has confirmed the existence of acts of sabotage in the workplace, which raises potential questions of comparison and application to other domains, such as academia.

The workplace deviance literature reviewed in this section paints a picture of employees who, motivated by their desire for control, distribution of power, hatred for the organization or individuals, fun, or boredom, are “pushed” to acts of sabotage (Ambrose et al., 2002). The current study operates on the assumption that if this particular phenomenon exists in corporate America, then a complementary phenomenon is at work in the higher education system. This assumption is supported by literature that confirms that college students who cheat during their undergraduate careers are more likely to cheat (or engage in dishonest behavior) in the workplace (Grimes, 2004; Harding et al., 2004; Lawson, 2004; Nonis & Swift, 2001; Ogilby, 1995; Sims, 1993). Despite these prior studies bridging the gap between academic integrity and workplace behavior, no quality studies have been performed to address the possibilities of academic sabotage in higher education. This study seeks to help build this field of research.

### Moral Development

For decades, researchers have explored the decision-making processes employed by college students when faced with moral or ethical dilemmas. Application of moral development theories to academic integrity research has yielded interesting conclusions. Bernardi et al. (2004) and Brimble and Stevenson-Clarke (2005) both linked college student moral development to toleration of cheating behaviors using Kohlberg’s Theory of Moral Development in their framework. Stephens et al. (2007) measured moral attitudes of students in relation to digital methods of cheating and found that students compromised their own ethical principles more frequently when given the chance to cheat using technology. Mayhew et al. (2009) and Stone et al. (2009) applied Ajzen’s Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) to predict student cheating



behaviors. Findings from the latter two studies support the use of TPB as a predictor of integrity violations.

The moral development component of this study draws heavily on Kohlberg's Theory of Moral Development (1976) and Bandura's work on Moral Disengagement (2002). In this section, each of these theories is reviewed, giving special attention to Bandura's mechanisms for moral disengagement. Items from the research instrument for this study have been modeled directly from Bandura's work and therefore require thorough examination. Finally, theoretical underpinnings that guide this study are discussed.

#### *Kohlberg's Theory of Moral Development*

Kohlberg's Theory of Moral Development describes moral development as a process where individuals progress through three levels. Within each level, there are sequential stages. The basic assumption guiding Kohlberg's theory is that moral judgment is based on the principle of justice, or, what is considered fair (Kohlberg, 1976). This is especially important to this study, because one of the guiding principles of the profession of law is justice.

In the early stages of development, individuals focus on personal motivation, such as avoidance of punishment or making deals (Kohlberg, 1976). This level, known as the preconventional level, contains two stages. The first stage in this level, *heteronomous morality*, suggests that individuals base actions on possible consequences. Therefore, decisions are deemed "good" or "bad" by weighing the likelihood of punishment if caught. The second stage in this level, *individualistic, instrumental morality*, situates moral action as a function of filling

personal or selfish needs. To the individual, adhering to any rules is only justified if it is to their own personal benefit. In this stage, there is no emphasis placed on the principles of justice or equity (Kohlberg & Hersch, 1977).

For individuals in the preconventional stage of moral development, conceptualizing the principles of honor, integrity, and justice on a *universal* scale is difficult. These principles appear distorted in this stage and are motivated only by how a person's actions can accomplish stated goals or fill specific needs. Evans, Forney, and Guido-DiBrito, (1998) summarize this level as behavior that is aimed at "minimizing the potential possibility of negative consequences" (p. 174). Although behavior in this level suggests a certain immaturity, it is important to note that in the second stage, the idea of relationships begins to form.

The second level of Kohlberg's theory is referred to as the conventional level. Like the first level, this level is marked by two distinct stages, *interpersonally normative morality* and *social system morality*. In this level, there is a strong focus placed on fulfilling expectations held by others as well as a respect for authority. Also known as the "good boy/good girl" stage, *interpersonally normative morality* focuses on "impression management," or, maintaining the appearance that one is a "good person." In the *social system morality stage*, individuals begin to base decisions and actions on the presence of authority as well as the maintenance of social structures (Kohlberg, 1976).

The conventional level is marked by an individual's departure from basing moral behavior on the fulfillment of selfish needs. In this level, the promotion of societal or cultural norms begins to be placed first. Doing what is considered "right" is no longer based on the

avoidance of punishment. Instead behavior is defined by adherence to authority. Put simply, individuals in this level of development uphold rules for the sake of the rules themselves.

According to Kohlberg (1976), the later stages of development are marked by an individual's reclassification of self in relation to community. Known as the post conventional level, individuals here promote universal principles, such as justice, honor, basic dignity, and inclusion. Stage 5 (*human rights and social welfare morality*) states that individuals begin to comprehend more complex social structures such as the protection of fundamental human rights. Relationships formed by people in this stage are based on shared trust. Moral decisions are then fueled by a combination of this trust and by a set of mutually agreed upon standards. The final stage of Kohlberg's model, *morality of universalizable, reversible, and prescriptive general ethical principles*, is the most advanced and complex of stages. Individuals in this stage make decisions driven by the compulsion to care for others, to uphold justice, and to promote others to do the same (Kohlberg, 1984).

Although Kohlberg (1984) classified very few people in these latter stages of his moral development theory (and even admitted to failing to empirically prove the existence of Stage 6), popular examples of those "moral exemplars" would be Martin Luther King, Jr. and Mother Theresa. These people were driven to care for others and promoted moral and ethical leadership on a global scale. Despite this, Kohlberg's model continues to be one of the most rigorously tested, empirically proven, and cited theories of moral development.

### *Bandura and Moral Disengagement*

The concept of moral disengagement suggests a reactionary relationship between external factors and intrinsic motivation (Bandura, 2002). According to Bandura, individuals self-regulate to produce the highest sense of self-satisfaction and lowest levels of self-condemnation. The tendency for individuals to display these types of behaviors (i.e., avoidance of punishment or condemnation) suggests operation in the lowest stage in the lowest level of Kohlberg's model, *heteronomous morality* in the preconventional stage. When an individual engages in behavior that goes against accepted standards of morality, Bandura (2002) suggested that "mechanisms" are used to disengage from the action. These eight mechanisms are (a) moral justification, (b) euphemistic labeling, (c) advantageous comparison, (d) displacement of responsibility, (e) diffusion of responsibility, (f) disregard of consequences, (g) dehumanization of the victim, and (h) attribution of blame (Bandura, 2002). Each of these mechanisms is discussed along with application statements to cheating/sabotage behavior as suggested by this study.

*Moral justification.* According to Bandura (2002), individuals who employ the moral justification mechanism use a warped sense of "nobility" to disengage from their actions. This suggestion is consistent with findings from both the body of literature on workplace sabotage and academic integrity. Findings from both of these fields state that individuals who commit deviant acts often justify those acts by claiming that the actions served a nobler purpose, such as restoring the balance of power, or attaining high levels of academic success (Analoui, 1995; Higbee & Thomas, 2002).

Moral Justification Statement: "Academic performance is highly prized in society. My program of study is really competitive so I cheat to get good grades. I do what I have to do to stay ahead of the competition."

*Euphemistic labeling.* In an attempt to disengage from morally reprehensible behavior, individuals employ what Bandura (2002) calls euphemistic labeling. These statements are often “softer” or “more attractive sounding,” but in fact mask the true nature of the behaviors themselves. These statements also deflect blame or guilt associated with the behaviors.

Euphemistic Labeling Statement(s): Cheating is just a different way of learning (or) Cheating is working smarter, not harder (or) I didn’t give my group the *wrong* answers to the practice test, I just didn’t give them all the *right* answers.

*Advantageous comparison.* In this mechanism, an individual justifies behavior by comparing it to the behavior(s) of others (Bandura, 1999). That is, a person will down play the severity of his or her own actions by highlighting the severity of the behaviors of others. Chapman et al. (2004) and Miller et al. (2008), both validated this notion by showing that students who engaged in cheating behaviors used “deflective statements” in an attempt to minimize his or her actions while calling attention to more serious cheating violations committed by other students.

Advantageous Comparison Statement: I do not cheat as much as everyone else does. (or) I know people who steal books, deface journals, and crash computer programs; at least I don’t do *that* kind of stuff.

*Displacement of responsibility.* In this mechanism, individuals attempt to remove themselves from any form of responsibility associated with questionable behaviors or the potential damage done to others as a result (Bandura, 2002). Bandura also noted that statements that employ displacement of responsibility are sometimes driven by social situations in which the

individual feels like they have little control. In an academic setting, a student may attempt to place responsibility for his or her behaviors on faculty members or other students.

**Displacement of Responsibility Statement:** It is the professor's responsibility to catch me cheating (or) it's not *my* fault that my classmate left her books and notes unattended and they got stolen, she should have known better than to do that.

*Diffusion of responsibility.* Similar to the displacement of responsibility, the diffusion of responsibility involves placing blame for behavior on a larger group instead of the individual (Bandura, 2002). Disgruntled employees were observed to diffuse responsibility for sabotage behaviors to co-workers in a study conducted by Giacalone and Rosenfeld (1987). Within this mechanism, behaviors that go against the grain of accepted moral behavior can actually become socially accepted norms, through the diffusion of responsibility to all group members.

**Diffusion of Responsibility Statement:** Everyone is cheating so I will too. (or) This is just what you do when you're in a competitive program like mine, it is tradition.

*Disregard of consequences.* The use of this mechanism is characterized by an individual who engages in morally reprehensible behavior, yet justifies actions by displaying a casual attitude toward its impact on others (Bandura, 2002). For example, students have been reported to justify cheating behavior because it "didn't hurt anyone" or because cheating was a "victimless crime" (Austin et al., 2005; Brent & Atkisson, 2011; Bernardi et al., 2004).

**Disregard of Consequences Statement:** No one gets caught cheating so I will not either. (or) I know how to work the system, I'm smart enough not to get caught (or) it's no big deal; I'm not hurting anyone by cheating.

*Dehumanization of the victim.* Perhaps one of the cruelest applications in Bandura's mechanisms is justification of behavior through dehumanization of the victim or victims. Bandura (1999) suggested that individuals excuse their own actions easier if they do not consider the victims of their behavior to be people, but instead assign them non-human qualities. One famous example of this is the treatment of the Jewish people by the Nazis during World War II. Through the use of propaganda, the Nazis portrayed Jews as "vermin" or "rats" or as an "inferior race polluting pure German bloodlines." Another famous example is the murdering of thousands of Native American "savages" by settlers during the Westward expansion of America. By stripping these victims of all human qualities, the groups committing these atrocities justified the behaviors.

Dehumanization of the Victim Statement: That teacher is an evil, soulless bitch, I *had* to cheat. (or) I don't have classmates, I have competition, and I will do whatever it takes to stay ahead of the competition.

*Attribution of blame.* In Bandura's (2002) final mechanism, individuals affix blame for behaviors on external forces. This notion has been validated in both workplace sabotage and academic integrity literature, where perpetrators blame deviant behavior on the organization (Ambrose et al., 2002), other employees (Douglas & Martinko, 2001), other students (Harding et al., 2004), or faculty/difficulty of course (Hard et al., 2006; Zelna & Bresciani, 2004). In short, individuals who use this mechanism feel justified because they were "forced" to act as they did.

Attribution of Blame Statement: Cheating is my way at getting back at the system because the class was really hard and my teacher was unfair. (or) My classmate set the curve on the last test so he made himself a target for people to mess with his stuff, he should have known better, it's totally his fault.

## Application of Moral Development to Academic Sabotage

The application of moral development theory to the phenomenon of cheating and/or sabotage presents a fairly clear and concise model. The proposed model suggests that there is a relationship between moral disengagement and acts of academic sabotage. The model also proposes, as Anderman and Murdock (2007) suggested, that students in a professional degree program will display a certain “moral and mental disorganization” between rhetoric (i.e., saying they believe sabotage is wrong) and action (i.e., what actually occurs). Finally, this model proposes that although some law students may claim to operate in the later stages of Kohlberg’s model, their moral development is far less advanced than their claim.

The suggestion made by Thoma and Bebeau (in press) regarding the rise of narcissism and interest in personal endeavors complements the idea of moral disorganization made by Anderman and Murdock (2007). The focus on personal interests suggests that the intrinsic system of priorities is preconventional in nature. According to Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, and Stephens (2003), students often place a low emphasis on discussions of personal integrity. This study seeks to empirically prove that students in a professional law program are not motivated by the principles of their profession (i.e., justice, honor, integrity, and fairness), but instead are motivated by a strong sense of competition from within the academic program itself, which provides opportunities to engage in cheating or sabotage behaviors.

As mentioned earlier, the emphasis on catching and punishing cheaters may be counterproductive to the promotion of academic integrity and moral development. Stephens et al.



(2007) agreed, citing that a punitive approach to addressing academic integrity is “not the optimal situation.” (p. 252). In order to encourage moral development and promote academic integrity, educators should address the behavior first as an educational opportunity instead of punishing. Punishing might provide negative reinforcement for the deviant behavior. This study hoped to prove the existence of academic sabotage so that those behaviors may be defined and subsequently included in programs to combat violations such as honor codes.

### Summary

This chapter has reviewed empirical and theoretical research in the areas of academic integrity, workplace sabotage, and moral development. These areas combined to provide the conceptual framework for this study. Components of the academic integrity research reviewed in this chapter, such as faculty and student perceptions of cheating, ambiguity of definitions of cheating, motivational factors related to cheating, traditional and modified honor codes, and student neutralization of cheating, provide insight into the reasons that cheating persists on college campuses today.

Workplace sabotage literature was reviewed in order to establish the existence of the phenomenon as a whole. By reviewing elements of sabotage, such as the nature of workplace sabotage, types of behaviors, targets of sabotage, and lesser forms of workplace deviance, the phenomenon is firmly established. By establishing this phenomenon in non-academic domains, the gap showing the lack of research exploring the application of sabotage behaviors to academic domains is revealed.

Finally, as suggested by the literature reviewed in this chapter, we know that multiple theories of moral development may be in play when students engage in violations of academic integrity. It seems nearly impossible not to consider the implications of moral development when exploring academically deviant behavior. This study sought to add to the body of literature that gives consideration to theories of moral development to cheating behavior.

As the higher education system in America has developed, so too have the methods used by students to cheat. From primitive methods of cheating, such as small crib sheets used by students at early American institutions to the more advanced practices, like the use of text messaging or purchasing custom written papers available from the internet, it is evident that cheating has firmly entrenched itself into the very fabric of the higher education experience. What also persist are the (sometimes) outrageous justifications given by students to excuse or minimize behaviors. If the college years are seen as a microcosm, or training ground, for real life, then the lack of accountability for cheating behaviors does a disservice to students.

Since its inception, American higher education has sought to produce upstanding members of society, whose moral and ethical conduct is above reproach. Although this aim is noble in principle, academically deviant behaviors like cheating or sabotage compromise the public trust in the products of higher education. Of course, affixing blame to any number of factors is possible. The shift from teaching to research, the changing composition of student bodies, financial and economic downturns, the rise and dependence on technology, or an increasingly cutthroat job market can all be cited as reasons students engage in cheating behaviors. Ultimately, the impetus to produce upstanding members of society whose moral and ethical conduct is above reproach still rests with those who are in the trenches, educators

themselves. Future research addressing matters of academic integrity is not only needed, it is required.

## CHAPTER 3

### METHODS

Accountability requires information. (Lipka, 2011, p. 1)

Traditionally, the phenomenon of cheating in higher education has been examined through the use of quantitative research methods. Over the past several decades, research data has offered suggestions as to who cheats in college, methods employed to cheat, reasons and motivations for cheating, organizational responses to cheating, and the relationship between student moral development and cheating. While the information provided by previous studies has proved invaluable to combating cheating, no single study has addressed the concept of academic sabotage. This study is unique as it is among the first to do so. The purpose of this study was to explore the phenomenon of academic sabotage in higher education through the frame of moral judgment and moral disengagement. This chapter describes the proposed methods of this study, including the research questions, overall approach, site selection, participant selection, access, ethical considerations, instrumentation, data collection procedures, data analysis techniques, delimitations, and assumptions.

#### Research Questions

This study sought to explore the relationship between student moral development, moral disengagement, and the phenomenon of academic sabotage in higher education. The following research questions guide this study.

Research Question 1: Do acts of academic sabotage exist in professional education programs, such as law?

Research Question 2: Are there differences between genders in measures of moral disengagement and attitudes that justify acts of academic sabotage?

Research Question 3: Are there differences between the three classifications of students in a professional law program (IL, IIL, IIIL) in measures of moral disengagement and attitudes that justify acts of academic sabotage?

Research Question 4: Are there differences between ages in measures of moral disengagement and attitudes that justify acts of academic sabotage?

These questions provided a structural approach to examine the phenomenon of academic sabotage in professional programs in higher education. These questions also allowed inquiry into how students use moral judgment to solve social problems.

### Overall Approach and Rationale

Given the absence of prior research on the phenomenon of academic sabotage in higher education, this study was unique in that any number of research methods could be used. Because one of the goals of this study was to establish the presence of academic sabotage in higher education, the scope of the study was taken into consideration before selecting research methods. Qualitative research methods, such as participant interviews, focus groups, observations, and document analysis might prove cumbersome and time consuming to the stated goals of this study. Furthermore, the sentiments and experiences of participants captured using qualitative methods may not be representative of the larger population. Therefore, the use of quantitative

methods was selected for this study for the potential ability to provide data that can be generalized to a larger population.

According to Babbie (1990) the purpose of survey research is “to generalize from a sample to a population so that inferences can be made about some characteristic, attitude, or behavior of a population” (p. 146). Because this study is among the first to explore the concept of sabotage in academia, “baseline” measurements were needed for items such as prevalence of sabotage, frequency of acts, degree, and how students interpret violations. Therefore, a cross-sectional approach was the preferred method of data collection for this study. Data were collected all at once via an online self-administered questionnaire. Use of such methods lends themselves generously when trying to establish the mere presence of any previously unstudied phenomenon, such as academic sabotage.

The decision to use an online questionnaire stemmed from not only the research questions themselves, but also from the unique advantages offered by such a technique. Most, if not all, students have access to the Internet or personal computers, making distribution of an online questionnaire fairly easy. The use of an online questionnaire was also cost effective and allowed each participant to complete the questionnaire privately, which when collecting “sensitive” information (such as academically deviant behavior) is crucial. Given the proposed population size of this study ( $n = 500+$ ), the time involved with personally collecting such a large number of questionnaires was also a factor.

## Site Selection

This study was conducted at a large public, top tier school of law in the Southeast. Named a “2010 Best Value Law School” by National Jurist, the institution serves a total of 509 students. The median undergraduate grade point average sits at 3.8 on a 4.0 scale. The median LSAT score is 165. The law school, founded in 1872, operates under its own independent Honor Code (see Appendix A) and is attached to a large public, research I institution that is home to over 30,000 students.

This single site was selected for several reasons. While some previous studies have addressed “traditional” cheating through large multi-campus investigations (e.g., Bowers, 1964; McCabe & Trevino, 1993), this study attempted to address the “newer” phenomenon of sabotage in the academic realm. Because this study is among the first to address such behaviors, a “conservative” approach to the overall scale was taken. Instead of attempting a multi-site effort, a single institution was chosen in order to ensure quality of design. Simply, this study served as its own pilot study. Additional reasons for the selection of this site included physical proximity to the researcher, familiarity with institutional culture, and access to faculty, staff, and administration.

## Participant Selection

For the purpose of this study, no student was initially excluded from participation. This study was open to all students currently enrolled in the professional law program during the spring 2012 semester ( $N = 509$ ). While Creswell (2009) recommends random sampling, this

study employed a convenience sample. The rationale for this decision stemmed from the limited window of access granted by the institution. Given the use of Kohlberg's theory of moral development as its framework, this study operated on the assumption that students enrolled in professional degree programs operate at higher levels of moral development/post-conventional thinking than undergraduates. Specifically, those students enrolled in a professional law program are assumed to have a keenly developed sense of virtues promoted by the very profession to which they subscribe. According to the website of the American Bar Association ([www.americanbar.org](http://www.americanbar.org)), some of these virtues include liberty, justice, honor, and integrity.

#### Access

Initial efforts to gain access to the proposed research site and participants were made in July 2011. The researcher was networked by his academic advisor to a faculty member at the proposed research site. Contact was subsequently made with this faculty member in early August 2011. At the suggestion of this faculty member, the researcher then contacted the Associate Dean of Students at the proposed site, who served as the primary contact for academic services and as gatekeeper for all research projects at the proposed site.

During a preliminary meeting in August 2011 between the researcher and the Associate Dean of Students, permission to conduct this study was conditionally granted, pending review of the survey instrument by academic officials at the proposed site. At the request of the researcher, the Associate Dean agreed to send out the recruitment email for this study, which included a hyperlink to the online questionnaire, in the form of an email blast to all currently enrolled students. This decision was influenced by Lipka's (2011) comments that students tend to



participate in research efforts more often when invited by those with whom they have an established, trusting relationship. Due to the researcher's separation from the proposed participants, the request was made for the Associate Dean to send out the recruitment email on behalf of the researcher in order to generate a higher response rate. The Associate Dean agreed with the rationale behind this request.

Also during this meeting, assurances of site anonymity, protection of participants, and disclosure of research findings to both the host site and interested participants were given. The researcher conveyed his genuine interest in the educational experience of all students and assured the gatekeeper that the current study would not be harmful in any way to the integrity of the host site's reputation. Both the researcher and Associate Dean affirmed their commitment that the current study would be mutually beneficial to both parties yet would respect and guard closely the privileges entrusted to the researcher by the proposed site.

In January 2012, the researcher learned that the Associate Dean/Gatekeeper had retired from the institution. Upon meeting the new Associate Dean/Gatekeeper, the researcher again presented the study and its methods for consideration. The new Associate Dean honored all agreements made previously and further suggested collection methods for the researcher to consider. A schedule of recruitment emails was also mutually decided upon by the researcher and Associate Dean.

### Ethical Considerations

According to Creswell (2009), data collection should not "put participants at risk, and respect vulnerable populations," (p. 89). Given the sensitive nature of the information being

collected in this study, great care was taken to protect the participant confidentiality, institutional anonymity, reputation, credibility, and prestige. Participants in this study remained completely anonymous and the institution's integrity was protected through the assignment of a pseudonym. Also mentioned by Creswell (2009) is the concept of reciprocity between researcher, participants, and host site. In August 2011, this concept was discussed between the researcher and the Associate Dean of Students at the proposed site. Although no direct benefits were foreseeable to participants, the proposed benefits to the host site included furthering the mission of the flagship institution (i.e., teaching, research, and service), gaining valuable insight into the academic practices of its students, being able to address previously undefined academically deviant behavior, managing the frequency of these behaviors, and developing accountability programs to encourage success.

As this study proposed to be one of the first of its kind, those who participated would be actively participating in the improvement of the educational experience of current and future students. This study was submitted for review and approval to The University of Alabama's Institutional Review Board (IRB) on December 16, 2011. Informed consent of participants was gained through digital signature methods (i.e., having the participant accept the conditions of the informed consent letter) prior to completing the online questionnaire. This study was voluntary and participants could discontinue their involvement at any time. Results of this study were made available to the host site's academic administration and any participants who wish to view the findings. IRB approval for this study was granted on February 6, 2012.

## Instrumentation

The research instrument for this study consisted of two main components: the Attitudes on Academic Behaviors (AAB) scale (author) and Carroll's (2009) modified scale of moral disengagement. The AAB was developed to address specific behaviors and violations at the host site and added a number of behaviors that describe acts of academic sabotage. Carroll's (2009) validated scale was chosen based on its success in prior studies in measuring the moral disengagement of college-aged students.

In an attempt to limit the influence of social desirability on survey responses, the researcher elected to incorporate the use of a vignette in the research instrument. According to Hughes and Huby (2004), using vignettes in social science research allows participants to engage with the research by viewing the scenario through the characters in the vignette. This method is particularly effective when assessing behaviors like cheating, as evidenced by Miller, Shoptaugh, and Woodridge (2011) Rettinger, Jordan, and Peschiera (2004), and Rettinger and Kramer (2009).

The steps in creating the instrument were as follows:

Step 1. The researcher began by conducting an extensive review of current literature on the topics of academic integrity, workplace sabotage, and moral development. Survey items were then written to reflect themes found in the literature. The researcher developed several survey items to reflect specific behaviors that constituted violations of academic integrity as pursuant to the host site's academic honor code. Eight items directly reflect prohibited behaviors. An additional three items were added which describe behaviors *not* identified in the honor code as

violations, but were identified by current students at the proposed site as common practices that may, or may not, be considered cheating.

With no previous studies on academic sabotage available, the researcher developed survey items to address sabotage behaviors by using Giacalone and Rosenfeld's (1987) list of workplace sabotage behaviors. Nine survey items reflect these behaviors. Examples of the adaptations of Giacalone and Rosenfeld's (1987) list are sabotage by hiding materials, sabotage by defacing materials, sabotage by theft of materials, and sabotage by tampering with technological devices. For a complete listing of these survey items, see Appendix B. The combination of items describing violations of academic integrity pursuant to the host site's honor code and items describing academic sabotage were then named the "Attitudes on Academic Behaviors" scale.

Carroll's (2009) scale of moral disengagement was included based on its previous use in educational specific contexts. Thirty-two (q2, q3, q4, q5, q6, q7, q8, q9, q10, q12, q13, q14, q15, q16, q17, q18, q19, q20, q21, q22, q23, q24, q25, q26, q27, q28, q29, q30, q31, q32, q33) items were included in this survey to measure moral disengagement. When scored, these items provided data on the eight mechanisms of moral disengagement as described by Bandura (2002).

The researcher developed the sabotage vignette using actual information as described by "Patrick", who provided the first narrative of academic sabotage in this study. The use of "Patrick's" experience was done intentionally. According to Rahman (1996), using actual situations to depict vignette scenarios enhances the ability of the instrument to perform. Additionally, use of vignettes in social science research has been shown to discourage survey fatigue in participants (Hughes & Huby, 2004).

Finally, questions relating to participant demographics (q96, q97, q98) were included. These items reflect participant age, gender, and year in school. In total, the research instrument for this study consists of 98 items. For a complete listing of all items is presented in Appendix B.

After completing the initial form of the instrument, the researcher consulted personal acquaintances who were engaged in the practice of law as a profession. The research questionnaire was confirmed by this panel of experts to reflect the academic and social culture(s) of competitive professional education programs such as law. This panel also noted that the ordering of questions was appropriate. One attorney remarked “Reading this brought back some bad memories from law school. . . . I hope they have it better now than when we had it.”

Step 2. A completed instrument was piloted using current law students from the proposed site. Participants were asked to complete the questionnaire in a timed environment and to provide feedback on any items that were vague or provided substantial difficulties in completing. The average time to complete the questionnaire was approximately 22 minutes, which fell into the researcher’s goal timeframe of 25 to 30 minutes.

Step 3. At the request of the Associate Dean of Students/Gatekeeper, the researcher provided a copy of the research instrument for critique. The Associate Dean reaffirmed his support for the current study and confirmed the truthfulness of the instrument. Additionally, the Associate Dean commented, “I sure hope some of these things aren’t true for our students.” At this time, the researcher also submitted the recruitment email and letter of consent to the Associate Dean.

Step 4. The research instrument was converted into its online form using the online software program SurveyMonkey. To test the accessibility of the instrument (specifically the hyperlink included in the recruitment email), the researcher sent sample recruitment emails to the same panel of experts who reviewed the initial instrument. After receiving affirmative responses confirming the online presence of the research questionnaire, the instrument was considered “live.” The final version of the research instrument can be found in Appendix B.

### Data Collection

Data collection for this study was done exclusively online through the use of the research portal SurveyMonkey. Invitations to participate were sent out in early February via email communication to all enrolled students during the spring 2012 semester. At the suggestion of current students, the researcher approached the president of the Student Bar Association and the president of the Honor Court to seek their endorsement for the study. This was done in an effort to establish researcher credibility and rapport. Both students enthusiastically endorsed the study. With the permission of the instructor, paper copies of the survey were also administered during three separate class sessions on March 7, 2012.

All data collected from these questionnaires were kept secure through the use of password protected database programs. Hard copies of any data were kept under lock and key in the office of the researcher. Data collection for this study began at approximately 9:30 am on Friday, February 10, 2012 and concluded at approximately 5:30 pm on Friday, March 9, 2012. A total of 223 responses were generated, with 193 being deemed usable.

## Data Analysis

The research questions for this study were analyzed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences software (SPSS) v.19. Statistical tests such as *t* tests were performed to examine differences between genders (male and female) and attitudes on academic behaviors and moral disengagement. ANOVA tests were performed to examine differences between the classifications of students (IL, IIL, and IIIL) as well as differences between age groups (number of age groups to be determined). Chi-square tests were performed to test the significance of these relationships.

The primary research focus for this study was to empirically validate the existence of acts of academic sabotage in professional education programs. Nine survey items (q29, q30, q31, q32, q33, q34, q35, q36, q37) were created in an effort to address this research question. Descriptive statistics were used to report on the responses to these items given by participants.

## Delimitations of the Study

This study employed the following boundaries:

1. This study was conducted at only one institution. This served to limit the application of potential findings to multiple institutions of varying size, scope, and geographic location.
2. The participant sample for this study was exclusively comprised of professional graduate students. The student body in this study held a composite *undergraduate* grade point average of 3.8 (on a 4.0 scale). Therefore it can be assumed that the cognitive abilities of these

students were above average. This might serve to limit the ability to generalize findings to undergraduate educational programs or to lower performing students in higher education.

3. This study was confined to only one professional graduate education program. This limited the ability to generalize the results of this study to other professional graduate education programs outside of law.

4. The research instrument was administered through an online portal, thereby limiting the control of the environment in which the questionnaire was completed.

5. Components of the research instrument were developed specifically for use at the proposed site. The Attitudes on Academic Behavior scale combined descriptions of behaviors prohibited by the proposed site's honor code as well as descriptions of acts of academic sabotage. Additionally, questionable academic practices not specified by the site's honor code were included at the suggestion of current students. These components posed a threat to the applicability of any findings produced by this study.

### Assumptions

As mentioned earlier, this study operated on the basic assumption that students in professional education programs function in the more advanced stages of Kohlberg's model of moral development based on their age and experience. In addition to this, another assumption of this study was that students in professional law programs have a keenly developed sense of the guiding principles of the profession for which they are pursuing. These two assumptions combined to provide the third assumption for this study, which was that all student participants answered the online questionnaire honestly and thereby provided useful data to the researcher.



The researcher also assumed that each participant completed the questionnaire independently and without any forms of assistance or collusion.

### Summary

This chapter has reviewed the research questions, overall approach, site selection, participant selection, access, ethical considerations, measures, data collection procedures, data analysis techniques, instrumentation, delimitations, and assumptions of this study. This study was conducted at a single site and invited all enrolled students to participate. The host site's Associate Dean of Students granted access to this site and its students in August 2011.

Quantitative data were collected through the use of online questionnaires and measured student attitudes toward integrity in their program, student attitudes on academic behaviors in their program, and moral disengagement as related to academic integrity. SPSS was used to test the relationships between these measures and the variables of age, gender, and year in school. The delimitations of this study mainly focused on its use of only one research site and included constraints of generalizing findings to the undergraduate education experience, academically challenged students, multiple similar institutions, and the application of findings in non-academic integrity contexts. Use of this single site and professional education program also informed the assumptions for this study, which included higher developed cognitive abilities of participants, a keenly developed sense of the ethics of their future profession, and that all students participated in this study in an open and honest manner.

## CHAPTER 4

### RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to examine factors that contribute to attitudes and opinions toward academic integrity, academic cheating, and academic sabotage. Previous studies have suggested strong relationships between gender, academic classification, and attitudes toward cheating (Kisamore, Stone, & Jawahar, 2007; Vandehey, Diekhoff, & LaBeff, 2007; Whitley, 1998). While multiple studies have addressed academic cheating, as a phenomenon in higher education, academic sabotage has been largely ignored in the literature. Therefore, this study was largely exploratory in nature. The following chapter presents findings from this study.

In order to present the findings in a logical manner, each scale from the research instrument receives individual treatment in this chapter. The organization of this chapter is as follows (a) frequencies of demographics, (b) sabotage vignette analyses, (c) sabotage items analyses, (d) non-sabotage behaviors/academic moral disengagement analyses, (e) honor code items analyses, (f) moral disengagement items analyses, and (g) exploratory factor analysis. Finally, each research question posed by this study is discussed directly, using the findings produced through the multiple analyses.

#### Frequencies of Demographics

Of the 509 total students enrolled at the host site during the Spring 2012 term, 223 participated in this study. After a thorough cleaning of the data, however, 30 surveys were

removed due to missing items or lack of consent. The researcher kept 193 surveys, which were deemed as usable. Therefore, the final return rate for this study was approximately 38% (193/509).

In this study there were 102 males (52.8%) and 91 females (48.2%). Of the 509 total students enrolled during the Spring 2012 term, 293 (57.5%) were males and 216 were females (42.5%). Therefore, approximately 35% (102/293) of the male student population participated in this study and approximately 42% (91/216) of the female student population participated. The distribution between male and female participants (52.8% vs. 48.2%) satisfied the researcher's desire to have a roughly equal representation from both genders. These findings are represented in Table 1.

Table 1

*Gender Distribution of Participants*

Gender	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
Male	102	52.8	52.8
Female	91	47.2	100.0

*Note.*  $N = 193$ ,  $M = 1.47$ ,  $SD = .50$

Of the 193 participants in this study, 47 (24.4%) were first year students (1L), 76 (39.4%) participants were second year students (2L), and 70 (36.3%) participants were third year students (3L). In relation to the total number of enrolled students, per academic classification, for the Spring 2012 term, the percentages of participants were roughly 29% of the 1L Class (47/163), 46% of the 2L Class (76/167), and 39% of the 3L Class (70/179). These percentages met the

researcher's desire to have at least 25% of each academic classification participate in this study.

These findings are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

*Distribution of Participant Academic Classification*

Class	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
1L	47	24.4	24.4
2L	76	39.4	63.7
3L	70	36.3	100.0

*Note.*  $N = 193$ ,  $M = 2.12$ ,  $SD = .77$

The age range for participants in this study was from 21 to 43. Three age groups were then created: (a) 21-23, (b) 24-26, and (c) 27 and above. In this study, 56 participants were between the ages of 21-23 (29%), 103 were between the ages of 24-26 (53.4%), and 34 participants were 27 years of age or older (17.6%). These findings support the researcher's assumption that given the academic level of the professional education program most participants would be traditional aged graduate/professional students (those who are 24-26 years of age). These findings are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

*Distribution of Participant Age Groups*

Age Group	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
21-23	56	29.0	29.0
24-26	103	53.4	82.4
27 and above	34	17.6	100.0

*Note.*  $N = 193$ ,  $M = 1.89$ ,  $SD = .67$

### *Sabotage Vignette*

Table 4 presents the means and standard deviations for all responses to the items from the “Austin and Patrick” sabotage vignette. Table 5 presents the results of the *t* test for gender, while Tables 6 and 7 present ANOVA data for academic classification and age categories, respectively.

Table 4

#### *Sabotage Vignette Means and Standard Deviations*

Item	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
How serious is Patrick’s action?	2.67	0.87
In your experience, is Patrick’s action a commonplace practice?	1.08	0.31
Is this an incident that you would report to the honor court?	1.68	0.46
Who is to blame in this situation?	1.77	0.58

*Note.* *N* = 193

The vignette used in this study described a student, Patrick, who purposely passes off chapter outlines that contain erroneous and irrelevant information to fellow classmates in an attempt to thwart their academic efforts. Participants were asked to rate the seriousness of Patrick’s behavior on a 4-point scale (1 = *Not serious*, 2 = *Somewhat serious*, 3 = *Serious*, 4 = *Very serious*), if Patrick’s actions were common (1 = *Not common*, 2 = *Somewhat common*, 3 = *Common*, 4 = *Very common*), if the participant would report these actions (1 = *Yes*, 2 = *No*), and who was to blame in this scenario (1 = *Austin and the group*, 2 = *Patrick*, 3 = *No one is to blame*).

Based on the responses provided by participants in this study, this type of behavior was not common at the research site (*N* = 193, *M* = 1.08, *SD* = .31) and would most likely go unreported (*N* = 193, *M* = 1.68, *SD* = .46). These findings were both reported using the mode of

responses for each survey item, with threshold levels being two and one respectively. Despite these findings, participants did rate the offense as *Serious* ( $N = 193$ ,  $M = 2.67$ ,  $SD = .87$ ) and overwhelmingly assigned blame to Patrick for the offense (60.6%). The contrast between participants rating the offense as *Serious*, but responding that the offense would not be reported to the honor court (or proper academic authorities) raises possible questions about how can students cognitively process acts of sabotage if the acts themselves are not occurring in a student's immediate circle. These findings do not provide support for the researcher's hypothesis that this specific type of academic sabotage existed at the host site.

Table 5

*Sabotage Vignette T test for Gender*

Item	Male		Female		<i>t</i> test	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>
Serious	2.68	0.85	2.67	0.90	191	0.04
Common	1.10	0.33	1.07	0.29	191	0.71
Report	1.73	0.44	1.64	0.44	191	1.31
Blame	1.77	0.52	1.77	0.65	191	0.06

*Note.*  $N = 193$

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

As indicated by Table 5, there were no significant differences found between the genders and responses to the sabotage vignette in this study. This finding was particularly interesting, as it failed to provide support for prior academic integrity research that has found differences between genders in reporting cheating and ranking the seriousness of cheating offenses (Brimble & Stevenson-Clarke, 2005; Chapman et al., 2004; Hendershott, Drinan, & Cross, 1999).

Table 6

*Demographics for Academic Classification, Means and Standard Deviations, Sabotage Vignette*

Item	1L		2L		3L	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Serious	2.79	0.88	2.51	0.84	2.77	0.90
Common	1.11	0.37	1.07	0.29	1.09	0.28
Report	1.55	0.50	1.76	0.42	1.69	0.46
Blame	1.62	0.53	1.88	0.65	1.76	0.52

*Note.* N = 193, 1L (47), 2L (76), 3L (70)

The results of an ANOVA test for academic classifications are presented in Table 7.

These results have been separated for easier navigation.

Table 7

*ANOVA Results for Academic Classification, Sabotage Vignette*

Item	ANOVA	
	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>
Blame	2	3.05*
Report	2	3.00
How serious	2	2.11
Common	2	0.24

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

A one-way ANOVA test produced one significant finding between academic classification and the sabotage vignette in this study. When comparing means values, second year students were significantly higher than first and third year students when assigning blame,  $F(2, 190) = 3.05, p = .04$ .

Table 8

*Demographics for Age Groups, Means and Standard Deviations, Sabotage Vignette*

Item	21-23		24-26		27 and above	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
How serious	2.79	0.84	2.58	0.85	2.76	0.98
Common	1.14	0.44	1.07	0.25	1.03	0.17
Report	1.63	0.48	1.71	0.45	1.71	0.46
Blame	1.77	0.53	1.78	0.60	1.76	0.60

*Note.* N = 193, 21-23 (56), 24-26 (103), 27 and above (34)

As indicated by Table 8, there were no significant differences found between the age groups and the items in the academic sabotage vignette. Table 9 presents the results of the ANOVA test.

Table 9

*ANOVA Results for Age Group, Sabotage Vignette*

Item	ANOVA	
	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>
Common	2	1.66
How serious	2	1.19
Report	2	0.62
Blame	2	0.00

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

Responses were fairly uniform and fail to complement the fourth researcher question in this study, which hypothesizes that a student's age would relate to attitudes toward academic



sabotage, as described in the vignette. Specifically, these findings failed to support Kohlberg's (1976) notion that moral development is tied to age and experience.

### *Sabotage Items*

Table 10 presents the means and standard deviations for all responses to the items from the sabotage behaviors and their perceived seriousness according to participants. Participants were asked if they knew anyone personally who had committed any of the behaviors (1 = *Yes, more than once*, 2 = *Yes, once*, 3 = *No, never*) and how serious they deemed the offense (1 = *Very serious*, 2 = *Serious*, 3 = *Somewhat serious*, 4 = *Not serious*). Table 11 presents the results of the *t* test for gender, while Tables 12 and 13 present ANOVA data for academic classification and age categories, respectively.

Table 10

### *Academic Sabotage Items, Occurrence, and Seriousness Means and Standard Deviations*

Item	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Defacing materials	2.99	0.10
Tampering	2.99	0.10
Seriousness	1.30	0.60
Stealing/Theft	2.96	0.23
Seriousness	1.22	0.49
Mutilating materials	2.95	0.21
Seriousness	1.29	0.52
Pass off	2.93	0.33
Seriousness	1.93	0.89
Mishandle	2.87	0.43
Seriousness	1.61	0.73

(table continues)

Item	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Hiding Materials	2.83	0.51
Seriousness	1.60	0.70
Withholding	2.01	0.93
Seriousness	3.15	1.07
Unwillingness	1.44	0.77
Seriousness	3.75	0.63

*Note.* N = 193; Defacing materials has no seriousness category

Nine items (q75, q77, q79, q81, q83, q85, q87, q88, q90) were developed specifically for use in this study. These items, all which describe behaviors that constitute academic sabotage as defined by the researcher, were developed by building on prior work by Giacalone and Rosenfeld (1987) that detailed common acts of sabotage in the workplace. Each sabotage item began with the phrase, “I know of students who...” and was then followed by a description of a specific behavior. Response sets for these questions were on a 3-point scale (1 = *Yes, more than once*; 2 = *Yes, once*; 3 = *No, never*). Participants then were asked to rate the seriousness of the offense on a 4-point scale (1 = *Very Serious*, 2 = *Serious*, 3 = *Somewhat Serious*, 4 = *Not Serious*).

Similar to the findings produced by the vignette section, academic sabotage appeared to not exist at the host site. Also similar to the responses generated by the vignette section, students appeared to rank most sabotage behaviors as *Very Serious*. Two interesting exceptions though are the findings from items 75 and 90. Participants’ responses to item 75, “I know of students who purposely withhold information (i.e., notes, outlines, case briefs) from other students,” were fairly evenly distributed between *Yes, more than once* and *No, never* (N = 193, *M* = 2.01, *SD* =

.89). Over half of the respondents rated this action as *Not serious* ( $N = 193$ ,  $M = 3.15$ ,  $SD = 1.07$ ). The responses from item 90, “I know of students who are unwilling to share their academic materials or resources with other students,” were similar, with participants answering *Yes, more than once* ( $N = 193$ ,  $M = 1.44$ ,  $SD = .77$ ), yet participants ranked the offense as *Not Serious* ( $N = 193$ ,  $M = 3.75$ ,  $SD = .63$ ). The data seem to suggest that students are most accepting of “passive aggressive” sabotage, such as withholding academic materials or being unwilling to share materials, yet are firmly against “aggressive” sabotage actions such as tampering with electronic devices, destroying or defacing academic materials, or theft of personal property such as notebooks. This finding is discussed in Chapter 5 as well.

Table 11

*Sabotage Items T test for Gender*

Item	Male		Female		<i>t</i> test	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>
Mishandle	2.89	0.42	2.85	0.44	191	0.73
Seriousness	1.77	0.78	1.42	0.63	191	3.45***
Pass off	2.95	0.29	2.9	0.36	191	1.04
Seriousness	2.12	0.91	1.71	0.82	191	3.20*
Tampering	2.99	0.09	2.99	0.10	191	0.08
Seriousness	1.44	0.73	1.13	0.34	191	3.66***
Stealing/Theft	2.96	0.24	2.97	0.23	191	-0.18
Seriousness	1.29	0.59	1.13	0.34	191	2.30*
Withholding	1.95	0.94	2.07	0.92	191	-0.84
Seriousness	3.36	0.93	2.9	1.17	191	3.04
Mutilating materials	2.96	0.19	2.95	0.22	191	0.51
Seriousness	1.31	0.56	1.26	0.49	191	0.65
Defacing materials	3.00	0.00	2.98	0.14	191	1.50
Hiding Materials	2.91	0.37	2.75	0.62	191	2.24*
Seriousness	1.71	0.75	1.47	0.63	191	2.30*
Unwillingness	1.43	0.77	1.45	0.77	191	-0.17
Seriousness	3.78	0.55	3.71	0.79	191	0.76

*Note.*  $N = 193$ , Male (101), Female (91)

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

As indicated in Table 11, there was only one statistical difference between gender and items describing actual acts of academic sabotage, item 88,  $t(191) = 2.24, p = .026$ . This finding suggests that females know of more students who hide materials, such as textbooks and study guides, from other students. In relation to assigning seriousness to potential actions, females tend to rate offenses as more serious than their male counterparts ( $p < .05$  for six items).

Table 12

*Means and Standard Deviations for Academic Classification, Sabotage Items*

Item	1L		2L		3L	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Mishandle	2.96	0.29	2.89	0.38	2.79	0.53
Seriousness	1.68	0.78	1.5	0.70	1.67	0.73
Pass off	2.96	0.29	2.92	0.31	2.91	0.37
Seriousness	1.94	0.79	1.93	0.97	1.91	0.88
Tampering	2.98	0.14	2.99	0.11	3.00	0.00
Seriousness	1.40	0.79	1.26	0.59	1.26	0.44
Stealing/Theft	2.96	0.29	2.95	0.27	2.99	0.12
Seriousness	1.23	0.56	1.22	0.53	0.12	0.40
Withholding	2.28	0.90	1.95	0.96	1.89	0.91
Seriousness	2.91	0.99	3.12	1.13	3.33	1.04
Mutilating materials	2.96	0.20	2.96	0.19	2.94	0.23
Seriousness	1.23	0.42	1.28	0.53	1.34	0.58
Defacing materials	2.98	0.14	2.99	0.11	3.00	0.00
Hiding Materials	2.94	0.32	2.84	0.51	2.76	0.60
Seriousness	1.60	0.74	1.54	0.70	1.66	0.70
Unwillingness	1.74	0.94	1.38	0.73	1.30	0.64
Seriousness	3.57	0.85	3.79	0.54	3.83	0.53

*Note.* N = 193, 1L (47), 2L (76), 3L (70)

The data produced by this analysis varies little in terms of mean responses. Participants in all three academic classes reported that they, for the most part, do not know anyone personally

who engages in any of the named sabotage behaviors. The exceptions to this, however, show that students know more of other students who are unwilling to share materials or withhold materials from others. The results of an ANOVA test for academic classifications and sabotage items are presented in Table 13. These results have been separated from the means and standard deviations of the academic classes for easier navigation.

Table 13

*ANOVA Results for Academic Classification, Sabotage Items*

Item	ANOVA	
	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>
Unwillingness	2	5.19***
Withholding	2	2.72
Seriousness	2	2.49
Mishandle	2	2.46
Seriousness	2	2.14
Hiding Materials	2	1.73
Seriousness	2	1.31
Seriousness	2	1.01
Tampering	2	0.66
Defacing materials	2	0.66
Seriousness	2	0.63
Stealing/Theft	2	0.49
Seriousness	2	0.49
Pass off	2	0.26
Mutilating materials	2	0.13
Seriousness	2	0.07
Seriousness	2	0.01

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

When participants were split out by academic classification, responses were fairly uniform to the items related to acts of academic sabotage. A Tukey HSD post-hoc test found

students tended to rate “aggressive” acts of sabotage, such as theft, tampering with devices, defacing or mutilating materials, and hiding materials, as more serious than “passive” acts, such as mishandling materials, passing off incorrect or incomplete work, withholding materials, or being unwilling to share materials. The only statistically significant finding produced by this test suggests that 3L students are more aware of, or know more, students who are unwilling to share academic materials or resources with other students,  $F(2, 109) = 5.19, p = .00$ .

This information again fails to confirm the researcher’s notion that acts of academic sabotage are a part of the prevailing academic culture at the host site. It is important to note, however, that while these acts seemingly did not exist at the host site, the students still rated them as generally serious offenses. This finding is discussed in Chapter 5.

Table 14

*Age Categories Means and Standard Deviations for Sabotage Items*

Item	21-23		24-26		27 and above	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Mishandle	2.91	0.34	2.83	0.48	2.91	0.37
Seriousness	1.66	0.74	1.57	0.68	1.62	0.88
Pass off	2.91	0.34	2.91	0.37	3.00	0.00
Seriousness	1.75	0.79	2.00	0.92	2.00	0.92
Tampering	3.00	0.00	2.98	0.13	3.00	0.00
Seriousness	1.30	0.71	1.30	0.59	1.26	0.44
Stealing/Theft	2.95	0.29	2.96	0.23	3.00	0.00
Seriousness	1.27	0.61	1.20	0.45	1.18	0.38
Withholding	2.32	0.87	1.81	0.91	2.09	0.96
Seriousness	2.82	1.09	3.30	1.00	3.21	1.14
Mutilating materials	2.95	0.22	2.97	0.16	2.91	0.28
Seriousness	1.30	0.53	1.29	0.53	1.26	0.51
Defacing materials	2.96	0.18	3.00	0.00	3.00	0.00
Hiding Materials	2.89	0.41	2.82	0.53	2.79	0.59
Seriousness	1.66	0.74	1.55	0.68	1.62	0.73
Unwillingness	1.68	0.89	1.30	0.65	1.47	0.82
Seriousness	3.52	0.89	3.86	0.42	3.79	0.59

*Note.* N = 193, 21-23 (56), 24-26 (103), 27 and above (34)

Similar to the data produced by this same analysis on academic classification, these results offer little variation in terms of mean responses. Participants in all three age categories report that they, by and large, do not know anyone personally who engages in any of the named sabotage behaviors. Again, the exceptions to this show that students in all three age categories more often know of other students who are unwilling to share materials or who withhold materials from others. There was also very little variation in how participants in all three age categories rated the seriousness of each sabotage offense, with most offenses leaning heavily toward the *Very Serious* rating. The results of an ANOVA test for age categories and sabotage items are presented in Table 15. These results have been separated from the means and standard deviations of the age categories for easier navigation.

Table 15

*ANOVA Results for Age Categories, Sabotage Items*

Item	ANOVA	
	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>
Withholding	2	5.93**
Seriousness	2	3.78*
Unwillingness	2	4.48*
Seriousness	2	5.70***
Defacing materials	2	2.49
Mutilating materials	2	1.04
Seriousness	2	0.05
Pass off	2	0.99
Seriousness	2	1.56
Tampering	2	0.87
Seriousness	2	0.05
Mishandle	2	0.74
Seriousness	2	0.26
Stealing/Theft	2	0.55
Seriousness	2	0.44
Hiding Materials	2	0.53
Seriousness	2	0.43

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

*Note.* Defacing materials has no seriousness category

A Tukey HSD post-hoc test on the age categories produced four statistically significant findings. These findings can be grouped together, because the item and corresponding rating of seriousness were both significant. The first items were 83 and 84 (knowing students who purposely withhold information and corresponding seriousness). Participants in the 24-26 years of age category know more students who withhold information,  $F(2, 190) = 5.93, p = .00$ , and rate the offense as less serious than participants in the other two age categories,  $F(2, 190) = 3.78, p = .025$ . This finding could be a result of the 24-26 years of age category containing more than 50% of the total sample for this study (103 out of 193).

The second set of items was 90 and 91, which asked participants if they knew of students who were unwilling to share academic materials or resources, and to rate the seriousness of such an action. Again, students in the 24-26 years of age category responded that they knew more students who were unwilling to share materials than students in the other two age categories,  $F(2, 190) = 4.48, p = .012$ . Respondents in this category also leaned heavily toward the *Not Serious* ranking ( $M = 3.86$ ),  $F(2, 190) = 5.70, p = .00$ .

These findings fail to provide support for the third research question in this study which posits that older students, given their age and experience, would rate acts of sabotage as more serious than younger students. This notion was based on the assumption that as students age and mature their view toward morally reprehensible behaviors would become more developed to include the concepts of justice and social responsibility. Data produced by these tests failed to support this notion.



### *Non-sabotage Behaviors/Academic Moral Disengagement*

Fifteen items in the questionnaire (q38, q39, q40, q41, q42, q43, q44, q45, q46, q47, q48, q49, q50, q51, q52) were developed to assess attitudes toward academic integrity and the honor code (HC) at the host site. Eight of these items (q45, q46, q47, q48, q49, q50, q51, q52) were developed using Bandura's (2002) eight mechanisms of moral disengagement and were exploratory in nature. The other seven items (q38, q39, q40, q41, q42, q43, q44) were developed to gauge student sentiment towards the honor code and academic integrity in general. Table 16 presents the means and standard deviations for all responses to the items related to the HC and disengagement exploratory items. Table 17 presents the results of *t* test for gender, while Tables 18 and 19 present ANOVA data for academic classification and age categories, respectively. All response sets were on a 5-point scale (1 = *Strongly Disagree*, 2 = *Disagree*, 3 = *Neutral*, 4 = *Agree*, 5 = *Strongly Agree*).

Table 16

#### *Non-sabotage Behaviors/Academic Moral Disengagement Means and Standard Deviations*

Item	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Value HC	4.31	0.88
Faculty enforce HC	3.93	0.89
Students enforce HC	3.68	0.91
Classmates as competition	3.42	1.30
Definitions easy and clear	3.37	0.90
Honor court is effective	3.36	0.67
Ways of getting around HC	3.06	0.92
Using outlines vs. plagiarizing	2.90	0.99
Professor's responsibility	2.48	0.93
HC is symbolic	2.39	1.00
No one ever gets caught	1.67	0.76
Cheating because of competition	1.46	0.71
Cheating because program is hard	1.35	0.60
Cheating is learning	1.31	0.59
Cheating for rank	1.27	0.57

*Note.* N = 193

Overall, participants in this study seemed to highly value the HC at the host site ( $N = 193$ ,  $M = 4.31$ ,  $SD = .88$ ), and feel that both the faculty ( $N = 193$ ,  $M = 3.93$ ,  $SD = .89$ ) and students ( $N = 193$ ,  $M = 3.68$ ,  $SD = .91$ ) enforce the standards set forth by the HC. This positive sentiment is somewhat challenged, though, by responses that indicate a lack of clear definitions of behaviors in the HC ( $N = 193$ ,  $M = 3.37$ ,  $SD = .90$ ), confidence in the honor court at adjudicating cases ( $N = 193$ ,  $M = 3.36$ ,  $SD = .67$ ), and that there are ways of getting around the HC if students so choose ( $N = 193$ ,  $M = 3.06$ ,  $SD = .92$ ).

The eight items based on Bandura's (2002) work offer possible encouragement to academic officials at the host site. Overall, students disagree that cheating would be justified if it helped with academic rank ( $N = 193$ ,  $M = 1.27$ ,  $SD = .57$ ), that cheating is another way of learning ( $N = 193$ ,  $M = 1.31$ ,  $SD = .59$ ), and that cheating is justified because the program is too hard ( $N = 193$ ,  $M = 1.35$ ,  $SD = .60$ ). As expected, students tend to see their classmates as competition ( $N = 193$ ,  $M = 3.42$ ,  $SD = 1.30$ ).

Table 17

*Non-academic Sabotage Behaviors/Academic Moral Disengagement T test for Gender*

Item	Male		Female		<i>t</i> test	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>
Value HC	4.13	0.95	4.51	0.75	191	-3.04**
Faculty enforce HC	3.84	0.87	4.03	0.88	191	-1.48
Students enforce HC	3.55	0.90	3.82	0.90	191	-2.10**
HC is symbolic	2.56	1.07	2.20	0.88	191	2.52
Definitions easy and clear	3.31	0.90	3.44	0.90	191	-0.96
Honor court is effective	3.29	0.66	3.44	0.68	191	-1.48
Ways of getting around HC	3.19	0.90	2.91	0.91	191	2.08**

(table continues)

Item	Male		Female		<i>t</i> test	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>
Cheating for rank	1.35	0.63	1.18	0.41	191	2.14**
Cheating is learning	3.15	0.92	2.63	0.99	191	2.89**
Using outlines vs. plagiarizing	3.15	0.92	2.63	0.99	191	3.76***
Professor's responsibility	2.55	0.94	2.40	0.93	191	1.13
Cheating because of competition	1.54	0.76	1.36	0.64	191	1.72
No one ever gets caught	1.83	0.80	1.49	0.67	191	3.14**
Classmates as competition	3.41	1.28	3.43	1.32	191	-0.08
Cheating because program is hard	1.36	0.64	1.34	0.56	191	0.25

*Note.* N = 193, Male (101), Female (91)

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

The results of this  $t$  test support the second research question in this study, which asked if there were differences between genders in measures of moral disengagement and attitudes that justify acts of academic sabotage. These findings also support the researcher's assumption that females in this study would behave in a manner supported by prior research, that is, females would have less tolerant attitudes toward cheating than males. Females in this study value the institutional HC more than males  $t(191) = -3.04, p = .00$ , and feel that students enforce the HC  $t(191) = -2.108, p = .036$ .

Females in this study also demonstrated a stronger sense of moral connection to violations of academic integrity. Males tended to remain neutral on some items, such as "Cheating is just another way of learning"  $t(191) = 2.89, p = .004$ , and on justifying one act of academically deviant behavior over another (using others' outlines compared to plagiarizing),  $t(191) = 3.15, p = .00$ . In relation to these items, the females in this study tended to disagree with the justifications.

The items in this scale were largely exploratory, yet yielded interesting results. Although the items based on Bandura's (2002) work lacked validation, the findings do suggest that there are differences between genders when it comes to academic moral disengagement. This finding is discussed further in Chapter 5.

Table 18

*Non-sabotage Behaviors/Academic Moral Disengagement by Academic Classification, Means and Standard Deviations*

Item	1L		2L		3L	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Value HC	4.43	0.80	4.16	0.98	4.39	0.80
Faculty enforce HC	4.11	0.69	3.89	0.90	3.86	0.98
Students enforce HC	3.70	0.83	3.57	0.85	3.79	1.02
HC is symbolic	2.28	0.94	2.43	0.95	2.41	1.09
Definitions easy and clear	3.64	0.81	3.39	0.85	3.17	0.97
Honor court is effective	3.55	0.71	3.25	0.61	3.36	0.70
Ways of getting around HC	2.94	0.94	3.01	0.80	3.19	1.01
Cheating for rank	1.30	0.58	1.26	0.55	1.26	0.60
Cheating is learning	1.36	0.67	1.34	0.60	1.23	0.54
Using outlines vs. plagiarizing	2.81	0.94	2.92	0.99	2.94	1.03
Professor's responsibility	2.21	0.83	2.59	0.98	2.53	0.92
Cheating because of competition	1.32	0.51	1.53	0.77	1.47	0.75
No one ever gets caught	1.64	0.73	1.68	0.73	1.69	0.82
Classmates as competition	3.64	1.07	3.22	1.33	3.49	1.39
Cheating because program is hard	1.36	0.52	1.42	0.65	1.27	0.58

*Note.* N = 193, 1L (47), 2L (76), 3L (70)

Only one statistically significant item was produced by an ANOVA test run on the three academic classifications. The results of an ANOVA test for academic classifications are presented in Table 19. These results have been separated for easier navigation.

Table 19

*ANOVA Results for Academic Classifications, Non-sabotage Behaviors/Academic Moral Disengagement Items*

Item	ANOVA	
	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>
Definitions easy and clear	2	3.89*
Honor court is effective	2	2.95
Professor's responsibility	2	2.59
Value HC	2	1.80
Classmates as competition	2	1.62
Cheating because of competition	2	1.25
Faculty enforce HC	2	1.21
Ways of getting around HC	2	1.18
Cheating because program is hard	2	1.12
Students enforce HC	2	1.07
Cheating is learning	2	0.92
HC is symbolic	2	0.39
Using outlines vs. plagiarizing	2	0.28
Cheating for rank	2	0.07
No one ever gets caught	2	0.06

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

A Tukey HSD post-hoc test found that first year students tended to agree more strongly that definitions of HC violations were clearly written and easy to understand,  $F(2, 190) = 3.89$ ,  $p = .02$ . This was an unexpected finding for the researcher. Despite this one significant finding, the responses generated by the three academic classifications displayed little variety.

Table 20

*Non-sabotage Behaviors/Academic Moral Disengagement Items by Academic Classification, Means and Standard Deviations*

Item	21-23		24-26		27 and above	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Value HC	4.32	0.85	4.24	0.89	4.47	0.89
Faculty enforce HC	4.11	0.70	3.91	0.89	3.71	1.08
Students enforce HC	3.64	0.92	3.79	0.87	3.41	0.91
HC is symbolic	2.34	0.99	2.38	0.97	2.50	1.13
Definitions easy and clear	3.55	0.76	3.35	0.92	3.15	1.01
Honor court is effective	3.54	0.68	3.32	0.63	3.21	0.77
Ways of getting around	2.93	0.97	3.08	0.92	3.21	0.80
Cheating for rank	1.38	0.64	1.23	0.56	1.21	0.47
Cheating is learning	1.41	0.65	1.28	0.58	1.21	0.53
Outlines vs. plagiarizing	2.96	1.04	2.83	0.99	3.00	0.92
Professor's responsibility	2.41	0.86	2.55	0.93	2.35	1.04
Cheating b/c competition	1.46	0.71	1.50	0.71	1.32	0.72
No one ever gets caught	1.64	0.74	1.71	0.72	1.62	0.92
Classmates as competition	3.39	1.23	3.55	1.26	3.06	1.47
Cheating b/c program is hard	1.43	0.56	1.33	0.60	1.29	0.67

*Note.* N = 193, 21-23 (56), 24-26 (103), 27 and above (34)

A Tukey HSD post-hoc test found no statistically significant items between age categories and the non-sabotage behaviors/academic moral disengagement items. One item ("The Honor Court is effective") approached significance, but still fell short,  $F(2, 190) = 2.98$ ,  $p = .053$ . The results of this ANOVA test offer encouragement to the apparent levels of moral engagement displayed by students of all ages. Table 21 presents the results of the ANOVA test for age categories.

Table 21

*ANOVA for Age Categories, Non-sabotage Behaviors/Academic Moral Disengagement Items*

Item	ANOVA	
	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>
Honor court is effective	2	2.98
Students enforce HC	2	2.24
Faculty enforce HC	2	2.23
Definitions easy and clear	2	2.23
Classmates as competition	2	1.88
Cheating is learning	2	1.42
Cheating for rank	2	1.35
Ways of getting around	2	1.01
Value HC	2	0.86
Professor's responsibility	2	0.78
Cheating b/c competition	2	0.74
Cheating b/c program is hard	2	0.67
Outlines vs. plagiarizing	2	0.50
HC is symbolic	2	0.27
No one ever gets caught	2	0.24

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

### *Honor Code Items*

Nine items in this survey (q53, q55, q57, q59, q65, q67, q69, q71, q73) were developed using descriptions of prohibited behaviors, as defined by the host site's Academic Honor Code (HC). Using a 3-point scale (1 = *Yes, more than once*, 2 = *Yes, once*, 3 = *No, never*), participants were asked to report if they knew anyone personally who had engaged in the specific behaviors. Each of these items was accompanied by a follow-up question asking the participant to rate the seriousness of the action using a 4-point scale (1 = *Very Serious*, 2 = *Serious*, 3 = *Somewhat Serious*, 4 = *Not Serious*). Two items (q61, q63) were developed using input from current students. The behaviors listed in items 61 and 63 are not explicitly prohibited in the HC, yet

according to current students, are common practices that could potentially constitute dishonest academic behaviors. According to data generated by this study, actions such as plagiarizing ( $M = 1.36$ ,  $SD = .64$ ), giving or receiving information during an exam ( $M = 1.39$ ,  $SD = .71$ ), and using materials specifically prohibited for use by students ( $M = 1.46$ ,  $SD = .72$ ) are considered more serious than actions such as using commercial outlines ( $M = 3.79$ ,  $SD = .59$ ), using a test file or outline bank ( $M = 3.51$ ,  $SD = .86$ ), or recycling materials for multiple assignments ( $M = 2.35$ ,  $SD = 1.11$ ).

Table 22 displays the means and standard deviations for all responses. Table 23 breaks down the responses by gender with corresponding  $t$ -test data, while Tables 24 and 25 display similar breakdowns by academic classification and age categories with appropriate ANOVA data, respectively.

Table 22

*Honor Code Items, Means and Standard Deviations*

Item	Occurrence	
	$M$	$SD$
Given or received info	2.88	0.41
Seriousness	1.39	0.71
Unauthorized Information	2.86	0.46
Seriousness	1.52	0.79
Used excluded materials	2.80	0.55
Seriousness	1.46	0.72
Plagiarized	2.78	0.57
Seriousness	1.36	0.64
Coercive or fraudulent behavior	2.75	0.56
Seriousness	1.54	0.67
Prepared materials	2.74	0.62
Seriousness	1.77	0.99
Unauthorized materials	2.73	0.59
Seriousness	1.68	0.85

(table continues)



Item	Occurrence	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Recycled Materials	2.68	0.64
Seriousness	2.35	1.11
Know someone personally	2.53	0.72
Seriousness	2.06	0.95
Engaged in prohibited behaviors	2.31	0.85
Seriousness	1.98	0.92
Aware of violations	2.27	0.88
Seriousness	2.05	0.90
Test File/Outline Bank	1.66	0.88
Seriousness	3.51	0.86
Commercial Outlines	1.31	0.70
Seriousness	3.79	0.59

*Note.* N = 193

Two items in this scale (q61, q63) were developed using information gathered from current students at the host site. The first item describes the use of a test file or outline bank, which is common at the host site. In some cases, previous research has dubbed the practice of using test files or test banks as outside the accepted means of academic decency. At this research site, use of test files is widely known (N = 193,  $M = 1.66$ ,  $SD = .88$ ) and is not considered a serious offense (N = 193,  $M = 3.51$ ,  $SD = .86$ ). The second behavior (use of study guides or outlines produced by third party companies, aka, “commercial outlines”) is apparently widespread (N = 193,  $M = 1.31$ ,  $SD = .70$ ) and is also not considered a serious offense/practice (N = 193,  $M = 3.79$ ,  $SD = .59$ ). Neither of these behaviors is explicitly prohibited by the HC, but can appear deviant if not allowed by academic faculty.

Means of “traditional” cheating also appear to not be common practices at the host site (N = 193,  $M = 2.88$ ,  $SD = .41$ ). Similar methods, such as obtaining unauthorized information

prior to an exam ( $N = 193$ ,  $M = 2.86$ ,  $SD = .46$ ), plagiarism ( $N = 193$ ,  $M = 2.78$ ,  $SD = .57$ ), and coercive or fraudulent behavior ( $N = 193$ ,  $M = 2.75$ ,  $SD = .56$ ) appear to be less common occurrences. Further analysis is provided by Tables 23, 24, and 25, which display  $t$ -test information for gender, ANOVA for academic classifications, and ANOVA for age categories, respectively.

Table 23

*T test for Gender, HC Items*

Item	Male		Female		<i>t</i> test	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>
Unauthorized materials	2.65	0.67	2.82	0.48	191	-2.08*
Seriousness	1.82	0.87	1.52	0.80	191	2.52*
Prepared materials	2.69	0.66	2.79	0.58	191	-1.16
Seriousness	1.87	0.99	1.65	0.99	191	1.56
Recycled Materials	2.64	0.67	2.74	0.61	191	-1.06
Seriousness	2.57	1.16	2.11	1.01	191	2.90**
Unauthorized Information	2.78	0.57	2.95	0.27	191	-2.43*
Seriousness	1.72	0.89	1.31	0.60	191	3.66***
Test File/Outline Bank	1.70	0.92	1.63	0.85	191	0.54
Seriousness	3.49	0.87	3.53	0.84	191	-0.30
Commercial Outlines	1.31	0.71	1.30	0.69	191	0.16
Seriousness	3.75	0.67	3.84	0.50	191	-1.04
Given or received info	2.86	0.42	2.90	0.39	191	-0.64
Seriousness	1.54	0.80	1.22	0.55	191	3.17**
Plagiarized	2.72	0.63	2.86	0.48	191	-1.72
Seriousness	1.51	0.72	1.19	0.49	191	3.56***
Used excluded materials	2.68	0.67	2.93	0.327	191	-3.301**
Seriousness	1.58	0.76	1.33	0.651	191	2.421*
Engaged in prohibited behaviors	2.14	0.91	2.51	0.75	191	-3.04**
Seriousness	2.20	0.94	1.75	0.83	191	3.47**
Coercive or fraudulent behavior	2.71	0.63	2.80	0.47	191	-1.17
Seriousness	1.74	0.75	1.33	0.49	191	4.34***

(table continues)

Item	Male		Female		<i>t</i> test	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>
Aware of violations	2.16	0.92	2.40	0.82	191	-1.88
Seriousness	2.19	0.94	1.90	0.84	191	2.20*
Know someone personally	2.42	0.80	2.66	0.61	191	-2.28*
Seriousness	2.23	0.98	1.87	0.88	191	2.64**

*Note.* N = 193, Male (101), Female (91)

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

According to this data, male students, who represent over half (52.8%) of the participants in this study, tend to personally know more students who use unauthorized materials on exams,  $t(191) = -2.08$ ,  $p = .039$ , students who gain unauthorized information prior to an exam,  $t(191) = -2.43$ ,  $p = .01$ , students who use materials specifically excluded for use by students,  $t(191) = -3.30$ ,  $p = .00$ , students who have engaged in behaviors prohibited by the HC,  $t(191) = -3.04$ ,  $p = .00$ , and students who has violated the HC,  $t(191) = -2.28$ ,  $p = .02$ . Females in this study tended to rate offenses as more serious than their male counterparts. These findings support the second research question in this study, which asked if there were differences in gender and measures of moral disengagement and attitudes that justify acts of academic sabotage.

Table 24

*Academic Classification, HC Items, Means and Standard Deviations*

Item	1L		2L		3L	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Unauthorized materials	2.89	0.31	2.78	0.53	2.57	0.75
Seriousness	1.62	0.84	1.62	0.84	1.79	0.86
Prepared materials	2.89	0.42	2.78	0.55	2.59	0.77
Seriousness	1.74	0.98	1.67	0.92	1.89	1.07
Recycled Materials	2.64	0.70	2.68	0.61	2.71	0.64
Seriousness	2.47	1.12	2.33	1.17	2.30	1.06
Unauthorized Information	2.81	0.53	2.88	0.43	2.87	0.44
Seriousness	1.55	0.82	1.51	0.87	1.51	0.69
Test File/Outline Bank	1.87	0.96	1.58	0.86	1.61	0.83
Seriousness	3.28	0.97	3.62	0.78	3.54	0.84
Commercial Outlines	1.47	0.83	1.22	0.62	1.29	0.68
Seriousness	3.64	0.79	3.91	0.43	3.76	0.57
Given or received info	2.91	0.35	2.84	0.46	2.90	0.38
Seriousness	1.4	0.74	1.36	0.74	1.41	0.67
Plagiarized	2.81	0.53	2.75	0.61	2.80	0.55
Seriousness	1.38	0.61	1.38	0.76	1.31	0.52
Used excluded materials	2.87	0.44	2.78	0.55	2.77	0.61
Seriousness	1.49	0.65	1.46	0.79	1.44	0.69
Engaged in prohibited behaviors	2.32	0.86	2.36	0.84	2.26	0.87
Seriousness	2.13	0.96	1.99	0.87	1.89	0.94
Coercive or fraudulent behavior	2.89	0.37	2.72	0.60	2.69	0.62
Seriousness	1.6	0.74	1.57	0.66	1.49	0.65
Aware of violations	2.3	0.88	2.36	0.87	2.16	0.89
Seriousness	2.15	0.95	2.01	0.88	2.03	0.90
Know someone personally	2.49	0.74	2.58	0.71	2.51	0.73
Seriousness	2.19	0.97	2.01	0.98	2.01	0.90

*Note.* N = 193, 1L (47), 2L (76), 3L (70)

The results of an ANOVA test for academic classifications are presented in Table 25.

These results have been separated for easier navigation.

Table 25

*ANOVA Results for Academic Classification, HC Items*

Item	ANOVA	
	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>
Unauthorized materials	2	4.66*
Seriousness	2	0.86
Prepared materials	2	3.75*
Seriousness	2	0.86
Recycled Materials	2	0.19
Seriousness	2	0.34
Unauthorized Information	2	0.39
Seriousness	2	0.04
Test File/Outline Bank	2	1.76
Seriousness	2	2.41
Commercial Outlines	2	1.81
Seriousness	2	3.18*
Given or received info	2	0.57
Seriousness	2	0.13
Plagiarized	2	0.20
Seriousness	2	0.24
Used excluded materials	2	0.55
Seriousness	2	0.05
Engaged in prohibited behaviors	2	0.23
Seriousness	2	0.97
Coercive or fraudulent behavior	2	2.05
Seriousness	2	0.43
Aware of violations	2	0.94
Seriousness	2	0.36
Know someone personally	2	0.25
Seriousness	2	0.61

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

A Tukey HSD post-hoc test produced a total of three statistically significant findings.

Two of these findings related to specific behaviors while the other corresponded to the seriousness rating for a behavior that did not produce any significant findings. In this study, third

year students personally knew more students who had used unauthorized materials on exams,

$F(2, 190) = 4.66, p = .01$ . Third year students also personally knew more students who had used

“prepared” materials on exams, such as blue books or scantrons with answers already filled in,

$F(2, 190) = 3.75, p = .02$ .

Table 26

*Age Categories, HC Items, Means and Standard Deviations*

Item	21-23		24-26		27 and above	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Unauthorized materials	2.86	0.40	2.69	0.64	2.65	0.69
Seriousness	1.66	0.83	1.72	0.84	1.59	0.92
Prepared materials	2.91	0.34	2.62	0.72	2.79	0.59
Seriousness	1.70	0.91	1.86	1.04	1.59	0.95
Recycled Materials	2.55	0.73	2.74	0.59	2.74	0.61
Seriousness	2.59	1.18	2.29	1.05	2.15	1.15
Unauthorized Info	2.8	0.51	2.86	0.46	2.94	0.34
Seriousness	1.66	0.94	1.47	0.72	1.47	0.74
Test File	1.70	0.89	1.65	0.87	1.65	0.95
Seriousness	3.46	0.83	3.50	0.87	3.59	0.89
Commercial Outlines	1.32	0.71	1.32	0.71	1.24	0.65
Seriousness	3.79	0.59	3.78	0.59	3.82	0.62
Given or received info	2.86	0.44	2.88	0.40	2.91	0.37
Seriousness	1.54	0.87	1.33	0.61	1.32	0.68
Plagiarized	2.79	0.59	2.79	0.57	2.76	0.55
Seriousness	1.43	0.73	0.13	0.63	1.26	0.51
Excluded materials	2.88	0.42	2.78	0.59	2.74	0.61
Seriousness	1.52	0.71	1.38	0.61	1.62	0.98
Prohibited behaviors	2.39	0.82	2.25	0.87	2.35	0.88
Seriousness	2.07	0.95	2.00	0.92	1.79	0.84
Fraudulent behavior	2.86	0.44	2.68	0.63	2.79	0.53
Seriousness	1.64	0.72	1.53	0.63	1.41	0.70
Aware of violations	2.39	0.80	2.25	0.90	2.12	0.94
Seriousness	2.21	1.00	1.98	0.86	2.00	0.85
Know personally	2.61	0.65	2.52	0.75	2.44	0.78
Seriousness	2.27	1.08	1.97	0.91	1.97	0.79

*Note.* N = 193, 21-23 (56), 24-26 (103), 27 and above (34)

A Tukey HSD post-hoc test was run on the three different age categories and items related to the HC at the host site. This test produced only one statistically significant finding.

The results of the test are presented in Table 27.

Table 27

*ANOVA Results for Age Categories, HC Items*

Item	ANOVA	
	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>
Prepared materials	2	4.17*
Seriousness	2	1.17
Fraudulent behavior	2	1.90
Seriousness	2	1.26
Unauthorized materials	2	1.86
Seriousness	2	0.31
Recycled Materials	2	1.62
Seriousness	2	2.00
Aware of violations	2	1.06
Seriousness	2	1.27
Unauthorized Info	2	0.94
Seriousness	2	1.17
Excluded materials	2	0.83
Seriousness	2	1.65
Know personally	2	0.56
Seriousness	2	1.95
Prohibited behaviors	2	0.53
Seriousness	2	0.99
Commercial Outlines	2	0.20
Seriousness	2	0.07
Given or received info	2	0.19
Seriousness	2	1.68
Test File	2	0.05
Seriousness	2	0.21
Plagiarized	2	0.02
Seriousness	2	0.69

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

Participants in this study aged 24-26 reported that they personally knew of more students who had used “prepared” materials on exams, such as blue books or scantrons with answers already filled in,  $F(2, 190) = 4.17, p = .01$ , than the other two age categories. This finding corresponds to the finding produced by the ANOVA for academic classification that suggests that 3L students know more students who engage in this practice. By the time a traditional student reaches the final year of study, their age typically falls in the range from 24-26.

Again, the behaviors of using test files/banks and using commercial outlines were ranked by participants as the most frequent and least serious of behaviors. This complements earlier findings produced by this study that suggest acceptance of these behaviors. As mentioned earlier, these behaviors are not explicitly prohibited by the institutional HC, but might blur the line between academic integrity and academic deviance.

### *Moral Disengagement Items*

Participants in this study were asked to complete Carroll’s (2009) 32-item scale of moral disengagement. Carroll (2009) used this scale in her study that measured the impact of moral judgment and moral disengagement on rape-supportive attitudes in college males. This scale was chosen for the current study based on its prior use in measuring student moral disengagement. Participants in this study were asked to consider each behavior using a 5-point scale (1 = *Strongly Disagree*, 2 = *Disagree*, 3 = *Neutral*, 4 = *Agree*, 5 = *Strongly Agree*). Table 28 displays the means and standard deviations for all responses. Table 29 breaks down the responses by gender with corresponding *t*-test data, while Tables 30 and 31 display similar breakdowns by academic classification and age categories with appropriate ANOVA data, respectively.



Table 28

*Moral Disengagement Items, Means and Standard Deviations*

Item	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Alright to fight to protect friends	3.84	0.92
Not blaming student who suggests breaking rules	2.85	0.99
Not bad to “get high” once in awhile	2.70	1.34
Ok to treat someone badly	2.59	0.97
Joking does not really hurt	2.55	0.94
Telling small lies	2.41	0.87
Alright to lie to keep friends out of trouble	2.33	0.79
Insults do not hurt friends	2.19	0.85
Student at fault if their property is stolen	2.18	1.09
Hitting/Shoving as joking	2.16	0.84
Fight to protect group’s honor	2.08	0.95
Insulting is better than fighting	1.99	0.88
Student cannot be blamed for using bad language	1.98	0.89
Unfair to blame student for harm caused by group	1.98	0.69
Student not blamed for behavior if not disciplined	1.97	0.80
Students are not at fault if parents force them too much	1.94	0.71
One person cannot be blamed for group’s behavior	1.91	0.95
People deserve what happens to them	1.88	0.77
Bad conditions	1.87	0.78
Rough treatment because of lack of feelings	1.78	0.83
Being made fun of	1.74	0.79
Students cannot be blamed if they were pressured	1.72	0.71
Damaging property vs. beating	1.68	0.85
Stealing small things is not serious	1.68	0.80
School’s fault for student behavior	1.64	0.65
Person not being blamed for gang’s	1.63	0.80
Treating people like animals	1.61	0.96
Giving someone a “lesson” by hitting	1.56	0.72
Stealing a little vs. stealing a lot of money	1.55	0.80
Treat someone badly who badmouths	1.52	0.67
Obnoxious people deserve unfair treatment	1.33	0.51
“Borrowing” a friend’s car	1.32	0.55

*Note.* N = 193

Overall, participants in this study believe that it is acceptable to fight to protect friends ( $N = 193$ ,  $M = 3.84$ ,  $SD = .92$ ). This finding is troubling as it suggests that the participants in this study seemingly justify acts of physical violence in order to “protect” their friends. This is the most aberrant finding from this analysis, with the rest of the items being answered in fairly moral and ethical terms. Other interesting findings were those of not blaming a student who merely suggests breaking rules if other students go ahead and do it ( $N = 193$ ,  $M = 2.85$ ,  $SD = .99$ ) and justifying treating someone badly who behaved in an underhanded way ( $N = 193$ ,  $M = 2.59$ ,  $SD = .97$ ). On the low end, participants in this study tend to disagree that taking a friend’s car without his or her permission is just “borrowing it” ( $N = 193$ ,  $M = 1.32$ ,  $SD = .55$ ), that obnoxious people do not deserve to be treated like human beings ( $N = 193$ ,  $M = 1.33$ ,  $SD = .51$ ), and that it is acceptable to treat someone badly who badmouths friends ( $N = 193$ ,  $M = 1.52$ ,  $SD = .67$ ).

Table 29

*Moral Disengagement Items, T test for Gender*

Item	Male		Female		<i>t</i> test	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>
Fight to protect friends	4.11	0.77	3.55	0.99	191	4.39***
Hitting as joking	2.42	0.83	1.87	0.74	191	4.81***
Damaging property vs. beating	1.88	0.92	1.45	0.70	191	3.61***
Person not being blamed for gang	1.65	0.82	1.62	0.77	191	0.27
Bad conditions	1.88	0.76	1.85	0.81	191	0.31
Telling small lies	2.50	0.92	2.31	0.81	191	1.53
Treating people like animals	1.82	1.11	1.36	0.70	191	3.38**
School’s fault for student behavior	1.60	0.66	1.69	0.64	191	-0.99

(table continues)

Item	Male		Female		<i>t</i> test	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>
Treat someone badly who badmouths	1.71	0.71	1.32	0.57	191	4.12***
“Lesson” by hitting	1.82	0.77	1.27	0.53	191	5.64***
Stealing a little vs. stealing a lot	1.74	0.94	1.35	0.54	191	3.40**
No blame suggesting breaking rules	3.04	1.01	2.64	0.92	191	2.86**
No blame if not disciplined	2.04	0.82	1.90	0.77	191	1.19
Being made fun of	1.91	0.81	1.54	0.73	191	3.33**
Ok to treat someone badly	2.82	0.95	2.32	0.91	191	3.72***
Student at fault if property is stolen	2.24	1.17	2.11	0.99	191	0.79
Fight to protect group’s honor	2.43	0.92	1.68	0.81	191	5.93***
“Borrowing” a friend’s car	1.39	0.63	1.23	0.44	191	2.02*
Insulting is better than fighting	2.16	0.92	1.80	0.80	191	2.83**
No blame for group behavior	1.89	0.97	1.92	0.94	191	-0.22
No blame for using bad language	2.17	0.97	1.78	0.74	191	3.06**
Joking does not really hurt	2.82	0.91	2.25	0.87	191	4.40***
People deserve unfair treatment	1.41	0.55	1.24	0.45	191	2.31*
People deserve what happens to them	2.04	0.77	1.70	0.75	191	3.05**
Lie to keep friends out of trouble	2.51	0.75	2.13	0.79	191	3.39**
Not bad to “get high” once in awhile	3.03	1.33	2.33	1.27	191	3.72***
Stealing small things is not serious	1.82	0.89	1.53	0.67	191	2.57*
No blame for harm caused by group	2.01	0.75	1.95	0.63	191	0.64
No blame if pressured	1.75	0.76	1.68	0.66	191	0.71
Insults do not hurt friends	2.52	0.92	1.81	0.59	191	6.25***
Rough treatment	1.96	0.95	1.58	0.61	191	3.23**
No fault if parents force too much	1.93	0.69	1.96	0.74	191	-0.23

*Note.* N = 193, Male (101), Female (91)

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

The *t* test for gender produced a total of 22 statistically significant results. For each of the 22 significant items, females had lower mean scores than their male counterparts. This suggests that the females in this study disagreed more strongly that the behaviors listed in Carroll’s (2009) study were acceptable or justifiable. In this study, females tended to strongly disagree that taking someone’s car without their permission is just “borrowing it”,  $t(191) = 2.02$ ,  $p = .04$ . Females

also strongly disagreed that obnoxious people did not deserve to be treated like human beings,  $t(191) = 2.31, p = .02$ , that it is alright to beat someone who bad mouths friends,  $t(191) = 4.12, p = .00$ , and that some people deserve to be treated like animals,  $t(191) = 3.38, p = .00$ .

Table 30

*Academic Classification, Moral Disengagement Items, Means and Standard Deviations*

Item	1L		2L		3L	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Fight to protect friends	3.91	0.80	3.93	0.94	3.70	0.96
Hitting as joking	2.28	0.92	2.18	0.87	2.06	0.74
Damaging property vs. beating	1.77	0.96	1.68	0.83	1.61	0.80
Person not being blamed for gang	1.57	0.77	1.67	0.90	1.63	0.70
Bad conditions	1.87	0.76	1.89	0.82	1.83	0.76
Telling small lies	2.36	0.96	2.42	0.86	2.43	0.82
Treating people like animals	1.49	0.90	1.79	1.07	1.49	0.86
School's fault for student behavior	1.66	0.70	1.66	0.68	1.61	0.59
Treat someone badly who badmouths	1.64	0.70	1.63	0.74	1.33	0.53
"Lesson" by hitting	1.66	0.81	1.63	0.78	1.43	0.57
Stealing a little vs. stealing a lot	1.38	0.67	1.68	0.85	1.53	0.81
No blame suggesting breaking rules	3.02	1.05	2.87	1.01	2.71	0.91
No blame if not disciplined	2.17	0.91	1.92	0.77	1.90	0.72
Being made fun of	1.83	0.76	1.70	0.81	1.71	0.80
Ok to treat someone badly	2.47	0.90	2.63	0.99	2.61	0.99
Student at fault if property is stolen	2.28	1.19	2.11	1.00	2.19	1.12
Fight to protect group's honor	2.19	1.01	2.16	1.03	1.91	0.79
"Borrowing" a friend's car	1.36	0.52	1.32	0.52	1.29	0.61
Insulting is better than fighting	2.13	0.96	1.88	0.78	2.01	0.92
No blame for group behavior	1.85	1.04	1.95	0.90	1.90	0.96
No blame for using bad language	1.89	0.81	2.11	0.88	1.91	0.94
Joking does not really hurt	2.85	0.88	2.53	0.88	2.39	0.99
People deserve unfair treatment	1.34	0.56	1.41	0.54	1.24	0.43
People deserve what happens to them	2.11	0.84	1.80	0.73	1.81	0.76
Lie to keep friends out of trouble	2.28	0.77	2.45	0.85	2.24	0.73
Not bad to "get high" once in awhile	2.36	1.22	2.92	1.35	2.69	1.38
Stealing small things is not serious	1.64	0.84	1.72	0.77	1.67	0.82

(table continues)

Item	1L		2L		3L	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
No blame for harm caused by group	1.89	0.47	2.05	0.78	1.96	0.73
No blame if pressured	1.77	0.75	1.79	0.75	1.61	0.64
Insults do not hurt friends	2.36	0.84	2.16	0.83	2.10	0.88
Rough treatment	1.68	0.69	1.93	0.94	1.69	0.77
No fault if parents force too much	1.89	0.66	2.00	0.78	1.91	0.67

*Note.* N = 193, 1L (47), 2L (76), 3L (70)

In this study, participants in all three academic classifications were fairly uniform in responses related to the moral disengagement items. The first item in this survey asked if it was “alright to fight to protect your friends.” This item produced the highest mean responses for all academic classes, for any item in the survey 1L (N = 47, *M* = 3.91, *SD* = .80), 2L (N = 76, *M* = 3.93, *SD* = .94), and 3L (N = 70, *M* = 3.70, *SD* = .96). Second year students not only had the highest mean score on this item, but this was also the highest mean score for any item in the scale, for any academic class. The lowest mean score for the entire scale was produced by 3Ls on the items that suggested that people who get mistreated usually do things to deserve said treatment (N = 70, *M* = 1.24, *SD* = .43).

An ANOVA run on academic classifications produced two statistically significant results. The results of an ANOVA test for academic classifications are presented in Table 31. These results have been separated for easier navigation.

Table 31

*ANOVA Results for Academic Classification, Moral Disengagement Items*

Item	ANOVA	
	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>
Treat someone badly who badmouths	2	4.71*
Joking does not really hurt	2	3.59*
People deserve what happens to them	2	2.65
Not bad to “get high” once in awhile	2	2.54
Treating people like animals	2	2.27
Stealing a little vs. stealing a lot	2	2.12
Rough treatment	2	2.11
“Lesson” by hitting	2	1.96
People deserve unfair treatment	2	1.90
No blame if not disciplined	2	1.89
Fight to protect group’s honor	2	1.64
Insults do not hurt friends	2	1.38
No blame suggesting breaking rules	2	1.37
Fight to protect friends	2	1.36
Lie to keep friends out of trouble	2	1.36
No blame if pressured	2	1.21
Insulting is better than fighting	2	1.17
No blame for using bad language	2	1.15
Hitting as joking	2	1.00
No blame for harm caused by group	2	0.80
Ok to treat someone badly	2	0.45
Damaging property vs. beating	2	0.44
Being made fun of	2	0.44
No fault if parents force too much	2	0.40
Student at fault if property is stolen	2	0.36
“Borrowing” a friend’s car	2	0.25
Person not being blamed for gang	2	0.21
Stealing small things is not serious	2	0.17
No blame for group behavior	2	0.14
Bad conditions	2	0.13
School’s fault for student behavior	2	0.10
Telling small lies	2	0.09

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

A Tukey HSD post-hoc test found all three groupings of students, by and large,, disagreed that beating someone who badmouths your friends is an unacceptable behavior,  $F(2, 190) = 4.71, p = .01$ . Specifically, third year students had a lower mean than the other two classifications of students ( $M = 1.33, SD = .53$ ).

Participants in this study disagreed with the statement, “Joking with someone does not really hurt them”  $F(2, 190) = 3.59, p = .02$ . First year students ( $M = 2.85, SD = .88$ ) were closer to the “neutral” choice ( $3 = Neutral$ ). This suggests that these students might be more inclined to justify this statement. This would also support Kohlberg’s (1976) finding that given the assumed age of first year students, moral development would be in a less developed stage than second and third year students.

Table 32

*Age Categories, Moral Disengagement Items, Means and Standard Deviations*

Item	21-23		24-26		27 and above	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Fight to protect friends	4.00	0.83	3.74	0.97	3.91	0.90
Hitting as joking	2.29	0.96	2.19	0.79	1.85	0.70
Damaging property vs. beating	1.66	0.74	1.70	0.87	1.65	0.98
Person not being blamed for gang	1.54	0.76	1.71	0.82	1.56	0.78
Bad conditions	1.84	0.70	1.84	0.83	1.97	0.75
Telling small lies	2.30	0.95	2.48	0.83	2.38	0.85
Treating people like animals	1.66	0.97	1.66	0.97	1.35	0.91
School’s fault for student behavior	1.66	0.66	1.62	0.62	1.68	0.72
Treat someone badly who badmouths	1.59	0.75	1.59	0.67	1.21	0.41
“Lesson” by hitting	1.59	0.70	1.63	0.78	1.32	0.53
Stealing a little vs. stealing a lot	1.52	0.73	1.54	0.76	1.65	1.01
No blame suggesting breaking rules	2.98	1.08	2.81	0.97	2.76	0.89

(table continues)

Item	21-23		24-26		27 and above	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
No blame if not disciplined	2.09	0.81	1.90	0.73	2.00	0.95
Being made fun of	1.68	0.66	1.83	0.87	1.53	0.70
Ok to treat someone badly	2.43	0.91	2.69	0.97	2.53	1.05
Student at fault if property is stolen	2.18	1.09	2.23	1.06	2.00	1.15
Fight to protect group's honor	2.23	1.06	2.03	0.89	1.97	0.93
"Borrowing" a friend's car	1.38	0.59	1.28	0.45	1.32	0.76
Insulting is better than fighting	2.00	0.91	2.02	0.85	1.88	0.94
No blame for group behavior	1.96	0.93	1.99	1.00	1.56	0.78
No blame for using bad language	1.96	0.80	1.93	0.88	2.18	1.02
Joking does not really hurt	2.75	0.89	2.50	0.97	2.38	0.85
People deserve unfair treatment	1.32	0.54	1.35	0.51	1.29	0.46
People deserve what happens to them	1.88	0.71	1.92	0.82	1.76	0.74
Lie to keep friends out of trouble	2.30	0.82	2.41	0.81	2.15	0.65
Not bad to "get high" once in awhile	2.46	1.33	2.69	1.33	3.12	1.34
Stealing small things is not serious	1.66	0.81	1.59	0.69	2.00	1.04
No blame for harm caused by group	1.98	0.58	1.98	0.70	1.97	0.87
No blame if pressured	1.79	0.70	1.72	0.73	1.62	0.69
Insults do not hurt friends	2.29	0.84	2.18	0.89	2.03	0.75
Rough treatment	1.91	0.90	1.80	0.83	1.53	0.66
No fault if parents force too much	1.89	0.66	2.00	0.78	1.91	0.67

*Note.* N = 193, 1L (47), 2L (76), 3L (70)

Participants in the 21-23 age category displayed the highest mean score of any age group when responding to the item asking if it was alright to fight to protect friends ( $N = 41$ ,  $M = 4.00$ ,  $SD = .83$ ). This suggests that younger students justify physical violence to protect friends. Surprisingly, the oldest group of students was second closest not only on this item, but for the whole scale as well ( $N = 34$ ,  $M = 3.91$ ,  $SD = .90$ ).

An ANOVA test run on moral disengagement items and age categories also produced two statistically significant results. These results are presented in Table 33.



Table 33

*ANOVA Results for Age Categories, Moral Disengagement Items*

Item	ANOVA	
	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>
Treat someone badly who badmouths	2	4.70*
Stealing small things is not serious	2	3.35*
Hitting as joking	2	3.03
No blame for group behavior	2	2.78
Not bad to “get high” once in awhile	2	2.53
“Lesson” by hitting	2	2.36
Rough treatment	2	2.28
Being made fun of	2	2.11
Joking does not really hurt	2	1.94
Fight to protect friends	2	1.58
Lie to keep friends out of trouble	2	1.43
Treating people like animals	2	1.41
Ok to treat someone badly	2	1.38
Fight to protect group’s honor	2	1.08
Person not being blamed for gang	2	1.02
No blame if not disciplined	2	1.00
No blame for using bad language	2	0.97
Insults do not hurt friends	2	0.94
Telling small lies	2	0.72
No blame suggesting breaking rules	2	0.72
Student at fault if property is stolen	2	0.58
No blame if pressured	2	0.57
People deserve what happens to them	2	0.52
“Borrowing” a friend’s car	2	0.51
Bad conditions	2	0.36
Insulting is better than fighting	2	0.31
No fault if parents force too much	2	0.31
Stealing a little vs. stealing a lot	2	0.29
People deserve unfair treatment	2	0.16
School’s fault for student behavior	2	0.12
Damaging property vs. beating	2	0.06
No blame for harm caused by group	2	0.00

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

Again, beating someone who badmouths friends was an item that produced interesting results,  $F(2, 190) = 4.70, p = .01$ . A Tukey HSD post-hoc test found that participants in the first two age categories (21-23, 24-26) had higher means than those students in the 27 and above category, suggesting a propensity to justify physical aggression toward a person who badmouths a friend.

The second finding produced by this analysis shows that the older students in this study strongly disagree with the notion that compared to the illegal things people do, taking some things from a store without paying for them is not very serious,  $F(2, 190) = 3.35, p = .03$ . This action complements the idea of one action being the “lesser of two evils.” Students in the 27 and older age category had the highest of all means for this item ( $M = 2.00, SD = 1.04$ ), suggesting that despite the assumed level or stage of moral development, these students only *Disagree* with the behavior listed in the item and do not *Strongly Disagree*.

### *Exploratory Factor Analysis*

The survey responses related to academic sabotage behaviors (q75, q77, q79, q81, q83, q85, q87, q88, q90) were subjected to an exploratory factor analysis using principal components analysis with a varimax, orthogonal, rotation. The purpose of this method of factor analysis was to examine how the particular sabotage items grouped together in order to provide classifications of the behaviors. Of the nine factors there were four factors extracted with an eigenvalue of 1.00 or greater. The first factor explained 21.57% of the variance. All four factors explained 72.16% of the variance.

After examining the principal components solution, a four-factor solution was retained, which provided the best simple structure. The item loadings were all above 0.74, which presents evidence to the construct validity for the instrument. The underlying dimensions for the four factors are (I) Sabotage by Violent Anti-Social Behavior, (II) Sabotage by Incivility, (III) Sabotage by Deviant Behavior, and (IV) Sabotage by Aggression. The exploratory factor matrix is presented in Table 34.

Table 34

*Exploratory Factor Analysis, Sabotage Items*

Scale and Item	Factor Loading			
	1	2	3	4
Sabotage by Anti-Social Behaviors				
Mutilation of materials	<b>.846</b>	.027	.007	-.070
Defacement of materials	<b>.767</b>	-.032	-.108	-.063
Hiding of materials	<b>.743</b>	.171	.218	.258
Sabotage by Incivility				
Passing off incomplete work	-.112	<b>.883</b>	.073	-.031
Purposely mishandling materials	.242	<b>.831</b>	.152	-.006
Sabotage by Deviant Behavior				
Unwilling to share materials	-.062	.020	<b>.873</b>	-.043
Withholding information	.100	.208	<b>.808</b>	.083
Sabotage by Aggression				
Stealing academic materials	.008	.027	-.091	<b>.847</b>
Tampering with electronics	.010	-.063	.123	<b>.821</b>
Eigenvalues	2.24	1.68	1.48	1.10
Percent of variance explained	21.57	17.20	16.96	16.41
Alpha	0.51	0.24	0.63	0.46
Alpha if item(s) removed	0.53	n/a	n/a	n/a

The absence of empirical evidence specific to academic sabotage made the application of prior literature to each factor difficult. The researcher again considered workplace sabotage

literature in order to provide the best link possible between the behaviors in a corporate setting and those in an academic setting. Each factor is discussed below with application of supporting literature.

The items that loaded on the first factor (Sabotage by Violent Anti-Social Behavior) described sabotage type behaviors, including mutilation of materials, defacement of academic materials, and the hiding of academic materials. The name of this factor is a combination of two previously defined classes of workplace deviance culled from work by Anderson and Pearson (1999). Additionally, the notion that workplace deviance includes “direct actions” made by Duffy et al. (2002) was incorporated when constructing the definitions of behaviors in this factor. Using descriptions provided previously by these authors, acts of Sabotage by Violent Anti-Social behavior are defined as “any direct action or behavior, or combination of actions and behaviors that are highly intense, physically aggressive, and aim to intentionally harm an organization and/or members, or prevent academic pursuits.” Behaviors such as physically damaging academic materials in order to prevent their use by others are aggressive and go against social norms for acceptable academic practices. The initial Cronbach alpha for this scale was .51. When item(s) were dropped, the Cronbach alpha was only increased to .53. According to Cronbach and Shavelson (2004) the internal consistency of this measure would have rating of “poor.”

The second factor in this study (Sabotage by Incivility) grouped together behaviors such as passing off incomplete work and purposely mishandling academic materials. With a Cronbach alpha of .24, the internal consistency is rated as unacceptable (Cronbach & Shavelson, 2004). The name of this factor was derived from Anderson and Pearson’s (1999) description of the

manifestation of these behaviors as “low-intensity behaviors with ambiguous intent to harm” (p. 456). However, this study challenges the notion that these behaviors are “ambiguous” or benign. As discussed earlier, the intent behind these actions requires further study. This factor is supported also by the findings produced by this study in which participants rated “passing off incomplete work” as *not serious* as evidenced in the vignette section of the research instrument. While not as severe as the behaviors grouped in the first factor, the behaviors in this factor can certainly compromise the peer relationship among students as well as potentially desensitize students to the malice behind the actions themselves.

Items loading on factor three (Sabotage by Deviant Behavior) also touched on Anderson and Pearson’s (1999) work. The behaviors grouped in this factor, those of being unwilling to share academic materials and withholding information from other students, are similar to the behaviors that loaded in the second factor. According to Anderson and Pearson (1999), deviant behaviors that occur in the workplace are “antisocial behaviors that violate norms” (p. 456). Therefore, if a student is intentionally unwilling to lend out their materials, hoards journals or library books, withholds critical information about exams or coursework from other students, or generally operates outside the norms for social grouping or camaraderie in an attempt to undermine other students, then their behavior(s) could be classified as Sabotage by Deviant Behavior. With a Cronbach alpha of .63, this factor has the highest internal consistency of any factor. Although this factor has the highest Cronbach alpha, its rating is still listed as “questionable” (Cronbach & Shavelson, 2004).

Lastly, the behaviors of stealing academic materials and tampering with electronic devices such as computers loaded onto the fourth factor (Sabotage by Aggression). Andersson

and Pearson (1999) broadly described these behaviors as “deviant behaviors with intent to harm” (p. 456). The Cronbach alpha for this factor, .46, is rated as unacceptable (Cronbach & Shavelson, 2004). The behaviors in this factor are also unique due to the attachment of criminality to the actions. Theft and destruction of property not only go against social norms for behavior, but present interesting implications for students who are held accountable if caught. Unlike traditional means of cheating, like using a cheat sheet, a student more than likely will not be arrested for their actions. However, if a student purposely destroys electronic or technological equipment or knowingly steals materials in order to prevent the academic preparedness or advancement of other students, the institution is well within its means to pursue criminal charges against the student. This difference effectively establishes academic sabotage as a more malevolent form of academically deviant behavior than traditional cheating.

Finally, it is also important to note Duffy et al.’s (2002) suggestion that those who engage in workplace deviance or sabotage try to “conceal its true nature” (p. 333). Chapter 1 of this dissertation provided narratives of students who recounted heightened levels of anxiety and competition because of fellow students who engaged, either passively or actively, in academic sabotage. The second chapter of this dissertation reviewed prior studies regarding these practices within the corporate world. Here they are applied to academia. Duffy et al.’s (2002) work suggested that the behaviors described in this study not only destroy student relationships, but also assault the sanctity, integrity, and principles of the educational process as well. Academic sabotage poses a substantial threat to higher education’s ability, or opportunity, to foster moral and ethical development in its student community.

This exploratory factor analysis in this study presented inherent limitations. First, with a small number of behaviors represented and subsequent loadings, the number of behaviors in each factor was rather small. Factors two, three, and four all had only two behaviors load in them, respectively. Second, the alpha reliabilities of each factor all fell well below acceptable values. For future research, these values would at least need to be increased to the “acceptable” level of .70 (Cronbach & Shavelson, 2004). Despite the less than desirable alpha reliabilities produced by this factor analysis, strong hints were revealed as to how sabotage behaviors might group together. Lastly, given the exploratory nature of this study, these factor loadings and names were kept to provide support of how the researcher hypothesized the behaviors would group together. Based on the lack of prior academic sabotage literature, the loadings and names were the closest fit for the findings produced by this study. In this study, the researcher hypothesized that the more aggressive forms of sabotage would group together. Similarly, the researcher hypothesized that the more passive aggressive forms of sabotage would group together. This provides support for the theory of cognitive congruence, or cognitive consistency, which states that individuals desire the establishment of equilibrium in cognitive processes (Abelson, Aronson, McGuire, Newcomb, Rosenberg, & Tannenbaum, 1968).

### Summary

Table 35 presents a summary of the findings for all research questions produced by this study. All four research questions were supported by the data and resulting analyses.

Table 35

*Summary of Research Questions*

Research Question	Result	Description
Do acts of academic sabotage exist in professional education programs, such as law?	Supported  Analyses used: <i>t</i> test, One-way ANOVA, Tukey HSD post hoc test, Descriptive statistics	“Aggressive” acts of academic sabotage as defined by this study, such as theft or destruction of materials are not common. However, low level/passive aggressive acts such as students being unwilling to share materials and/or withholding materials are fairly common.
Are there differences between genders in measures of moral disengagement and attitudes that justify acts of academic sabotage?	Strongly Supported  Analyses used: <i>t</i> test, Descriptive Statistics	Female participants in this study had statistically significant lower mean responses on 22 of the 33 items related to moral disengagement, suggesting a stronger sense of moral connection to deviant behaviors. Females also considered acts of sabotage as “more serious” than males in this study.
Are there differences between the three classifications of students in a professional law program (1L, 2L, 3L) in measures of moral disengagement and attitudes that justify acts of academic sabotage?	Moderately Supported  Analyses used: One-way ANOVA, Tukey HSD post hoc test, Descriptive Statistics	Third year students in this study had statistically significant lower mean responses on two of the 33 items related to moral disengagement, suggesting the tendency to not justify deviant behaviors.
Are there differences between ages in measures of moral disengagement and attitudes that justify acts of academic sabotage?	Moderately Supported  Analyses used: One-way ANOVA, Tukey HSD post hoc test, Descriptive Statistics	Students in the oldest age category (24 and above) scored significantly lower on one of the 33 items related to moral disengagement than the other two age categories. Students in the 24-26 age category scored significantly lower than the other two age categories on one of the 33 items related to moral disengagement. Students in the 24-26 age category also responded that they knew of lower level/passive aggressive acts of sabotage and ranked them as less serious than the other two age categories.



In conclusion, this chapter described the data collected from currently enrolled students in a professional education program at a large public, top tier School of Law in the Southeast. The chapter provided results of multiple data analyses from the various sections of the research instrument. The factor analysis run on Carroll's (2009) items confirmed that the items grouped as predicted, according to Bandura's (2002) eight mechanisms of moral disengagement. The exploratory factor analysis showed the groupings of the nine sabotage behaviors as defined by this study and identified names for the groupings of behaviors. All four of the research questions for this study were supported, but to varying degrees. In this study, gender was the most strongly related variable to moral disengagement and attitudes that justify cheating and sabotage. Academic class and age of participants were also related to moral disengagement and justifying attitudes, but in a far less convincing manner. The final chapter of this dissertation will discuss the results produced by this study, present limitations, highlight offerings to the body of literature, make suggestions for academic integrity/sabotage research and practice, and will offer concluding remarks.

## CHAPTER 5

### CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to explore the phenomenon of academic sabotage in higher education. Prior literature has shown that forms of academically deviant behavior have cemented themselves into the experiences of students in higher education (Bertram Gallant, 2008; Whitley & Spiegel, 2002; Zou, 2011). Empirical studies focusing on the behaviors that constitute academic sabotage have, by and large, been limited if not non-existent. Based on this, the current study was constructed using a combination of anecdotal evidence, extant literature, and exploratory methods and analyses.

The body of literature regarding academic integrity, cheating, and other academically deviant behaviors is rife with studies like those conducted by Austin et al. (2005), Baker et al. (2008), Caldwell (2010), and Lavine and Roussin (2012), that seem to recycle theoretical constructs, definitions, and research methods. Seeing this as an opportunity, the researcher sought to depart from these norms and break new ground in the field of integrity research. By identifying a gap in the body of literature, the researcher used anecdotal evidence in the place of prior empirical knowledge on academic sabotage in order to construct the theoretical assumptions and research questions that guided this study. The premise of this dissertation was simple: use episodic narratives of those who have experienced academic sabotage as a substitute for prior literature. Use of

these narratives was done intentionally so as to also provide context to the potential threat academic sabotage poses to the sanctity of the educational process and student civility. In order to get a possible glimpse into the behaviors of academic sabotage, questions were couched in between items about moral and ethical behavior, honor codes, and effectiveness of faculty in upholding academic integrity; students seemed comfortable when answering the items that did not directly address aggressively deviant behaviors.

While the current study still falls under the broad umbrella of academic integrity research, this study has the potential to be groundbreaking in the field. The findings uncovered by this study seem to merely scratch the surface of this understudied, and possibly misunderstood, phenomenon in higher education. And as with many other studies, the findings produced by this study not only provide possible answers to the current research questions, but simultaneously pose new research questions as well. It is the hope of the researcher that this study inspires future integrity researchers.

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the research conclusions produced by the current study. This chapter has been divided into discussions of the following: (a) research results, (b) study appraisal, (c) limitations, (d) contributions to academic integrity literature, (e) suggestions for research and practice, and (f) concluding remarks. These discussions are also linked with the concepts, literature, and research questions discussed in Chapters 2 and 3.

### Discussion of Results

This study was guided by four research questions. Each of these questions was informed by prior research. The first research question sought to identify the existence of academic

sabotage in a professional law education program. Using descriptions of workplace sabotage behaviors offered by Giacalone and Rosenfeld (1987), it was discovered that only low-level acts of sabotage existed at the host site, as reported by the research participants. These low-level behaviors such as students being unwilling to share materials or students withholding information seemed to be fairly common. These findings confirmed the evidence offered by the testimonials in Chapter 1 of this dissertation, that students engage in passive aggressive behaviors in an attempt to derail the academic progress of others. This is potentially a completely new contribution to the field of academic integrity research.

Guided by prior studies conducted by Allmon et al. (2000) and McCabe and Trevino (1997), the second research question asked if there were mean differences between males and females in measures of moral disengagement and attitudes that justified acts of academic sabotage or cheating. In this study, gender proved to be the strongest variable related to moral disengagement and attitudes that justify violations of academic integrity. Females in this study consistently had lower mean scores on measures of moral disengagement and on measures that ranked the seriousness of academically deviant behaviors. These findings suggest support for prior studies by Allmon and colleagues (2000) and McCabe and Trevino (1997). These two studies found that females tend to not only refrain from cheating behaviors more often than males, but also that women attach a stronger sense of significance or seriousness to cheating behaviors.

The third research question in this study examined mean differences between the three classifications of students at the host site. Using Kohlberg's (1976) model of moral development as its base, this research question operated on the assumption that as students gained academic

and social experiences in each year of their academic program, they would be less likely to morally disengage or justify violations of academic integrity. This research hypothesis was weakly supported. In this study, third year students had lower mean scores on only one of the items in the measure of moral disengagement than first and second year students. Third years students also had lower mean responses toward the effectiveness of the HC, prohibited behaviors, and the effectiveness of faculty at promoting academic honesty. Academic classification appears to be the weakest related variable in this study. Yet, these findings still provide minor support for the notion that students in their final year of study would be in the latter stages of Kohlberg's (1976) model. Supplementing this notion is empirical evidence produced by McCabe, Butterfield, and Trevino (2006), McCabe, Trevino, and Butterfield (2001), and Pulvers and Diekhoff (1999), all of who explored cheating as a function of academic classification. Each of these studies offered that a student's academic classification is related to attitudes and beliefs towards cheating.

The fourth and final research question in this study split out the responses generated by participants into three age categories. Using prior work by McCabe and Trevino (1997) and Whitley (1998), as well as Kohlberg's (1976) model to inform this research question, the researcher hypothesized that older students would be more morally engaged to the academic and social activities of the community of scholars in which they operated. This was also weakly supported by the finding that students in the oldest age category tended not to justify acts of cheating or sabotage, while students in the middle age group (24-26 years of age) responded that they were aware of more students who engaged in cheating behaviors. This supports prior work conducted by Austin et al. (2005), Kisamore et al., (2007), Murdock and Stephens (2007), and

Stephens et al. (2007), who all suggested that age was a significant variable in attitudes and opinions toward academic integrity.

The findings produced by this study suggest that a student's gender presents the most significant relationship to moral disengagement and justifying attitudes than does a student's academic classification or age. The implications for these findings are discussed in further detail in this chapter.

### Study Appraisal

The impetus for this study stemmed from a conversation the researcher had with a personal acquaintance. In this discussion, the social, academic, and professional cultures in a graduate law education program were examined. The agreement was made that despite the mission of law school (i.e., to prepare ethical and moral people for entry into the profession), that the lines of acceptable and unacceptable academic practices were blurred due to competition among students. The question was then posed regarding research on the topic. Seeing none, the researcher was inspired to explore the phenomenon further.

Prior to this study, little was known about academic sabotage outside of the stories that existed as "urban legends" in higher education. The concept of academic sabotage is sensational, because it draws on extreme forms of deviant behaviors that manifest themselves in aggressive, destructive, and extremely anti-social ways. The exhibition of these behaviors displays a sense of "evil" not yet approached within the body of academic integrity literature. What is more concerning is that this spirit of "evil" originates from the students themselves.

Although this study failed to prove the existence of the more hostile forms of sabotage, like destruction of materials or theft, it did prove that superficial sabotage does exist in higher

education. If there is one finding produced by this study that is the most exciting, it is this one. This finding is significant because it represents *one end of the possible spectrum* of sabotage behaviors.

While rather simplistic in design and approach, this study provides valuable data to the fields of academic integrity research and moral development research in college-aged students. The results of this effort confirm that a student's gender, academic classification, and age are all significant in the construction of attitudes toward academic integrity. Although these findings are not wholly new, they add validity to the use of these variables in measuring attitudes toward academic integrity.

This study is significant in the fact that it identifies a phenomenon in the workplace, sabotage, and applies the same behaviors to academia. The researcher was convinced that if these behaviors were documented in the workplace (Ambrose et al., 2002; Anderson & Pearson, 1999; Analoui, 1995; Crino, 1994; Douglas & Martinko, 2001; Dubois, 1979; Duffy et al., 2002; Giacalone & Rosenfeld, 1987; Giacalone et al., 1997; Robinson & Bennett, 1995; Terris, 1985), that the same behaviors had to be occurring in higher education. According to these authors, sabotage in the workplace contributes to low employee morale, fear and anxiety among employees, a deterioration of the relationship between the employee and organization, and a failure of trust among the corporate community. Furthermore, these authors also agree that aggressive or anti-social (Anderson & Pearson, 1999) forms of sabotage, such as physical violence (Giacalone & Rosenfeld, 1987; Robinson & Bennett, 1995) or extreme physical damage (Ambrose et al., 2002; Douglas & Martinko, 2001; Duffy et al., 2002) rank as more serious offenses. This is important as this information establishes a hierarchy of reprehensible behaviors in the workplace.

In a sense, the phenomenon of workplace sabotage was synthesized, then “reverse engineered” for use by this study in a higher education setting. In so doing, sabotage has effectively been established as a practice in higher education and can be studied within this context without having to borrow literature from other fields like workplace sabotage, as this study was forced to do. One goal of this study was to add to the field of integrity research by creating a thread in the literature unique to academic sabotage. This has been accomplished and the researcher is well satisfied by this contribution.

This study is also significant in that it revealed flaws in its own design and implementation. Having little prior research to rely upon, this study broke new ground and now serves as a benchmark for future efforts to explore the topic of academic sabotage. While the application of the findings produced by this study is rather limited, the concepts and ideas expressed by its efforts are perhaps a greater contribution than the data itself. Future studies on this topic should not be a “trial and error” approach much like this study was, but should be more focused and deliberate in scope. The academy is well advantaged by what this study found, and perhaps even more so by what it did not. As this study was the first of its kind, it has helped to fundamentally define the very field of sabotage research.

Academic sabotage was found not to be a predominate practice at the host site. Low-level acts of sabotage, however, might desensitize students to the severity of the more aggressive behaviors such as theft and destruction of property.. If academic sabotage continues as an unmonitored practice, it might inadvertently encourage the fearful, anxious, competitive, and uncivil environment in academia as it exists in the workplace (Anderson & Pearson, 1999; Duffy et al., 2002).



Should this attitude prevail, higher education could see a severe compromise in student learning; students would only be worried about mastering how not to get caught sabotaging other students instead of developing skills and absorbing material as intended by faculty members. Should this attitude infect the faculty ranks, the sense of camaraderie among educators would lose its value. If sabotage, like cheating, embeds itself into the very fabric of the higher education experience, the dominos of civility, scholarship, and stewardship are sure to fall.

The primary goal of this study was to make a significant contribution to the body of literature on academic sabotage. A second goal emerged during the data analysis portion of this dissertation and, in some ways, is perhaps more immediate and important to higher education. The goal that developed through the latter portion of this study was to make a significant contribution to the *practice* of higher education and student affairs. It is the opinion of this researcher that the findings produced by this study are worthless if not used to inform practice or enhance the student experience in higher education.

Academic sabotage is a delicate subject matter especially to students who consider themselves to be upright and ethical members of the academic community on a college campus. A greater question to this study is how can it be used to help students, moving forward? This question is difficult to answer, because the phenomenon itself is still being defined. Initial efforts like this one serve to assist academic and student affairs professionals in educating the campus community on the existence of these problems and, more importantly, *why* sabotage is wrong. If sabotage can weave itself into the common definition of “cheating, then real change can take place. This might be possible if academic and student affairs professionals make deliberate efforts to associate sabotage with those acts of traditional cheating that students consider to be serious.

This study also adds to the wealth of literature related to college student moral development and complements efforts made by Bernardi et al. (2004), Brimble et al. (2005), Mayhew et al. (2009), and Stone et al. (2009) that have examined cheating through the lens of moral development. Due to the dichotomous nature between the social and academic climates within a professional law education program, the researcher was inspired to use student moral development as the theoretical base for this study. The researcher was fascinated by the work pioneered by Bandura (2002) and its application to college-age students in Carroll's (2009) dissertation study. The decision was made then to use Bandura's (2002) work as the primary theoretical construct in this study, in hopes of further expanding the reach of moral disengagement research. Although Carroll's (2009) scale was perhaps too expansive for this study, its use revealed the need for the development of a scale of moral disengagement in academia. Despite this, the researcher was well satisfied with the results of Carroll's (2009) scale and the data produced by its use.

This study begins to fill the gap in academic integrity literature by addressing the phenomenon of academic sabotage by using moral development as a theoretical framework. Use of this framework was successful as the data produced by this study adds value to prior studies in the field, such as the efforts conducted by Bernardi et al. (2004), Brimble et al. (2005), Mayhew et al. (2009), and Stone et al. (2009). An alternate interpretation of these findings includes the phenomenon of socialization as students move through the academic program. As each academic class moves through the program, the group itself develops characteristics. Group dynamics might influence attitudes toward academic integrity and professional ethics. This notion is supported by prior research, according to Kohlberg (1976) and Evans et al. (1998). As the factor analysis showed, the explained variance decreased with each factor. This suggests that the

pattern of relationships between items weakened as the number of factors increased. Further inquiry into academic sabotage should include a wider array of behaviors, which might lend credibility to the use of factor analysis in determining classifications of behaviors.

### Limitations

Throughout the process of data collection and analysis, several limitations were exposed by this study. Some of these were discussed previously in Chapter 3 as delimitations. Efforts were made by the researcher to minimize the effect of these limitations, yet this study was still subject to an inherent extent of capacity.

First, only professional law education students were recruited to participate in this study. While the cross-sectional convenience sample was collected intentionally, a more aggressive multi-site investigation might have been more appropriate. Instead of this study being strictly quantitative, it developed into more of a quantitative case study. This study excelled in capturing sentiments of students in one program, at one location, during one short period of time. Employing a more comprehensive research methodology would serve to complement the theoretical assumptions that guided this study. Inclusion of undergraduate students in various programs or graduate students in multiple professional and terminal degree programs would also lend credibility to the mission of academic integrity research.

Second, the cognitive abilities of the research participants presented unique challenges to this study. Specifically, the difficulties with which some participants had separating from program specific curriculum, pedagogy, or professional culture and the research questionnaire. The researcher was given prior notice by the Associate Dean of the potential for the research

instrument to “trigger the law brain” in the participants. Minimal attention was paid to this suggestion and the researcher continued to operate on the assumption that law students would be able to grasp the concepts being explored by the study free of influence from professional identity characteristics as future attorneys. Future studies would be well advantaged to develop curriculum specific questionnaire items to measure sabotage in different academic programs.

Third, this study served to essentially create definitions for new behaviors while simultaneously measuring student attitudes toward these behaviors. This seemed to provide confusion for some of the participants. As the findings have shown, there is no compelling evidence that academic sabotage is widespread at the host site. According to some participants who contacted the researcher with comments about the study, conceptualizing the behaviors was difficult due to the lack of experience with the behaviors themselves at the host site. Simply put, participants could not understand how a student could engage in acts of sabotage against another student. Therefore, measuring sabotage behaviors at this site was inherently difficult.

Finally, due to the lack of specific measures for academic moral disengagement and academic sabotage, the research instrument itself was considerably long. The inclusion of a vignette, although invaluable in terms of the data produced by its responses, seemed to be the point where many of the research participants discontinued their involvement in the study. In total, over 30 participants elected to discontinue their participation after beginning the questionnaire. Further pilot studies of materials would be beneficial so as to prevent survey fatigue in participants.

In summary, these limitations provide opportunities for improvements. Addressing these limitations would serve to enhance future efforts to explore academic sabotage in higher education.

### Contributions to Literature

This study offers important contributions to the field of academic integrity research and student moral development in higher education. The synthesis of integrity literature, workplace sabotage literature, and moral development literature exposed gaps in the current research while simultaneously constructing the foundation for the current study. By incorporating multiple areas of prior research, this study has effectively answered the call to broaden the scope of empirical research by producing new knowledge on a previously understudied topic. Because no prior literature exists on the topic of academic sabotage, support for the notion to extend sabotage research seems paradoxical. This study did, however, respond to calls for progressive academic integrity research made by Bertram Gallant (2008), Callahan (2004), Davis et al. (2009), and McCabe (2007).

This study managed to effectively challenge the status quo on what are acceptable forms of academic conduct in higher education. Traditional forms of cheating, such as plagiarism, using cheat sheets, recycling assignments for multiple classes, and gaining unauthorized information prior to an exam have seen near exhaustion in the literature (Boehm et al., 2009; Chapman et al., 2004; Crown & Spiller, 1998; Eberhardt et al., 2003; Higbee & Thomas, 2002; Jaeger & Thornton, 2007; Trenholm, 2007; Zelna & Bresciani, 2004). Aside from the advent of

the Internet and its use by students to cheat in college, the body of literature has seen few wholly new approaches to the topic in the last several decades.

This dissertation also complements current integrity research aimed at addressing emerging trends on college campuses like contract cheating (Walker & Townley, 2012), methods to curb cheating through pedagogy (Twomey, White, and Sagendorf, 2011), and social bonds among students through shared cheating experiences (Kobayashi & Fukushima, 2012). By conceptualizing academic integrity, as more than “traditional” means of cheating, this dissertation was able to explain how academically deviant behaviors have adapted and matured within the context of higher education.

The concepts of academic sabotage explored in this dissertation have given integrity researchers a new literature base with which to work. This study has defined and tested a multitude of behaviors that until recently have gone not only understudied but also unregulated in academia. The incorporation of workplace sabotage literature, while necessary for this study, should not impose the same demands on future research based on the findings produced by this study.

The use of theories of moral development is certainly not new to the study of academic integrity (Bruhn et al., 2002; Mahaffey, 2010; Stephens et al., 2007). This dissertation serves to complement a number of these studies that have examined cheating using multiple theories of moral development as their framework. This study also suggests merely one approach to studying academic sabotage, that of using moral development to inform the research design and theoretical constructs. In addition to these contributions, this study also exposes a need for a

scale to measure moral disengagement specific to academic settings; much like Boardley and Kavussanu (2007) did in their study that created a scale for moral disengagement in sports.

### Suggestions for Research, Policy, and Practice

The synthesis of extant empirical literature, as well as the findings and limitations produced by this study, offer a number of suggestions for future research on the phenomenon of academic sabotage in higher education. The knowledge produced by this dissertation also provides practical implications to policy development and practice for academic administrators, faculty, and staff at the university level.

#### *Suggestions for Research*

First and foremost, future studies on academic sabotage should address a more comprehensive set of behaviors than the ones used in this study. Given the limited availability of literature related exactly to the types of academic behaviors explored in this study, the scope of the effort was rather limited. This study, however, can provide future studies with a benchmark of behaviors that have been culled from areas of literature outside of higher education, specifically that of workplace sabotage. The development of a more comprehensive list would assist researchers in properly diagnosing the extent of the problem of sabotage in higher education, therefore allowing a more aggressive and purposeful study of the phenomenon itself.

Secondly, the quality of sabotage research would be enhanced with the development of a measure of moral disengagement in academia. Numerous studies have addressed the “how” of cheating (Chapman et al., 2004; Crown & Spiller, 1998; Eberhardt et al., 2003; Whitley &

Spiegel, 2002). Studies such as Mayhew et al. (2009), Murdock & Stephens (2007), and Stone et al. (2009) have begun to address the “why” of cheating from a cognitive and moral development schema. A scale of academic moral disengagement (AMD) would give integrity researchers a “measure of their own” to use in future efforts to explore behaviors, instead of having to borrow or adapt measures specific to other fields of study. In addition to this, a scale of AMD could prove beneficial to the study of student development in college unrelated to cheating or academically deviant behaviors, such as underage alcohol consumption, hazing in Greek organizations and sports teams, and student/classroom civility.

Third, the research methods for future studies should complement the research questions. Due to the exploratory nature of this study, quantitative methods were used to capture a snapshot of the phenomenon at one location. However, the researcher gained invaluable insight into the academic and social cultures of the student body through informal conversations with currently enrolled personal acquaintances he knew prior to the study. This suggestion is not without fault though. The nature of topics being studied, those of deviance, cheating, and prohibited behaviors, make establishing trust with potential participants difficult. However, as the researcher discovered, establishing this rapport was not altogether impossible. Future researchers would be well advantaged to employ a mixed-methods approach that combined survey components with individual interviews or focus groups. Vignette research might prove particularly helpful as well, as evidenced by Carroll (2009) and Miller, Shoptaugh, and Wooldridge (2011).



Research should also take into account the impact that *intent* has on acts of sabotage.

This study failed to explore how the intent attached to a potential act of sabotage would influence how participants viewed the seriousness of the action. Academic sabotage is arguably more serious than traditional acts of cheating, because of the intent to harm or create difficulties for other students to perform well. The tendency for some of these acts to take on characteristics of anti-social behavior, as well as the presence of “targets” of behaviors, creates an entirely new field of study.

Future efforts to address academic sabotage should first include multiple sites. Pilot materials should be administered before data collection to gauge the frequency and seriousness of sabotage activities at each site. In order to capture a clearer view of how moral development contributes to student attitudes towards academic sabotage, it is the suggestion of this researcher that an instrument similar to the Defining Issues Test (DIT) be developed to assess moral judgment of participants. Furthermore, a measure of academic moral disengagement would be useful to measure the tendencies of students to morally disengage from academically deviant behaviors in higher education.

With regards to demographic variables, future research should attempt to further examine academic classification, age, and the relationship these variables have with moral disengagement and attitudes that justify sabotage. These variables produced the least convincing findings in this study. As stated earlier, gender played a significant role in moral disengagement and attitudes towards academic sabotage. This lends credibility to the use of the variable of gender in future studies.

### *Suggestions for Policy*

With the exception of a handful of institutions, most notably Virginia Tech, Southern Methodist University, Case Western Reserve University, and DePaul University, policies describing academic sabotage are still largely absent from institutional honor codes or student codes of conduct. One explanation for this is that the phenomenon is so new, that the behaviors are still relatively unknown. Also, the phrase “academic integrity” typically brings to mind the practices of traditional cheating like using cheat sheets or plagiarizing. Expanding the definition of academic integrity would not only help to discourage behaviors, but also to educate the academic community as to the existence of the behaviors themselves. These policies should not only be directed towards students but should encompass all members of the academic community, including faculty.

Prior research has shown the effectiveness of incorporating policies that define and prohibit cheating behaviors (McCabe, 2007; McCabe & Pavela, 2000; Vandehey et al., 2007; Zelna & Bresciani, 2004). The most popular use of these policies is through academic honor codes or student codes of conduct. Based on the results produced by this study, the host site might develop policies to define standards of student civility to encourage a nurturing academic environment. The decision for a student to help another student however, it still ultimately in the hands of the individual.

### *Suggestions for Practice*

With regard to practice, academic sabotage should be openly discussed among the community of scholars and involve multiple constituent groups, such as faculty, staff, and

students. Academic integrity should be actively taught to students as a way of life, not just as a set of rules to abide by during the collegiate experience (Twomey et al., 2011). By combining pedagogy with practice, academic integrity can become the norm on college campuses, and not the exception. Campus wide programming for all students, not just first year students, could help to accomplish these goals. Institutions such as Mississippi State University (MSU), the University of South Carolina (USC), and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNCC) have long set the standards for programs. At MSU, first year students are asked to sign the Academic Honor Code during an event called “The Drill,” where members of the campus community join together to learn university traditions, such as the fight song and traditional cheers. MSU has used this symbolic gesture to embed integrity into the fabric of the campus community and make honesty a part of the “tradition” of the campus. USC hosts “Carolinian Creed Week” every year to promote the values of academic integrity. During this week, various campus groups pair together to hold student forums and speakers on the topics of honor, integrity, and ethics. At UNCC, the student honor council led a campaign called “Honor is Sexy,” in which academic integrity was paired with social media to promote ethical academic conduct on campus. While these institutions have honed the message of academic integrity to their campus, there is no one “cookie cutter” program that can eradicate cheating on a college campus. Education on the topic should be the primary approach to combatting the behaviors, which has proven to be effective at the institutions named above.

Early education and intervention programs would also benefit institutions seeking to manage violations of academic integrity. Given the data produced by this study, the host site would be well advantaged to aim intervention efforts towards male students, since males scored

lower than females on nearly every measure on the research instrument. Much like the continuing education programs required by many professions, specific integrity education programs should be developed and implemented at the undergraduate and graduate levels to address ethical standards in the workplace and occupational codes of conduct.

The Center for Academic Integrity provides a wealth of resources for educational programming related to academic integrity. Among these resources are ethics tutorials for students, honor code templates, current academic integrity research articles, and links to institutions that have made academic integrity a priority on campus. Many institutions are requiring academic integrity workshops for first year students in an attempt to educate and prevent cheating. Additionally, some institutions use similar workshops as a educational sanction once a student has been held accountable for a violation of academic integrity.

### Concluding Remarks

The final chapter of this dissertation provided a discussion of the results produced by this study. Limitations were presented along with potential contributions to the body of literature. Finally, suggestions for future research, policy development, and practice were offered.

This dissertation explored a previously understudied facet of academic integrity known as academic sabotage. Results from this study suggest that rather benign sabotage behaviors existed at the host site. Mean differences were found between all demographic variables (gender, academic classification, and age categories) in measures of moral disengagement and attitudes that justified acts of sabotage and cheating. The demographic variable of gender produced the greatest number of mean differences. Females tended to rate sabotage offenses as more serious

than males. Academic classification produced the second most amounts of differences.

Participant age played a lessor role in attitudes toward academic integrity. It is the hope of this researcher that the contributions made by this study inspire future integrity researchers to expand the concepts presented here.

In conclusion, this study hopes to shed light on a particularly disturbing set of practices among students in higher education. The primary goal of this study was to document the existence of academic sabotage in higher education. While both cheating and sabotage are inherently deviant in nature, it is the hope of the researcher that this dissertation has sufficiently defined the apparent differences between the two. Although similar in action and appearance, both sets of behaviors share differences. As mentioned previously in this study, academic sabotage differs from cheating in that with sabotage there are targets of the behaviors that often do not exist with traditional acts of cheating. Sabotage also differs from traditional cheating with regards to legality. Some of the more aggressive types of sabotage, such as theft and destruction of property hold severe consequences through the enforcement of the law. Traditional acts of cheating such as plagiarism or using a cheat sheet during an exam lack such measures of accountability.

While academic cheating and academic sabotage present differences, one of the most concerning similarities shared by these behaviors is the hazard they pose to the community of scholars in higher education. Cheating and sabotage both expose vulnerability in the educational process and serve to undermine the heart-laden efforts of faculty, staff, and administrators to inspire moral and ethical development in students. This study produced findings suggesting that academic sabotage was not a prevailing part of the academic culture at the host site. This offers

opportunities to continue exploring the phenomenon of academic sabotage and to encourage the practice of academic integrity as the norm, and not the exception in higher education.

## REFERENCES

- Abelson, R. P., Aronson, E., McGuire, W. J., Newcomb, T. M., Rosenberg, M. J., & Tannenbaum, P. H. (Eds.). (1968). *Theories of cognitive consistency: A sourcebook*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Allmon, D., Page, D., & Roberts, R. (2000). Determinants of perceptions of cheating: Ethical orientation, personality, and demographics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 23(4), 411-422.
- Ambrose, M. L., Seabright, M. A., & Schminke, M. (2002). Sabotage in the workplace: The role of organizational injustice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Processes*, 89, 947-965.
- Anderman, E. A., & Murdock, T. B. (2007). *Psychology of academic cheating*. Burlington, MA: Elsevier Academic Press.
- Anderson, S. (2011). Honesty on application essays. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from [http://www.insidehighered.com/views/2011/02/03/scott\\_anderson\\_on\\_college\\_application\\_essays](http://www.insidehighered.com/views/2011/02/03/scott_anderson_on_college_application_essays)
- Anderson, L. M., & Pearson, C. M. (1999). Tit for tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(3), 452-471.
- Angell, L. R. (2006). The relationship of impulsiveness, personal efficacy, and academic motivation to college cheating. *College Student Journal*, 40(1), 118-131.
- Analoui, F. (1995). Workplace sabotage: Its styles, motives, and management. *Journal of Management Development*, 14(7), 48-65.
- Aurich, D. (2010). Proceedings from the International Conference on Academic Integrity '10: Academic integrity and organizational change: A case study of Mississippi State University. Long Beach, CA.
- Aurich, D. (2011). Proceedings from the Southern History of Education Society (SHOES) Annual Meeting '11: Decades of Dishonesty: The cheating scandal of 1960 and the development of the honor code at The University of Alabama. Charleston, SC.
- Austin, Z., Simpson, S., & Reynen, E. (2005). The fault lies not in our students, but in ourselves: Academic honesty and moral development in health professions education results of a pilot study in Canadian pharmacy. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 10(2), 143-156.

- Babbie, E. (1990). *Survey research methods*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Baker, R. K., Berry, P., & Thornton, B. (2008). Student attitudes on academic integrity violations. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning*, 5(1), 5-13.
- Bandura, A. (1999). Moral disengagement and the perpetration of inhumanities. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 3(3), 193-209.
- Bandura, A. (2002). Selective moral disengagement in the exercise of moral agency. *Journal of Moral Education*, 31(2), 101-119.
- Bertram Gallant, T. (2007). The complexity of integrity culture change: A case study of a liberal arts college. *The Review of Higher Education*, 30(4), 391-411.
- Bertram Gallant, T. (2008). Moral panic: The contemporary context of academic integrity. *Academic integrity in the twenty-first century* (pp. 1-143). doi: 10.1002/aehe.3305
- Bertram Gallant, T., & Drinan, P. (2006a) Organizational theory and student cheating: Explanation, responses, and strategies. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77(5), 839-860.
- Bertram Gallant, T., & Drinin, P. (2006b). Institutionalizing academic integrity: Administrator perceptions and institutional actions. *NASPA Journal*, 44(1), 61-81.
- Bertram Gallant, T., & Drinin, P. (2008). Toward a model of academic integrity institutionalization: Informing practice in postsecondary education. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 38(2), 25-43.
- Bernardi, R. A., Metzger, R. L., Bruno, R. G. S., Hoogkamp, M. A. W., Reyes, L. E., & Barnaby, G. H. (2004). Examining the decision process of students' cheating behavior: An empirical study. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 50, 397-414.
- Boardley, I.D., & Kavussanu, M. (2007). Development and validation of the moral disengagement in sport scale. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 29, 608-628.
- Boehm, P. J., Justice, M., & Weeks, S. (2009). Promoting academic integrity in higher education. *Community College Enterprise*, 15(1), 45-61.
- Bowers, W. J. (1964). *Student dishonesty and its control in college*. New York: Columbia University.
- Brent, E., & Atkisson, C. (2011). Accounting for cheating: An evolving theory and emergent themes. *Research in Higher Education*, 52(6), 640-658. doi: 10.1007/s11162-010-9212-1



- Brimble, M., & Stevenson-Clarke, P. (2005). Perceptions of the prevalence and seriousness of academic dishonesty in Australian universities. *Australian Educational Researcher*, 32(3), 19-44.
- Bruhn, J. G., Zajac, G., Al-Kazemi, A. A., & Prescott, L. D. (2002). Moral positions and academic conduct. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(4), 461-493.
- Butz, D., & Ripmeester, M. (1999). Finding space for resistant subcultures. *Invisible Culture--An Electronic Journal for Visual Studies*. Retrieved from [http://www.rochester.edu/in\\_visible\\_culture/issue2/butz.htm](http://www.rochester.edu/in_visible_culture/issue2/butz.htm)
- Caldwell, C. (2010). A ten step model for academic integrity: A positive approach for business schools. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 92(1), 1-13. doi: 10.1007/s10551-009-0144-7
- Callahan, D. (2004). *The cheating culture*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt.
- Calabrese, R. L., (2006). *The elements of an effective dissertation and thesis: A step-by-step guide to getting it right the first time*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Carroll, J.A. (2009). Impact of moral judgment and moral disengagement on rape supportive attitudes in college males. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Alabama.
- Chapman, K. J., Davis, R., Toy, D., & Wright, L. (2004). Academic integrity in the business school environment: I'll get by with a little help from my friends. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 26(3), 236-249.
- Chronicle of Higher Education. (2010). NCAA reportedly investigating recruitment of football start at Auburn U. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/blogs/ticker/ncaa-reportedly-investigating-recruitment-of-football-star-at-auburn-u/28135>
- Chronicle of Higher Education. (2011). Drake U. hit with \$600,000 embezzlement. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/blogs/ticker/drake-u-hit-with-600000-embezzlement/32401>
- Colby, A., Ehrlich, T., Beaumont, E., & Stephens, J. (2003). Undergraduates for responsible citizenship. *Change*, 35(6), 40-48.
- Connelly, R. J. (2009). Introducing a culture of civility in first-year college classes. *JGE: The Journal of General Education*, 58(1), 47-64.
- Constitution of the Graduate Honor System. (1991) Virginia Tech University, Blacksburg, VA.
- Cooper, H., Hedges, L. V., & Valentine, J. C. (Eds.). (2009). *The handbook of research synthesis and meta-analysis*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publishing.
- Crino, M. D. (1994). Employee sabotage: A random or preventable phenomenon? *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 6, 311-330.
- Cronbach, L. J., & Richard J. Shavelson. (2004). My current thoughts on coefficient alpha and successor procedures. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 64(3), 391-418. doi:10.1177/0013164404266386.
- Crown, D., & Spiller, M. (1998). Learning from the literature on collegiate cheating: A review of empirical research. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 17(6), 683-700.
- Dante, E. (2010). The shadow scholar: The man who writes your students' papers tells his story. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from [http://chronicle.com/article/The-Shadow-Scholar/125329/?sid=cr&utm\\_source=cr&utm\\_medium=en](http://chronicle.com/article/The-Shadow-Scholar/125329/?sid=cr&utm_source=cr&utm_medium=en)
- Davis, S. F., Drinan, P. F., & Gallant, T. B. (2009). *Cheating in school: What we know and what we can do*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Douglas, S. C., & Martinko, M. J. (2001). Exploring the role of individual differences in the prediction of workplace aggression. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(4), 547-559.
- Drake, C. A. (1941). Why students cheat. *Journal of Higher Education*, 12(8), 418-420.
- Dubois, P. (1979). *Sabotage in industry*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.
- Duffy, M. K., Ganster, D. C., & Pagon, M. (2002). Social undermining in the workplace. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 45(2), 331-351.
- Eberhardt, D., Rice, N. D., & Smith, L. (2003). Effects of Greek membership on academic integrity, alcohol abuse, and risky sexual behavior at a small college. *NASPA Journal*, 41(1), 137-148.
- Evans, N. J., Forney, D. S., & Guido-DiBrito, F. (1998). *Student development in college: Theory, research, and practice*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- 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.
- Giacalone, R. A., & Rosenfeld, P. (1987). Reasons for employee sabotage in the workplace. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 1(4), 367-378.

- Giacalone, R. A., Riordan, C. A., & Rosenfeld, P. (1997). Employee sabotage: Toward a practitioner-scholar understanding. In A.G. Robert & J. Greenberg (Eds.), *Antisocial behavior in organizations* (pp. 109-129). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Grimes, P. W. (2004). Dishonesty in academics and business: A cross-cultural evaluation of student attitudes. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 49(3), 273-290.
- Hall, T., & Kuh, G. (1998). Honor among students: Academic integrity and honor codes at state-assisted universities. *NASPA Journal*, 36(1), 2-18.
- Hard, S. F., Conway, J. M., & Moran, A. C. (2006). Faculty and college student beliefs about the frequency of student academic misconduct. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77(6), 1054-1080.
- Harding, T. S., Carpenter, D. D., Finelli, C. J., & Passow, H. J. (2004). Does academic dishonesty relate to unethical behavior in professional practice? An exploratory study. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 10(2), 311-324.
- Hart, C. (1998). *Doing a literature review: Releasing the social science research imagination*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hendershott, A., Drinan, P., & Cross, M. (1999). Gender and academic integrity. *Journal of College Student Development*, 40(4), 345-54.
- Hendershott, A., Drinan, P., & Cross, M. (2000). Toward enhancing a culture of academic integrity. *NASPA Journal*, 37(4), 587-597.
- Hersh, R., & Schneider, C. (2005). Fostering social and personal responsibility on college campuses. *Liberal Education*, 91(3).
- Hetherington, E. M., & Feldman, S. E. (1964). College cheating as a function of subject and situational variables. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 55(4), 212-218.
- Higbee, J. L., & Thomas, P. V. (2002). Student and faculty perceptions of behaviors that constitute cheating. *NASPA Journal*, 40(1), 39-52.
- Hughes, R. & Huby, M. (2004). The construction and interpretation of vignettes in social research. *Social Work and Social Sciences Review – An International Journal of Applied Research*, 11(1), 36-51.
- Hughes, J. M. C., & McCabe, D. L. (2006). Academic misconduct within higher education in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 36(2), 1-21.

- Hudd, S. S., Apgar, C., Bronson, E. F., & Lee, R. G. (2009). Creating a campus culture of integrity: Comparing the perspectives of full-and part-time faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 80(2), 146-177.
- Jaeger, A. J., & Thornton, C. H. (2007). Forsaking honor for for the sake of honor: A case study of Lee-Allen University. *Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership*, 10(3-4), 32-41.
- Kibler, W. (1993a). Academic dishonesty: A student development dilemma. *NASPA Journal*, 30(4), 252-267.
- Kibler, W. (1993b). A framework for addressing academic dishonesty from a student development perspective. *NASPA Journal*, 31(1), 8-18.
- Kibler, W. (1994). Addressing academic dishonesty: What are institutions of higher education doing and not doing? *NASPA Journal*, 31(2), 92-101
- Kisamore, J. L., Stone, T. H., & Jawahar, I. M. (2007). Academic integrity: The relationship between individual and situational factors on misconduct contemplations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 75, 381-394. Doi: 10.1007/s10551-006-9260-9
- Kobayashi, E. & Fukushima, M. (2012). Gender, social bond, and academic cheating in Japan. *Sociological Inquiry*, 82(2), 282-304.
- Kohlberg, L. (1976). Moral stages and moralization: The cognitive-developmental approach to socialization. In D. Goskin (Ed.), *Handbook of socialization theory and research* (347-480). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Kohlberg, L. (1984). *Essays on moral development: Vol. 2: The psychology of moral development*. San Francisco: Harper and Row.
- Kohlberg, L., & Hersch, R. (1977). Moral development: A review of the theory. *Theory into Practice*, 26(2), 53-59.
- Kohn, A. (2007). Who's cheating whom? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 89(2), 84-94, 96-97.
- Lavine, M.H. & Roussin, C.J. (2012). From idea to action: Promoting responsible management education through a semester-long academic integrity learning project. *Journal of Management Education*, 36(3), 428-455. Doi: 10.1177/10525629 1 1428602
- Lawson, R. A. (2004). Is classroom cheating related to business students' propensity to cheat in the "real world"? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 49(2), 189-199.

- Lipka, S. (2011). Want data? Ask students. Again and again. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/Want-Data-Ask-Students-Again/128537/>
- Mahaffey, P. (2010). Academic integrity: The experience of learning through cheating. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of California, San Diego.
- Mangan, K. (2011). Villanova U. reveals its law school gave false reports of GPA's and test scores. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/Villanova-U-Reveals-Its-Law/126286/>
- Mayhew, M. J., Hubbard, S. M., Finelli, C. J., Harding, T. S., & Carpenter, D. (2009). Using structural equation modeling to validate the theory of planned behavior as a model for predicting student cheating. *The Review of Higher Education*, 32(4), 441-468.
- McCabe, D. (1992). The influence of situational ethics on cheating among college students. *Sociological Inquiry*, 62, 365-374.
- McCabe, D. (2007). Current trends in academic misconduct. Symposium conducted at the Center for Academic Integrity International Conference, Newport News, VA.
- McCabe, D. L., Butterfield, K.D., & Trevino, L.K. (2006). Academic dishonesty in graduate business programs: Prevalence, causes, and proposed action. *The Academy of Management Learning and Education ARCHIVE*, 5(3), 295-305.
- McCabe, D. L., Butterfield, K. D., & Trevino, L. K. (2003). Faculty and academic integrity: The influence of current honor codes and past honor code experiences. *Research in Higher Education*, 44(3), 367-385.
- McCabe, D., & Pavela, G. (2000). Some good news about academic integrity. *Change*, 32, 32-38.
- McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (1993). Academic dishonesty: Honor codes and other contextual influences. *Journal of Higher Education*, 64(5), 521-538
- McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (1996). What we know about cheating in college: Longitudinal trends and recent developments. *Change, January/February*, 29-33.
- McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (1997). Individual and contextual influences on academic dishonesty: A multicampus investigation. *Research in Higher Education*, 38(3), 379-396.
- McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (2002). Honesty and honor codes. *Academe*, 88(1), 37-42.

- McCabe, D. L., Trevino, L. K., & Butterfield, K. D. (2002). Honor codes and other contextual influences on academic integrity: A replication and extension to modified honor code settings. *Research in Higher Education*, 43(3), 357-358.
- McCabe, D. L., Trevino, L. K., & Butterfield, K. D. (2001). Cheating in academic institutions: A decade of research. *Ethics and Behavior*, 11(3), 219-232.
- Miller, A., Shoptaugh, C., & Parkerson, A. (2008). Under reporting of cheating in research using volunteer college students. *College Student Journal*, 42(2), 326-339.
- Miller, A., Shoptaugh, C., & Wooldridge, J. (2011). Reasons not to cheat, academic integrity-responsibility, and frequency of cheating. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 79(2), 169-184.
- Morse, A. (2006). Cheaters ever prosper. *On Campus*. Retrieved March 27, 2006, from [http://www.boundless.org/2000/departments/campus\\_culture/a0000242.html](http://www.boundless.org/2000/departments/campus_culture/a0000242.html)
- Murdock, T., & Stephens, J. (2007). Is cheating wrong? Student's reasoning about academic dishonesty. In E. M. Anderman & T. B. Murdock (Eds.), *Psychology of Academic Cheating* (pp. 229-251). Burlington, MA: Elsevier Academic Press.
- Nonis, S., & Swift, C. (2001). An examination of the relationship between academic dishonesty and workplace dishonesty: A multicampus investigation. *Journal of Education for Business*, 77(2), 69-77.
- Ogilby, S. M. (1995). The ethics of academic behavior: Will it affect professional behavior? *Journal of Education for Business*, 71(2), 92-96.
- Papp, R., & Wertz, M. H. (2005). Academic integrity violations: Isolated problems or epidemic? *SAIS 2005 Proceedings*. Paper 30. <http://aisel.aisnet.org/sais2005/30>
- Pulvers, K. & Diekhoff, D.M. (1999). The relationship between academic dishonesty and college classroom environment. *Research in Higher Education*, 40(4), 487-498.
- Rahman, N. (1996). Caregiver's sensitivity to conflict: The use of the vignette methodology. *Journal of Elder Abuse and Neglect*, 8(1), 35-47.
- Rakovski, C. C., & Levy, E. S. (2007). Academic dishonesty: Perceptions of business students. *College Student Journal*, 41(2), 466-481.
- Rest, J., Bebeau, M., & Volker, J. (1986). An overview of the psychology of morality. In J. Rest (Ed.), *Moral development: Advances in research and theory* (pp. 1-39). Boston: Praeger Publishers.

- Rettinger, D.A., Jordan, A.E., & Peschiera, F. (2004). Evaluating the motivation of other students to cheat: A vignette experiment. *Research in Higher Education*, 45(8), 873-890.
- Rettinger, D. A. & Kramer, Y. (2009). Situational and personal causes of student cheating. *Research in Higher Education*, 50(3), 293-313.
- Rezaee, Z., Elmore, R. C., & Szendi, J. Z. (2001). Ethical behavior in higher educational institutions: The role of the code of conduct. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 30, 171-183.
- Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 555-572.
- Schmelkin, L. P., Gilbert, K., Spencer, K. J., Pincus, H. S., & Silva, R. (2008). A multidimensional scaling of college students' perceptions of academic dishonesty. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 79(5), 587-607.
- Sims, R. L. (1993). The relationship between academic dishonesty and unethical business practices. *Journal of Education for Business*, 68(4), 207-211.
- Spacey, K. (Executive Producer) & Fincher, D. (Director). (2010). *The Social Network* [Motion picture]. United States: Columbia Pictures.
- Stephens, J., Young, M., & Calabrese, T. (2007). Does moral judgment go offline when students go online? A comparative analysis of undergraduate's beliefs and behaviors related to conventional and digital cheating. *Ethics and Behavior*, 17(3), 233-254.
- Stone, T. H., Jawahar, I. M., & Kisamore, J. L. (2009). Using the theory of planned behavior and cheating justifications to predict academic misconduct. *Career Development International*, 14(3), 221-241.
- Suler, J. (2004). The online disinhibition effect. *CyberPsychology and Behavior*, 7, 321-326.
- Sykes, G. M., & Matza, D. (1957). Techniques of neutralization: A theory of delinquency. *American Sociological Review*, 22(6), 664-670.
- Talbert, R. (2010). Cheating at central Florida. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/blognetwork/castingournines/2010/11/24/cheating-at-central-florida/>
- Terris, W. (1985). Attitudinal correlates of employee integrity. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*, 1, 60-68.
- Thoma, S., & Bebeau, M. (draft in press). Moral judgment competency is declining over time: Evidence from twenty years of defining issues test data. 1-17.

- Trenholm, S. (2007). A review of cheating in fully asynchronous online courses: A math or fact-based course perspective. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, 35(3), 281-300.
- Twenge, J. M., & Campbell, W. K. (2009). *The narcissism epidemic: Living in the age of entitlement*. New York: Free Press.
- Twomey, T., White, H., & Sagendorf, K. (Eds.). *Pedagogy, not policing: Positive approaches to academic integrity at the university*. Syracuse, NY: The Graduate School Press of Syracuse University.
- Vandehey, M. A., Diekhoff, G. M., & LaBeff, E. E. (2007). College cheating: A twenty-year follow-up and the addition of an honor code. *Journal of College Student Development*, 48(4), 468-480.
- Walker, M. & Townley, C. (2012). Contract cheating: A new challenge for academic honesty? *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 10(1), 27-44.
- Whitley, B. (1998). Factors associated with cheating among college students: A review. *Research in Higher Education*, 39(3), 235-270.
- Whitley, B., Nelson, A. B., & Jones, C. (1999). Gender differences in cheating attitudes and classroom cheating behavior: A meta-analysis. *Sex Roles*, 41(9110), 657-680.
- Whitley, B., & Spiegel, K. (2002). *Academic dishonesty: An educator's guide*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Zelna, C. L. & Bresciani, M. J. (2004). Assessing and addressing academic integrity at a doctoral extensive institution. *NASPA Journal*, 42(1), 72-93.
- Zou, J.J. (2011). With cheating only a click away, professors reduce the incentive. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/Cheating-Is-Now-Only-a-Click/128879/>



APPENDIX A  
LAW STUDENT HONOR CODE

## LAW STUDENT HONOR CODE

### CHAPTER ONE – GENERAL PROVISIONS

#### Section One: General Violations

The goal of the Honor Code is to ensure that no Student gains an unfair advantage in Law School over another Student and to promote those ideals of honor and integrity that are germane to the practice of law. PURSUANT TO THIS GOAL, ALL STUDENTS WHILE ENROLLED AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA SCHOOL OF LAW SHALL REFRAIN FROM INTENTIONALLY LYING, CHEATING, STEALING, OR TOLERATING SUCH ACTION BY ANOTHER AND SHALL REFRAIN FROM OTHER REPREHENSIBLE ACTS.

#### Section Two: Purpose

The purpose of these rules is as follows:

- (a) To promote among Law Students the highest standards of honor, integrity, and ethical conduct;
- (b) To serve as notice to all Students of those acts that will not be tolerated at the University of Alabama School of Law;
- (c) To foster an atmosphere of fair dealing, ensure a level playing field, and prevent any student from gaining an unfair academic advantage; and
- (d) To provide a fair, speedy, and just hearing to any Student accused of violating this Honor Code.

#### Section Three: Oath

- (a) All students are bound by the Honor Code.
- (b) Upon entering law school, all students shall sign a card containing the Honor Code Oath, indicating a commitment to abide by the Honor Code while enrolled in the University of Alabama School of Law.
- (c) The Honor Code Oath is as follows:  
“While enrolled at the University of Alabama School of Law, I will refrain from intentionally lying, cheating, stealing, or tolerating such action by another student and will abide by the Honor Code at all times.”

#### Section Four: Jurisdiction

Violations of the Honor Code, SBA Constitution, and SBA Bylaws are subject to the jurisdiction of the Honor Court. The Code shall apply to all students, as defined in Chapter Eighteen hereof. While students also are subject to administrative rules and regulations of the Law School – such as rules pertaining to food and drink in the Law School building, health and safety regulations, etc. – violations of these rules and regulations are not within the jurisdiction of the Honor Court but fall within the sole jurisdiction of the law school administration. Of course, the Honor Code does not replace, and Students are still subject to, civil and criminal laws of the city and state.

### Section Five: Scope

The provisions of this Honor Code shall be binding upon all Students in connection with any Law School Related Activity. It shall be the responsibility of each Student to be familiar with the contents of this Code and to obtain an advisory opinion from the Court on any unclear or uncertain situation. Ignorance of the contents of this Code shall not be a defense to an accusation of a violation.

## CHAPTER TWO – SUBSTANTIVE VIOLATIONS

### Section One: Violations

Each student shall conduct himself or herself according to the highest standards of honor, integrity, and ethical conduct referred to in Chapter One hereof. A violation of the Honor Code will subject the Student to sanction pursuant to Chapter Twelve of the Code. The following are situations in which a violation of Chapter One, Section One may be found to have occurred; however, these should not be construed as exhaustive but rather illustrative.

- (1) No Student shall take into an examination any material that his or her Instructor has not authorized. It is the responsibility of each Student to be fully aware of the Instructor's limitations with regard to the taking of any examination.
- (2) No Student shall begin an exam prior to being given permission to do so. This includes making any notes or outlines in his or her blue books, examination paper, or any other paper or typing in ExamSoft or other word processing program prior to being authorized to do so.
- (3) No Student shall continue typing or writing an exam after the allotted exam time has expired.
- (4) Any Student who through intentional action gains unauthorized knowledge about the Instructor's examination will be in violation of this Code. Any Student who either intentionally or unintentionally gains such unauthorized knowledge is under an affirmative duty to report such knowledge to the Instructor involved or another appropriate official.
- (5) No Student shall give or receive assistance from another while taking an examination.
- (6) No Student shall take an exam in an unauthorized location.
- (7) Each Student shall be responsible for knowing the definition of plagiarism and shall make every good faith effort to give the appropriate credit when not using original thought. As the definition of "plagiarism" in Chapter Eighteen, Section g, states, "In light of course requirements, plagiarism may include any work submitted to a professor in a course for credit (regardless of whether the paper itself is graded) and may include work submitted as a draft as well as work submitted as a final product. Plagiarism may also occur in work submitted to other students as part of the requirements in a course for credit."
- (8) No Student shall use any materials that have been specifically excluded from the Student's research use. Each Student shall be responsible for ascertaining what materials have been authorized by the Instructor.
- (9) No Student shall engage in an activity or action prohibited by the Instructor or the Honor Code. Furthermore, failure to comply with an Instructor's requirements or directions may constitute a violation of the Honor Code.

- (10) No student shall knowingly misrepresent or withhold any material information concerning himself, herself, or another, with the intent to influence any Student election, honorary or competitive process.
- (11) During or in connection with any such process as described in subsection (10), no Student shall engage in any coercive or fraudulent activity on behalf of himself, herself, or another.

#### Section Two: Illustrations of Honor Code Violations

The following have been deemed by the Honor Court to constitute a violation of Chapter One, Section One:

- (1) Lying about one's grades or other qualifications to a prospective interviewer in an effort to obtain an interview constitutes an Honor Code violation.
- (2) Stealing another Student's summary constitutes an Honor Code violation.
- (3) Collaborating with another student on a legal research assignment when instructed not to do so constitutes an Honor Code violation.
- (4) Knowing failure to report having missed more than a certain number of classes to an Instructor who specifically requires all Students to do so constitutes an Honor Code violation.

#### Section Three: Student Responsibility to Report

Taking into consideration the basic presumption of honor and integrity that each Student must accord to each other Student, Students shall report, in the manner provided in Chapter Four, any conduct which they have reason to believe constitutes a violation of any provision of the Code. Failure to do so constitutes a violation of this Code. Violations should be reported within three weeks of discovering a violation has occurred. The Prosecutor is given discretion as to charging late reporters.

#### Section Four: Failure to Attend Class

Nothing in this section or any other section of the Code shall be construed to mean that failure to attend class is a violation of the Code. Any decision about failure to attend class is a faculty decision. However, misrepresentation of class attendance to an Instructor constitutes an Honor Code violation.

#### Section Five: Pledge

- (a) On any Law School assignment or examination, the word "Pledge" followed by either a Student's signature or anonymous number must be included. However, even if a pledge is not given, all work is covered by all aspects of the Honor Code.
- (b) The pledge is as follows: "On my honor I represent that I have neither given nor received unauthorized aid on this (paper), (memorandum), (brief), or (anything else covered by this Honor Code)."
- (c) It shall be the responsibility of the Instructor to specifically designate what is authorized aid.
- (d) If a Student does not pledge the examination paper or assignment, it will not be graded, unless the Instructor decides otherwise.

#### Section Six: Violations during Honor Court Proceedings

During or in connection with the proceedings authorized by these rules, it is an Honor Code violation to:

- (a) Intentionally accuse another Student falsely of a violation of these rules. (b) Testify falsely
- (c) Avoid being called as a witness, refuse or fail to appear as a witness after being notified to appear, or fail or refuse to respond to questions properly propounded, unless the refusal to respond is based upon a claim that the answer may tend to expose the witness to prosecution under these rules. This subsection shall not apply to the accused.
- (d) Induce, coerce, or intimidate another to testify falsely or to fail or refuse to testify. (e) Attempt to influence the prosecutor or any member of the Honor Court to act in any manner in dereliction of his or her duties of office, whether the act is one of commission or of omission.
- (f) Act in dereliction of one's duties of office as the Prosecutor, Assistant Prosecutor, Defense Counsel, or member of the Honor Court.
- (g) Fraudulently falsify, destroy, alter or conceal any document or record made or preserved in connection with any proceeding.
- (h) Disclose confidential information pertaining to an Honor Court proceeding. This prohibition does not apply to the Accused in an Honor Court proceeding.

### CHAPTER THREE – COMPOSITION AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE HONOR COURT

#### Section One: The Court

The Honor Court is the official representative of Law Students in deciding matters arising under this Honor Code. Members of the Court are elected as provided in Article VI, Section Two of the SBA Constitution.

#### Section Two: The Prosecutor

The Prosecutor is an officer of the Court and is the official representative of Law Students in investigating, presenting, and prosecuting alleged violations of this Code. The Prosecutor is elected as provided in Article VI, Section 5 of the SBA Constitution.

#### Section Three: The Assistant Prosecutor

The Assistant Prosecutor is an officer of the Court and will assist the Prosecutor in investigating, presenting, and prosecuting alleged violations of this Code. The Assistant Prosecutor is elected as provided in Article VI, Section 6 of the SBA Constitution.

#### Section Four: The Defense Counsel

The Defense Counsel is an officer of the Court and will defend or assist in the defense of any Student accused of an Honor Code violation. The Defense Counsel shall be present at all Probable Cause Hearings and Final Hearings unless the accused objects. The Defense Counsel is elected as provided in Article VI, Section 7 of the SBA Constitution.

### Section Five: The Assistant Defense Counsel

The Assistant Defense Counsel is an officer of the Court and will assist the Defense Counsel in defending any Student accused of a violation of the Code. The Assistant Defense Counsel is elected as provided in Article VI, Section 8 of the SBA Constitution.

## CHAPTER FOUR – REPORTING A VIOLATION

A student who reasonably believes that a violation of this Honor Code has occurred shall report such suspicion to the Prosecutor, if available. The name of the Prosecutor, together with his or her home telephone number, will be posted on the official SBA bulletin board. In cases of emergency, if the Prosecutor is not immediately available, the violation may be reported to the Assistant Prosecutor, Office of the Registrar of the Law School or the Office of the Chief Justice of the Honor Court. As soon as the Prosecutor becomes aware of a potential Honor Code violation, whether filed by another party or self-filed, the Prosecutor has a duty to mount a thorough investigation in good faith.

## CHAPTER FIVE – INVESTIGATION

### Section One: Initial Investigation

- (a) The Prosecutor shall make a thorough investigation of the reported incident, taking care not to reveal any details to any person not directly involved in the investigation. If the Prosecutor, in good faith, believes that the evidence is insufficient to establish that a violation has occurred, he or she may decide to take no further action.
- (b) If the action was reported to the Prosecutor, all reporting parties shall be informed of this decision without undue delay. The Prosecutor shall submit to the Chief Justice a typewritten document stating the Prosecutor's decision not to proceed with the investigation and his or her reasons for the decision.
- (c) Such a decision shall be a final judgment; provided that, the investigation can be reopened if the Prosecutor, after consultation with and approval of the Vice Dean, determines that material evidence has been subsequently brought to the Prosecutor's attention and the evidence is such that the Prosecutor could not reasonably have discovered it prior to his or her initial decision.

### Section Two: Appointment of a Prosecutor Pro Tempore

If both the Prosecutor and Assistant Prosecutor are disqualified from acting or are unable to act for any reason, the Chief Justice shall appoint a Prosecutor Pro Tempore to investigate and prosecute a particular case.

### Section Three: Reconsideration

If after having been notified of the Prosecutor's decision a person is dissatisfied with the decision of the Prosecutor not to prosecute, on request of such person the SBA President may in his or her discretion appoint a Prosecutor Pro Tempore to further investigate the accusation. If the SBA President is unable to appoint a Prosecutor Pro Tempore for any reason, the Chief Justice may appoint the Prosecutor Pro Tempore. If the Chief Justice is unable to appoint, the SBA Vice-President will appoint.

## CHAPTER SIX – ACCUSATION

### Section One: Notification

If the prosecutor believes the evidence is sufficient to establish that a violation has occurred he or she shall with reasonable dispatch prepare and present a written accusation to the accused and the Defense Counsel, and shall notify the Chief Justice that a Probable Cause hearing is necessary.

### Section Two: Form of Accusation

The accusation shall state the specific section or sections of the Code alleged to have been violated and shall state the facts giving rise to the alleged violation. The prosecutor shall provide the Chief Justice with a copy of the accusation prior to the Probable Cause or Final hearing. The Chief Justice shall distribute copies of the accusation to members of the Court hearing the matter at the Probable Cause or Final hearing. The Honor Court will consider only the allegations presented to it by the prosecutor, subject to amendment by the prosecutor up to and until the Probable Cause hearing.

## CHAPTER SEVEN – PROBABLE CAUSE PROCEEDINGS

### Section One: Selection of the Probable Cause Committee

Probable Cause determinations will be made by the Probable Cause Committee. The Committee will be comprised of three Honor Court justices. The Honor Court justices serving on the Committee will be selected at the beginning of each semester on a volunteer basis initially or, if necessary, randomly from the remaining justices.

### Section Two: Procedure

The prosecutor shall prepare a written information detailing the allegations and facts surrounding the incident. The prosecutor shall then present copies of the written information and the accusation that was served on the accused to the members of the Probable Cause Committee. All names and identifying information shall be redacted from the documents presented to the Probable Cause Committee. The Committee shall meet and render a decision as soon as possible but with the goal of issuing a decision within a calendar week of notification from the prosecutor. During the Committee's deliberations, the prosecutor and defense counsel shall be available on site to answer any questions the Committee may have.

### Section Three: Finding of Probable Cause

If at least two out of the three Committee members find Probable Cause to believe that a violation has occurred, the accusation shall be deemed sufficient for final hearing. The prosecutor shall, without undue delay, notify the accused that Probable Cause has been found. In making this preliminary determination, Committee members are to bear in mind that there has been no full hearing and no full argument by either party.

#### Section Four: Finding of No Probable Cause

A determination of no Probable Cause shall be a bar to further prosecution of the case unless the Prosecutor, after consultation with and approval of the Vice Dean of the Law School, determines that at least one of the following exists:

- (a) subsequently discovered material evidence,
- (b) evidence of a false statement as to a material fact,
- (c) evidence of intrinsic fraud or tampering with the process, or
- (d) evidence that the panel misapprehended its function or failed for any reason to apply the appropriate standard of proof on Probable Cause.

In such event, the Prosecutor, with advice and consent of the Vice Dean, can request a second Probable Cause determination by delivering a written request to the Chief Justice. A copy of such request shall also be promptly delivered to the accused and the Defense Counsel or mailed to their respective addresses of record.

#### Section Five: Waiver

The accused may waive the Probable Cause Proceedings.

### CHAPTER EIGHT – PRE-FINAL HEARING RIGHTS OF THE PARTIES

#### Section One: Rights of the Accused

Following a finding of Probable Cause and prior to the final hearing, the accused has the right to:

- (a) Receive a list of all members of the Court with a designation of those chosen to sit at the final hearing;
- (b) Challenge any member for cause;
- (c) Receive a list of all reporting witnesses and all witnesses expected to testify on behalf of the prosecution;
- (d) Choose an open or closed final hearing;
- (e) Receive a summary description of all relevant evidence available to the prosecutor, including any exculpatory evidence, and on request to examine any such evidence.

#### Section Two: Rights of the Prosecutor

Following a finding of Probable Cause and prior to the final hearing, the prosecutor has the right to:

- (a) Receive a list of all members of the Court with a designation of those chosen to sit at the final hearing;
- (b) Challenge any member for cause;
- (c) Receive a list of witnesses expected to testify on behalf of the accused;
- (d) Be advised of the name of any person who will be representing or advising the defendant and whether such person is an attorney;
- (e) Be given notice of the nature of the defense, or defenses, if any, to be presented by the accused.



## CHAPTER NINE – FINAL HEARING FOR HONOR CODE VIOLATIONS

### Section One: Burden

THE ACCUSED IS PRESUMED INNOCENT. The burden is on the prosecutor to prove the accusation beyond a reasonable doubt.

### Section Two: Selection of the Court

On receiving notice from the prosecutor that a final hearing is necessary, the Chief Justice and six members of the Court, selected at random by the Chief Justice in the presence of the prosecutor and the defense counsel, shall be designated to sit at the final hearing. The prosecutor and/or defense counsel, with permission of the accused, may waive their right to be present at the time of Justice selection. Members of the Probable Cause Committee are not eligible. The Chief Justice shall set a date, a time, and place, away from the law school campus, for the final hearing and shall notify the prosecutor, the defense counsel, the accused, and the selected members of the Court. The final hearing shall be held as soon as practicable after a finding of Probable Cause.

### Section Three: Challenges, Recusals, and Vacancies

- (a) Challenges for cause must be submitted to the Chief Justice no later than three days prior to the final hearing. Challenges for cause shall be decided by majority vote of the remaining members of the panel.
- (b) Members may recuse themselves if they reasonably feel they are unable to render a fair and just decision, and will be automatically recused in the event that they are a reporting witness in the case at issue.
- (c) Vacancies caused by challenge, recusal, or absence shall first be filled by the remaining justices, excluding the members who sat on the Probable Cause Committee and, in the case of a new final hearing, those who sat at the original trial. Remaining vacancies shall be filled by a vote of the Honor Court justices. The Chief Justice shall convene the Honor Court justices, with the presence of seven justices constituting a quorum. The justices present shall nominate students from the first, second, and third year classes to fill the vacancies. The justices present shall then fill the remaining vacancies by majority vote with the Chief Justice voting in the case of a tie.
- (d) In the case of a new final hearing, the composition of the panel is subject to the provisions of Chapter Thirteen, Section Three.
- (e) If the Chief Justice is removed or is absent, after he or she has been replaced and all other vacancies have been filled, a Chief Justice Pro Tempore shall be selected from among their numbers by majority vote of the panel sitting. If either party moves to recuse the Chief Justice, the Chief Justice should, absent good cause to the contrary, grant the motion and recuse himself or herself. If the Chief Justice recuses himself or herself, a Chief Justice Pro Tempore shall be selected from the Court by the recused Chief Justice.

#### Section Four: Failure of the Accused to Appear

If an accused, having been duly notified of the time, date, and place of the hearing, willfully fails or refuses to attend, the hearing may be conducted in his or her absence, or may be continued at a later date and time, at the discretion of the presiding Chief Justice.

#### Section Five: Order of Proceedings and Continuations

The proceeding shall begin with the Prosecutor reading the accusation. At any time prior to imposition of a sanction, the Chief Justice may, if justice so requires, declare the proceedings continued. A continuance of action shall not be deemed a final judgment. The justices on the panel, the prosecutor, the defense counsel, and the accused shall be informed without undue delay of the reasons for continuance and a date for a new hearing shall be set with reasonable dispatch.

#### Section Six: Rights of the Parties

- (a) At the final hearing the accused shall have the right to:
  - (1) Represent himself or herself or be represented by the person of his or her choice;
  - (2) Make an opening statement and/or closing argument;
  - (3) Call and examine witnesses;
  - (4) Cross-examine prosecution witnesses;
  - (5) Decline to testify or choose to testify;
  - (6) Present any physical or demonstrative evidence, independent of witnesses, which is relevant to the matter in question;
  - (7) Make electronic sound recordings;
  - (8) Present character evidence and character witnesses.
- (b) At the final hearing the prosecutor shall have the right to:
  - (1) Have the services of an attorney or other advisor, upon his or her request and with consent of the Dean, to advise and assist in prosecution of the case, if the accused has the services of any person, other than another Law Student, to represent or advise him or her at the final hearing;
  - (2) Make an opening statement and/or closing argument, including the right to make the final closing argument;
  - (3) Call and examine witnesses;
  - (4) Cross-examine witnesses called by or on behalf of the accused;
  - (5) Present any physical or demonstrative evidence, independent of witnesses, that is relevant to the matter in question;
  - (6) Make electronic sound recordings;
  - (7) Present character evidence and character witnesses if the accused has put his or her character into issue;
  - (8) Present evidence in rebuttal of evidence presented by or on behalf of the accused

### Section 7: Undisputed Facts

- (a) In order to help the parties narrow the issues for the final hearing, the prosecutor and the defense, at any time prior to the final hearing, may stipulate to the existence of any fact or set of facts, which are to be specifically set out and presented to the Court in writing at the final hearing. For the purposes of the final hearing, the Court will deem all stipulated facts as having been conclusively established.
- (b) In the event that there are no issues of fact to be resolved by the Court at the final hearing, the undisputed facts must be presented to the Court for a determination as to whether those facts constitute a violation of this Code. The Chief Justice, in his/her discretion, may grant as much time for oral arguments regarding whether the facts presented constitute a violation as is necessary.
- (c) No part of this section should be construed to relieve the prosecutor's burden of proof. All disputed facts must be proven at the final hearing through documentary or testimonial evidence.

## CHAPTER TEN – NATURE OF THE PROCEEDINGS

### Section One: Evidence

The Final Hearing is administrative in nature. The general rules of evidence applicable to administrative hearings are to apply, subject only to such exceptions as are specifically provided herein. It is contemplated that evidence will be admitted liberally at hearings conducted pursuant to this Code. Evidence likely to influence the decision of fair-minded individuals is to be readily admitted, bounded only by the most severe concerns of relevancy, materiality, and repetition.

### Section Two: Presiding over the Proceedings

At a final hearing the Chief Justice shall rule on all objections and questions of procedure in connection with the conduct of the final hearing. The presiding Chief Justice is authorized to use all reasonable means necessary to preserve order and judicial decorum during the hearing, including the right to exclude persons, including the accused, from the room for sufficient cause. The sitting panel of justices by majority vote may ask a lawyer, faculty member, or judge to preside, but such lawyer, faculty member, or judge while presiding at the hearing shall have no vote on the final question of guilt or innocence of the accused or the sanction to be imposed. In any case in which a lawyer, faculty member, or judge is asked to preside the Chief Justice or Chief Justice Pro Tempore shall continue as a member of the panel and shall continue to have all powers herein granted except those of presiding, ruling on objections, and maintaining order and judicial decorum.

### Section Three: Order of Proceedings

- (a) The Final Hearing of any matter brought before the Honor Court will begin with a reading of the Formal Accusation by the prosecutor.
- (b) The prosecutor may give his or her opening statement. This statement can include an outline of the case and evidence to be presented but cannot include arguments of any form. Upon the completion of the prosecution's opening statement, the accused or defense counsel may give his or her opening statement. This statement is subject to the same limitations as the prosecution's opening statement, namely that they contain no arguments. All facts, evidence and inferences thereof contained in each opening must in good faith attempted to be proved in the respective case in chief. The opening statement may be waived by agreement between the accused and the prosecution.
- (c) The prosecutor will then present his or her case-in-chief. The prosecution may present its case in chief through examination of witnesses or presentation of evidence. For each of the prosecution's witness the prosecution has the right of direct examination and the accused has the right of a cross examination. If the prosecution feels it is necessary for his or her case in chief he or she shall have an absolute right to one re-direct examination of the witness after the accused finishes his or her cross examination. If the right to re-direct is exercised, the accused shall have the absolute right to one re-cross of the witness. More opportunity for multiple re-directs may be allowed subject to the discretion of the presiding Chief Justice so long as the accused has the right to another cross of the same witness. The accused has the right to waive any opportunity for cross-examination, but may re-call any prosecution witness during the accused's case in chief. The prosecution may call any number of witnesses in its case in chief as needed subject to discretion of the court for any redundancy.
- (d) Upon the completion of the prosecution's case in chief the accused may present its case in chief. Any documents or exhibits to be presented by the accused are subject to the same rules and limitations placed upon the prosecution. The cross-examinations and re-directs are subject to the restrictions outlined in the above section.
- (e) Upon the completion of the accused's case in chief the prosecution may call any rebuttal witnesses.
- (f) Upon completion of the accused's case in chief or the prosecution's rebuttal, whichever is last, both sides shall have the right to a closing argument. The closing arguments may contain any evidence presented at the hearing as well as arguments by either party. The closing arguments may not contain facts or evidence not presented during the hearing. The prosecution shall give a closing argument first, followed by the accused. Upon completion of the accused closing the prosecution may, at its discretion, follow up with a limited closing lasting no more than 3 minutes. The closing arguments can be waived by agreement between both parties.

## CHAPTER ELEVEN – CONVICTION, ACOUITTAL, AND RETRIAL: PERSONAL STATEMENT

### Section One: Final Judgment

A final judgment of guilty requires a unanimous vote that the evidence establishes a violation beyond a reasonable doubt. A judgment of guilty may be based in whole or in part upon circumstantial evidence.

### Section Two: Acquittal

Any vote that is less than unanimous for conviction constitutes an acquittal; provided that if there are at least 5 votes for conviction the accused may be retried one time in the discretion of the Prosecutor. An acquittal is a final judgment.

### Section Three: Statement

Upon a final judgment of guilty, and prior to the imposition of a sanction, either party has the right to make a statement relative to the degree of punishment and to present relevant evidence going to mitigation, exoneration, or severity of the sanction. If an Instructor is involved, he or she also has the right to make a statement relative to the degree of punishment. The Court will give the Instructor's suggestion substantial consideration when arriving at a recommended sanction.

## CHAPTER TWELVE – SANCTIONS: DISCRETION OF THE COURT: DUTY OF THE COURT

### Section One: Sanctions & Duties of the Court

Upon a final judgment of guilty, and following the personal statement or waiver of personal statement by the accused, statements by the prosecutor and Instructor, and the presentation of any evidence relevant to a proper sanction, the members of the Court conducting the Final Hearing shall deliberate and arrive at an appropriate sanction pursuant to Section Two of this Chapter.

### Section Two: Arriving at a Sanction

It is the duty of the Court to arrive at a sanction, agreed upon by at least four of the seven empanelled members, which reflects the severity of the offense as well as all mitigating circumstances. The Court may recommend to the Dean one or more of the following sanctions:

- (1) Permanent dismissal;
- (2) Suspension for one or more semesters or terms; (3) Probation for up to three calendar years;
- (4) An "F" in the course in which a violation occurred; to be designated on the student's records as "PF" (Penalty Failure subject to removal in 5 years) or as an "F";
- (5) A written reprimand; (subject to removal from the Student's Record within 5 years);
- (6) Any other appropriate sanction (e.g. dismissal from the Moot Court Board, Law Review Staff, Law School office, or report to Character and Fitness Committee of the Bar).

### Section Three: Issuing a Decision

The Court shall reconvene and inform the Accused of the arrived upon sanction. The Chief Justice, or a justice designated by the Chief Justice, shall issue a written opinion on behalf of the Court. Any member dissenting from the majority decision may attach his or her dissenting opinion to the Court's opinion.

### Section Four: Submission of the Court's Recommendation to the Dean

Within 10 days, the Chief Justice will submit the Court's determination and recommendation to the Dean, along with a copy of the full written opinion, including any concurrences and dissents, and any pertinent evidence or information. The Dean then has authority to issue the final sanction(s).

### Section Five: Assignment of Grades

Nothing in this section or any other section of this Code precludes an Instructor from assigning the grade he or she believes is appropriate, as long as it comports with the Dean's authority.

## CHAPTER THIRTEEN – APPEAL AND NEW FINAL HEARING

### Section One: Petition for New Final Hearing

Any Student convicted under these rules may petition the Dean or the Dean's designee for a new final hearing. Such petition must be in writing, submitted within 10 days of final judgment, and must set forth the grounds on which a new final hearing is sought, together with substantiating facts.

### Section Two: Grounds for a New Final Hearing

The following may be grounds for a new final hearing:

- (a) material and prejudicial denial of any right provided the accused; (b) a verdict contrary to the great weight of the evidence;
- (c) newly discovered evidence, taking into consideration whether the evidence could have been discovered prior to the hearing, the diligence with which the evidence was sought, the promptness of its disclosure, and the likelihood that the newly discovered evidence if presented would have affected the outcome of the hearing;
- (d) perjury on the part of a witness where it appears that the perjured testimony could have affected the outcome of the hearing;
- (e) that the demands of justice so require.

### Section Three: Conditions for a New Hearing

If the Dean orders a new final hearing, he or she may specify conditions, such as the composition of the Court, the prosecutor, and the place and time of the new final hearing, as he or she deems to be necessary and proper in the interests of justice.

## CHAPTER FOURTEEN – RECORDS

### Section One: Official Records

The following records constitute the official record of the proceedings and shall be maintained by the Court in a special locked file cabinet located in the office of the Dean or in a place designated by the Dean:

- (a) a copy of the accusation signed by the prosecutor with evidence of date and manner of service on the accused;
- (b) the decision of the panel at the Probable Cause Hearing, dated and signed by all members of the panel;
- (c) the decision of the Court at the Final Hearing, signed and dated by all justices sitting at the hearing;
- (d) the decision recommending sanction, signed and dated by all justices sitting at the hearing;
- (e) a summary of the Court's findings, holdings, recommended sanctions, and the Dean's final disposition, written and signed by the Chief Justice and stated in such a manner as not to disclose the identity of persons involved;
- (f) a record of the final disposition of the matter by the Dean.

### Section Two: Presentation to the Dean

A copy of all records, including any video or audio recording, shall be presented to the Dean with reasonable dispatch after the conclusion of the process. A failure of one or more justices to sign the record shall not of itself be deemed a material or fatal defect.

### Section Three: Summary of Proceedings and Public Posting

A redacted copy of the summary made by the Chief Justice shall be placed in a file in the Honor Court or SBA Office. In the event of a finding of guilty, a second copy of the summary prepared by the Chief Justice shall be placed on the official SBA bulletin board and Honor Court website for a reasonable time. However, at no time shall a copy of the summary be placed on the bulletin board during pendency of any appeal or new hearing granted under Chapter Thirteen.

### Section Four: Access to Records

Access to the official records, as enumerated in Chapter Fourteen, Section One, shall be made available to the Dean, the Honor Court Chief Justice, and the Honor Court Prosecutor. Any person accused of an Honor Code violation to which records relate may request copies of such records from the Chief Justice, which request shall be honored.

## CHAPTER FIFTEEN – EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES

In the event of extraordinary circumstances and emergency conditions which make the processes for selection of members to conduct hearings pursuant to the provisions of Chapter Nine impossible or grossly impractical, the Chief Justice may adopt such alternative means of selection as may be necessary and which will accord to the accused substantial justice and procedural due process.

## CHAPTER SIXTEEN – ADVISORY OPINIONS

### Section One: Requesting an Advisory Opinion

The Honor Court may issue an advisory opinion sua sponte at any time. Additionally, the Honor Court shall render advisory opinions at the request of:

- (a) any SBA elected executive officer, senator, or group of senators; (b) members of the SBA Elections Committee;
- (c) any law school faculty member; or
- (d) petition from ten students of the Law School

### Section Two: Procedure

Requests for Advisory Opinions should be written, signed by the all parties requesting the opinion, and delivered to the Chief Justice. Upon receipt of the request, the Chief Justice shall convene the Honor Court justices as soon as practicable to issue an advisory opinion. For the purpose of issuing an opinion under this Chapter, seven justices constitute a quorum and a simple majority is necessary to issue an advisory opinion. Any vacancies due to absence or recusal will be filled in the same manner as provided in Chapter Nine, Section Three.

### Section Three: Issuing an Advisory Opinion

Following deliberations by the assembled court, the Chief Justice, or a justice designated by the Chief Justice, shall prepare a written advisory opinion to be signed by all the justices in the majority. Justices may issue concurring and dissenting opinions, which must also be signed. The advisory opinion, along with any concurring and dissenting opinions, shall be posted on the Honor Court bulletin board and website. Copies of the advisory opinion and accompanying opinions shall be delivered to the parties who requested the opinion and kept on reserve in the Law School library. The Chief Justice should also notify the Law School community.

### Section Four: Applicability of Advisory Opinions

The advisory opinion shall be binding unless revoked by the Honor Court. Opinions can be revoked by a vote of two-thirds of the justices and should follow the same procedure as outlined in Sections One through Three of this Chapter.

## CHAPTER SEVENTEEN – SUMMER PROCEEDINGS

### Section One: Proceedings Involving a Non-Graduating Student

In the event a complaint is brought during the summer or late in the spring semester, the Prosecutor and Court will comply with the ordinary procedures as set forth in this Code, unless it is so impractical or inconvenient to either party as to preclude the possibility of a fair and impartial proceeding. In such instance, proceedings may be held at the beginning of the fall semester. The newly elected Honor Court will preside over all summer proceedings. In the event that there are an insufficient number of new Honor Court Justices available for the proceedings, the Chief Justice shall fill the vacancies by selecting rising second- and third-year students enrolled in summer classes.



## Section Two: Proceedings Involving a Graduating Senior

If a graduating senior has been charged with an Honor Code violation, there shall be an investigation, Probable Cause Hearing, and Final Hearing within two weeks after graduation. The two-week time limitation for this procedure shall not apply to the extent that any delay is caused solely by the accused. The outgoing Honor Court shall be the court to hear the case but in the event that the Chief Justice, Prosecutor, Defense Counsel or a sufficient number of justices are unavailable, then the vacancies shall be filled first by the newly elected Court and then by second and third year students enrolled in summer courses as chosen by the presiding Chief Justice. The Court will recommend to the Dean of the Law School that the senior's degree be withheld pending completion of these proceedings.

## CHAPTER EIGHTEEN – DEFINITIONS

Wherever used in this Honor Code, the following terms shall have the following respective meanings:

- (a) "Honor Code" or "Code" means all provisions of this Document.
- (b) "Instructor" means any full, associate, assistant, adjunct or part-time professor, student proctor and instructor, practicing attorney conducting instructional programs, and any other person acting in a teaching capacity or in connection with any Law School Related Activity.
- (c) "Intent": An act, either of commission or omission, may be inferred to have occurred "knowingly," "intentionally" or "with intent" if done with such recklessness as to evidence as a conscious or wanton disregard for the consequences thereof.
- (d) "Law School" means the University of Alabama School of Law.
- (e) "Law School Related Activity" includes but is not limited to job interviews, functions organized by the Law School or any student organization established thereunder; and any activity in the Law School building or the immediately surrounding grounds.
- (f) "Lying, Cheating or Stealing" means all acts of the general nature described by the respective terms, as contained in Webster's Dictionary (3d ed.).
- (g) "Plagiarism" as defined by the Legal Writing Institute and as adopted by this Honor Code, is the "taking of the literary property of another, passing it off as one's own without appropriate attribution, and reaping from its use any benefit from an academic institution." Malicious or deceitful intent is not required to commit plagiarism. In light of course requirements, plagiarism may include any work submitted to a professor in a course for credit (regardless of whether the paper itself is graded) and may include work submitted as a draft as well as work submitted as a final product. Plagiarism may also occur in work submitted to other students as part of the requirements in a course for credit.
- (h) "Probable Cause" means a reasonable ground to suspect that a person has committed or is committing a violation.
- (i) "Student," "Students," and "Law Students" refer to all students admitted to and enrolled in the School of Law, including transferring, transient, auditing, visiting, or part-time students from any other school.
- (j) "Student Honor Court," also referred to as the "Honor Court" or "Court," means the court established pursuant to the provisions of Article VI of the Constitution of the Student Bar Association of the University of Alabama School of Law ("SBA Constitution").

- (k) “Student Honor Court Assistant Defense Counsel,” also referred to as the “Assistant Defense Counsel,” means the Student Bar Association Court Assistant Defense Counsel established pursuant to the provisions of Article VI, Section 8 of the SBA Constitution.
- (l) “Student Honor Court Assistant Prosecutor,” also referred to as the “Assistant Prosecutor,” means the Student Bar Association Court Assistant Prosecutor established pursuant to the provisions of Article VI, Section 6 of the SBA Constitution.
- (m) “Student Honor Court Defense Counsel,” also referred to as “Defense Counsel,” means the Student Bar Association Court Defense Counsel established pursuant to the provisions of Article VI, Section 7 of the SBA Constitution.
- (n) “Student Honor Court Prosecutor,” also referred to as the “Prosecutor,” means the Student Bar Association Court Prosecutor established pursuant to the provisions of Article VI, Section 5 of the SBA Constitution.
- (o) “Vice Dean” means the person holding the office of Vice Dean of the Law School. If at any time there is no position at the Law School of Vice Dean, the duties of the Vice Dean referred to in the Code shall be undertaken by the designate of the Dean of the Law School.

Approved by the Student Bar Association Senate and by the Law School Faculty, April 14, 1986.  
Amended by the Student Bar Association Senate, April 24, 2002. Amended by the Student Bar Association Senate, March 12, 2008. Amended by the Student Bar Association Senate, December 3, 2008. Amended by the Student Bar Association Senate, August 18, 2010.

## APPENDIX B

### EXPERIENCES OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION STUDENTS SURVEY

## 1. Informed Consent (PART 1 OF STUDY)

The University of Alabama  
INFORMED CONSENT

FOR QUESTIONS ABOUT THE RESEARCH CONTACT Nathaniel J. Bray, the Department of Educational Leadership, Policy, and Technology Studies at 205-348-1159 or by email, [nbray@bamaed.ua.edu](mailto:nbray@bamaed.ua.edu). This consent explains the research study. Please read it carefully and ask your instructor or Nathaniel Bray any questions about anything you do not understand (may be done via email). If you do not have questions now, you may ask later.

If you have questions or complaints about your rights as a research participant, call Ms. Tanta Myles, the Research Compliance Officer of the University at 205-348-8461.

You may also ask questions, make a suggestion, or file complaints and concerns through the IRB Outreach Website at [http://osp.ua.edu/site/PRCO\\_Welcome.html](http://osp.ua.edu/site/PRCO_Welcome.html). After you participate, you are encouraged to complete the survey for research participants that is online there, or you may the investigator for a copy of it.

**PURPOSE:** You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by David M. Aurich, from The University of Alabama, Department of Educational Leadership, Policy, and Technology Studies. I hope to learn about how students in professional degrees interact with each other within academic contexts. You have been selected as a possible participant in this study because you are currently enrolled in the School of Law at the University of Alabama.

**PROCEDURES & TIME COMMITMENT:** This study is completely voluntary. The purpose of this questionnaire is to assess your perceptions of your academic environment. You may complete the questionnaire from any location you choose, provided an internet connection is available. You will also be asked some demographic information relating to you personally such as your age, gender, and your level of education. Completing these surveys should take no longer than 15-20 minutes. You will have the opportunity to learn about the data analysis and results if you wish.

**CONFIDENTIALITY:** The surveys are strictly confidential and there will not be any way to identify you with your responses to either the questionnaires or the demographic questions. All responses will be used for data analysis and archival purposes only. To further ensure confidentiality, all data will be kept in a locked cabinet in 324 Carmichael Hall at the University of Alabama.

**YOUR PARTICIPATION:** Your participation in this study is voluntary. You may refuse to participate or withdraw from the study at any time.

**RISKS AND BENEFITS:** There are no potential risks to your participation in this research. You currently possess the necessary skills needed for participation. The benefits which may reasonably be expected to result from this study are the opportunity to further the research on social and political reasoning.

**PARTICIPANT STATEMENT:** I have read the explanation provided to me. I have had all my questions answered to my satisfaction, and I voluntarily agree to participate in this study. I have been given a copy of this consent form. Please indicate your consent by checking one of the following options.

### 1. Please indicate consent:

☐

## 2. MD scale

This survey is part of an investigation of the opinion(s) of professional education students concerning a variety of social issues. You will probably find that you agree with some of the statements and disagree with others, to varying extents. Please indicate your reaction to each statement by choosing the answer that best fits your attitude. Remember that this survey is anonymous. There will be no way to determine your identity.

### 2. It is alright to fight to protect your friends.

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

### 3. Hitting and shoving someone is just a way of joking.

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

### 4. Damaging some property is no big deal when you consider that others are beating people up.

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

### 5. A person in a gang should not be blamed for the trouble the gang causes.

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**6. If people are living under bad conditions they cannot be blamed for behaving aggressively.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**7. It is okay to tell small lies because they don't really do any harm.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**8. Some people deserve to be treated like animals.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**9. If students fight and misbehave on campus, it is usually the school's fault.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**10. It is alright to beat someone who bad mouths your friends.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**11. To hit obnoxious friends is just giving them "a lesson."**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**12. Stealing some money is not too serious compared to those who steal a lot of money.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**13. A student who only suggests breaking rules should not be blamed if other students go ahead and do it.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**14. If students are not disciplined for their behavior then they should not be blamed for their behavior.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**15. Students do not mind being made fun of because it shows an interest in them.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**16. It is okay to treat somebody badly who behaved in an underhanded way.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**17. If students are careless where they leave their things it is their own fault if they get stolen.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**18. It is alright to fight when your group's honor is threatened.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**19. Taking someone's car without their permission is just "borrowing it."**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**20. It is okay to insult a student because fighting him/her is worse.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree



**21. If a group decides together to do something harmful it is unfair to blame any one person in the group for it.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**22. Students cannot be blamed for using bad language when all their friends do it.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**23. Joking with someone does not really hurt them.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**24. Someone who is obnoxious does not deserve to be treated like a human being.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**25. People who get mistreated usually do things to deserve it.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**26. It is alright to lie to keep your friends out of trouble.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**27. It is not a bad thing to "get high" once in a while.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**28. Compared to the illegal things people do, taking some things from a store without paying for them is not very serious.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**29. It is unfair to blame a student who had only a small part in the harm caused by a group.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**30. Students cannot be blamed for misbehaving if their friends pressured them to do it.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**31. Insults among friends do not hurt anyone.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**32. Some people have to be treated roughly because they lack feelings that can be hurt.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**33. Students are not at fault for when they get in trouble if their parents force them too much.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

### 3. Austin and Patrick Scenario

The following describes an often reported occurrence in competitive professional academic programs. Please read the scenario and answer the following questions as if you had experienced the situation directly.

#### 34. Austin and Patrick

**During a study session in the library, Austin and his group are approached by Patrick, a fellow classmate. Patrick sort of has the reputation for being a lone wolf; not many people seem to know much about him since he prefers to study alone. He seems harmless enough, so when Patrick offers to trade some outlines with the group that he had prepared, in exchange for ones he did not have, the group agreed.**

**The next day in class, the professor began asking questions about the material that was covered in the briefs that Patrick had traded with the group. The professor called on Austin's group to present their material, but what quickly became evident was that the briefs Patrick had supplied to the group were completely off base. Key points were missing, explanations of the case were incorrect, and given their inability to respond, Austin and his group were kicked out class by the professor for being unprepared.**

**After the group exits the classroom, Patrick raises his hand to respond to the original line of questions from the professor. However, he begins to read his own prepared brief, which is clearly not the same one he had supplied to Austin and the group. After hearing of this, Austin begins to wonder if Patrick had given them incorrect briefs on purpose.**

**How serious is Patrick's action?**

- ☐ Not serious
- ☐ Somewhat serious
- ☐ Serious
- ☐ Very Serious

**35. In your experience is Patrick's action a common practice?**

- ☐ Not Common
- ☐ Somewhat Common
- ☐ Common
- ☐ Very Common

**36. Is this an incident that you would report to the honor court?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

**37. Who is to blame in this situation?**

- ☐ Austin and the group
- ☐ Patrick
- ☐ No one is to blame

#### 4. AAI Scale

The purpose of this survey is to determine your opinion on academic integrity in professional education programs. For the purpose of this section, academic integrity is defined as lying, cheating, or stealing as pursuant to the institutional Honor Code of the host site. Violations of academic integrity make take place inside or outside of the classroom, on or off campus, and may be directed or not directed to another student. Remember that this survey is anonymous. There will be no way to determine your identity.

**38. I value the honor code in my program.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**39. The faculty enforce the honor code in my program.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**40. The students enforce the honor code in my program.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**41. The honor code in my program is symbolic and does not deter cheating.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**42. Definitions of violations of the honor code are clear and easy to understand.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**43. The Honor Court in my program is effective at adjudicating cases.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**44. There are ways of getting around the honor code in my program.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**45. Cheating would be justified if it helps your rank within your class**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**46. Cheating is just another way of learning.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**47. Using someone else's outline is not as bad when you consider that some people are plagiarizing.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**48. It is the professor's responsibility to catch those who cheat.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**49. Cheating is just what you do when you're in a competitive program like mine, it is tradition.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**50. No one ever gets caught cheating, so I will not ever get caught cheating.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

**51. I see my classmates as my competition for the top spots in my class.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree



**52. Cheating is ok because the program is too hard.**

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

## 5. AAB Scale

The following statements describe various methods used by students to gain advantage over other students. For these statements, please recall behaviors that have occurred during the previous academic semester. Remember that this survey is anonymous. There will be no way to determine your identity.

**53. I know someone personally who has used used unauthorized materials on an examination (i.e., crib sheets, notes, outlines):**

- ☐ Yes, more than once
- ☐ Yes, once
- ☐ No, never

**54. How would/did you judge the seriousness of the action?**

- ☐ Very Serious
- ☐ Serious
- ☐ Somewhat Serious
- ☐ Not Serious

**55. I know someone personally who has used "prepared" examination materials, such as a blue book with notes and outlines already in it, on an examination**

- ☐ Yes, more than once
- ☐ Yes, once
- ☐ No, never

**56. How would/did you judge the seriousness of the action?**

- ☐ Very Serious
- ☐ Serious
- ☐ Somewhat Serious
- ☐ Not Serious

**57. I know someone personally who has "recycled" academic materials (i.e., submitting the same paper or assignment for multiple classes)**

- ☐ Yes, more than once
- ☐ Yes, once
- ☐ No, never

**58. How would/did you judge the seriousness of the action?**

- ☐ Very Serious
- ☐ Serious
- ☐ Somewhat Serious
- ☐ Not Serious

**59. I know someone personally who has gained unauthorized information about an Instructor's exam, prior to the exam.**

- ☐ Yes, more than once
- ☐ Yes, once
- ☐ No, never

**60. How would/did you judge the seriousness of the action?**

- ☐ Very Serious
- ☐ Serious
- ☐ Somewhat Serious
- ☐ Not Serious

**61. I know someone personally who has used a test file or outline bank.**

- ☐ Yes, more than once
- ☐ Yes, once
- ☐ No, never

**62. How would/did you judge the seriousness of the action?**

- ☐ Very Serious
- ☐ Serious
- ☐ Somewhat Serious
- ☐ Not Serious

**63. I know someone personally who has used "commercial outlines" (i.e., outlines produced by third party companies).**

- ☐ Yes, more than once
- ☐ Yes, once
- ☐ No, never

**64. How would/did you judge the seriousness of the action?**

- ☐ Very Serious
- ☐ Serious
- ☐ Somewhat Serious
- ☐ Not Serious

**65. I know someone personally who has given or received unauthorized assistance from another student during an exam**

- ☐ Yes, more than once
- ☐ Yes, once
- ☐ No, never

**66. How would/did you judge the seriousness of the action?**

- ☐ Very Serious
- ☐ Serious
- ☐ Somewhat Serious
- ☐ Not Serious

**67. I know someone personally who has plagiarized:**

- ☐ Yes, more than once
- ☐ Yes, once
- ☐ No, never

**68. How would/did you judge the seriousness of the action?**

- ☐ Very Serious
- ☐ Serious
- ☐ Somewhat Serious
- ☐ Not Serious

**69. I know someone personally who has used materials specifically excluded or prohibited for use by students:**

- ☐ Yes, more than once
- ☐ Yes, once
- ☐ No, never

**70. How would/did you judge the seriousness of the action?**

- ☐ Very Serious
- ☐ Serious
- ☐ Somewhat Serious
- ☐ Not Serious

**71. I know someone personally who has engaged in activities or behaviors specifically prohibited by the Honor Code and/or Instructors:**

- ☐ Yes, more than once
- ☐ Yes, once
- ☐ No, never

**72. How would/did you judge the seriousness of the action?**

- ☐ Very Serious
- ☐ Serious
- ☐ Somewhat Serious
- ☐ Not Serious

**73. I know someone personally who has engaged in coercive or fraudulent behavior on behalf of themselves or others:**

- ☐ Yes, more than once
- ☐ Yes, once
- ☐ No, never

**74. How would/did you judge the seriousness of the action?**

- ☐ Very Serious
- ☐ Serious
- ☐ Somewhat Serious
- ☐ Not Serious

**75. I know of students who purposely mishandle academic materials to prevent others from making progress:**

- ☐ Yes, more than once
- ☐ Yes, once
- ☐ No, never

**76. How would/did you judge the seriousness of the action?**

- ☐ Very Serious
- ☐ Serious
- ☐ Somewhat Serious
- ☐ Not Serious

**77. I know of students who purposely pass off incomplete or incorrect work (i.e., study guides, case briefs, chapter outlines, etc) to group members in an attempt to hinder the progress of other group members:**

- ☐ Yes, more than once
- ☐ Yes, once
- ☐ No, never

**78. How would/did you judge the seriousness of the action?**

- ☐ Very Serious
- ☐ Serious
- ☐ Somewhat Serious
- ☐ Not Serious

**79. I know of students of purposely tamper with electronic or technological devices (i.e., laptops, tablet PCs) to hinder academic progress of others:**

- ☐ Yes, more than once
- ☐ Yes, once
- ☐ No, never

**80. How would/did you judge the seriousness of the action?**

- ☐ Very Serious
- ☐ Serious
- ☐ Somewhat Serious
- ☐ Not Serious

**81. I know of students who steal academic materials (i.e., notebooks, text books, outlines, notes, etc.) from other students in order to hinder academic progress:**

- ☐ Yes, more than once
- ☐ Yes, once
- ☐ No, never

**82. How would/did you judge the seriousness of the action?**

- ☐ Very Serious
- ☐ Serious
- ☐ Somewhat Serious
- ☐ Not Serious

**83. I know of students who purposely withhold information (i.e. notes, outlines, case briefs) from other students:**

- ☐ Yes, more than once
- ☐ Yes, once
- ☐ No, never

**84. How would/did you judge the seriousness of the action?**

- ☐ Very Serious
- ☐ Serious
- ☐ Somewhat Serious
- ☐ Not Serious

**85. I know of students who "mutilate" (i.e., tearing out pages from notebooks, textbooks, or study guides, etc.) the academic materials of other students:**

- ☐ Yes, more than once
- ☐ Yes, once
- ☐ No, never

**86. How would/did you judge the seriousness of the action?**

- ☐ Very Serious
- ☐ Serious
- ☐ Somewhat Serious
- ☐ Not Serious

**87. I know of students who "deface" (i.e., using markers to black out sections of text or scratch out sections of text, etc.) academic materials to hinder the academic progress of others**

- ☐ Yes, more than once
- ☐ Yes, once
- ☐ No, never

**88. I know of students who hide materials (i.e., journals, textbooks, library books, study guides) from other students so as to hinder the academic progress of others:**

- ☐ Yes, more than once
- ☐ Yes, once
- ☐ No, never

**89. How would/did you judge the seriousness of the action?**

- ☐ Very Serious
- ☐ Serious
- ☐ Somewhat Serious
- ☐ Not Serious

**90. I know of students who are unwilling to share their academic materials or resources with other students:**

- ☐ Yes, more than once
- ☐ Yes, once
- ☐ No, never

**91. How would/did you judge the seriousness of the action?**

- ☐ Very Serious
- ☐ Serious
- ☐ Somewhat Serious
- ☐ Not Serious

**92. I am personally aware that violations of the honor code happen in my program:**

- ☐ Yes, more than once
- ☐ Yes, once
- ☐ No, never

**93. How would/did you judge the seriousness of the action?**

- ☐ Very Serious
- ☐ Serious
- ☐ Somewhat Serious
- ☐ Not Serious



**94. I know someone personally who has violated the honor code in my program:**

- ☐ Yes, more than once
- ☐ Yes, once
- ☐ No, never

**95. How would/did you judge the seriousness of the action?**

- ☐ Very Serious
- ☐ Serious
- ☐ Somewhat Serious
- ☐ Not Serious

## 6. Demographics

In order to help give us context to your answers, please provide some information in the following three items. Remember that this survey is anonymous. There will be no way to determine your identity.

### 96. What is your gender?

- ☐ Male  
☐ Female

### 97. What year in Law School are you?

- ☐ IL (First Year)  
☐ IIL (Second Year)  
☐ IIIL (Third Year)

### 98. What is your age?