An Empirical Assessment of Academic Dishonesty Codes

David McClough
Ohio Northern University
525 S. Main St., Ada
OH 45810, USA

Jeffery Heinfeldt
Randolph College
2500 Rivermont Ave., Lynchburg
VA24503, USA

Abstract

Honor codes and modified honor codes can be effective at reducing academic dishonesty in institutions of higher learning. In the absence of an honor code, students may be subject to a code of academic conduct. This study compares self-reporting of academic dishonesty by undergraduate students subject to separate codes of academic conduct at one institution. Survey results and empirical findings reveal that students subject to a more rigorous academic code of conduct expanded to include a professional code of conduct report cheating more overall, however, the analysis reveals a distinction between cheating in-class and out-of-class. Open-ended responses suggest that academic dishonesty outside the classroom is motivated by helping others and learning, two objectives elsewhere typically regarded positively.

Keywords: Academic Dishonesty, Higher Education, Academic Code of Conduct, Academic Honor Society

1. Introduction

Academic dishonesty remains fertile ground for academic research. Studies assess prevalence, motivation, as well as student and faculty perceptions and attitudes of academic dishonesty. In recent decades, research has examined the effectiveness of academic honor codes. Further research may appear futile given the prevalence and apparent acceptance of dishonest behavior celebrated in nearly every sphere of society including sport, commerce, law, politics, and relationships.

This study uses survey data to confirm the pervasiveness of academic dishonesty on one campus and finds that a separate more rigorous academic code of conduct is not associated with less self-reported academic dishonesty. Indeed, the empirical analysis reveals weak evidence suggesting that students subject to the more rigorous code of conduct engage academic dishonesty more, notably outside the classroom.

2. Literature Review

Survey research documents the persistence of academic dishonesty (Drake, 1941; Goldsen, 1960;Baird, 1980;Sierles *et al.*, 1980; Jendrek, 1989;Graham*et al.*, 1994;Slobogin, 2002;McCabe, 2005).A common research approach requests students to identify behaviors of academic dishonesty (Hollinger & Lanza-Kaduce,1996; Jordan,2001). Despite studies revealing a rising proportion of students admitting to cheating over time, Scheers & Dayton (1987) employed a randomized response technique attributed to Warner (1965) to determine that survey respondents underreport cheating. To summarize, survey results vary based on the methodological approach and the definition of cheating yet reveal the pervasiveness of academic dishonesty.

Evidence suggests that honor codes, pledges, and statements are often associated with reporting of reduced cheating (McCabe & Trevino, 1993, 1996; McCabe *et al.*, 1999; McCabe 2005; McCabe &Pavela, 2005; Burrus *et al.*, 2007; Schwartz*et al.*, 2013). Introducing and strengthening an honor code can reduce academic dishonesty in a relatively short period of timeand increase the faculty commitment necessary for an effective honor code (Canning, 1956; Burrus*et al.*, 2015). Rather than comparing institutions with and without an honor code, Barnard-Brak*et al.*(2013) employed an experimental design to contrast honor codesand instructor-implemented measures to find that verbal reprimand and grade reduction by the instructor may be more effective than an honor code.

Honor codes typically share a combination of characteristics including: an honor pledge, a peer-reporting obligation, a student-run adjudication system, and a requirement that infractions are sent to the judiciary body rather than addressed directly with the student (Tatum & Schwartz, 2017).McCabe and Trevino (1993) suggested that honor codes contribute to increased integrity by clarifying the definition of academic dishonesty and expectations of appropriate behavior. Some institutions go so far as to prohibit faculty presence during exams to demonstrate the commitment to student obligation and to reinforce the expectation of integrity.

Hamilton College requires that students who witness cheating tap their pencil on the desk to notify the students in the room that they are being cheated, while the code at Haverford College requires students to write an apology distributed through email to the campus community (Cheung, 2014). Academic dishonesty, however, is not limited to classroom activity, so when academic dishonesty occurs outside the classroom, there is no one to tap or hear the pencil.

Traditional honor codes may be difficult to implement at large, public universities (McCabe et al., 2002), although exceptions exist (Fleischmann, 2006; Cheung, 2014). Modified honor codes maintain student involvement in adjudication, but do not typically require student reporting and may permit faculty to address some violations (Tatum & Schwartz, 2017). McCabe*et al.* (2002) examined the effect of modified honor codes at thirty-one colleges to find evidence that modified honor codes can be effective and represent an alternative to no honor code. In the absence of an institutional honor code, evidence suggests that a classroom honor code may reduce cheating (Konheim-Kalkstein *et al.*, 2008).

A body of research focuses on students enrolled in specific majors or programs associated with health-related professions and occupations (Brooks *et al.*, 1981;LaDuke, 2013; Klocko, 2014; Krueger, 2014; Mabins*et al.*, 2014). Professional and occupational programs relating to the provision of health services may introduce and reference oaths or codes of conduct emphasizing the significant responsibility of the profession or occupation in service to society. Brooks *et al.* (1981) surveyed medical students to find that 78 percent of respondents agreed that the honor code typifies the ideals and standards of the medical profession.

This study contributes to the literature by comparing self-reported academic dishonesty by undergraduate students subject to separate codes of academic conduct at a single institution. The university's code applies to students enrolled in three colleges and an expanded code applies to the students enrolled in only onecollege within the university. At issue is whether students subject to the enhanced code of conduct report less academic dishonesty.

3. Research question and hypotheses

The opportunity to conduct a natural experiment exploiting the presence of two distinct codes of student academic conduct on a college campus prompts this investigation. The research question asks whether the annual requirement by one of four colleges for students to sign a more rigorous and expanded Code of Ethical and Professional Conduct (CEPC) is associated with reporting less academic dishonesty relative to students who are subject only to the university's Code of Student Academic Conduct (CSAC). According to the university handbook, the university policy is the minimum standard, however colleges may implement more rigorous standards. Only students enrolled in the College of Pharmacy are subject to the CEPC. Students enrolled in the College of Arts and Science, the College of Business, and the College of Engineering are subject only to the university's CSAC.

This study tests the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1:Students required to sign the expanded Code of Ethical and Professional Conduct acknowledge cheating less than students subject only to the Code of Student Academic Conduct.

Hypothesis 2: Students required annually to sign the expanded Code of Ethical and Professional Conduct acknowledge providing and receiving less unauthorized assistance than students subject only to the Code of Student Academic Conduct.

Hypothesis 3: Students required annually to sign the expanded Code of Ethical and Professional Conduct acknowledge fewer behaviors associated with academic dishonesty than students subject only to the Code of Student Academic Conduct.

4. Data and Survey Results

A survey was administered to undergraduate students enrolled in a small, private university located in the Midwest to assess the prevalence of academic dishonesty. Administration of the survey resulted in a sample of 275 completed surveys, which represents 12.28 percent of the undergraduate population of the university. The overall response rate of the survey was 98.92 percent. To encourage respondents to report honestly about dishonest behavior, the development and administration of the survey emphasized anonymity. Rather than use an online survey that retains an identifying address, all surveys were completed using paper and pencil. There was no way for the researchers to match a completed survey with a student.

The sample is 52.4 percent male, compared to 50 percent of total enrollment. The survey includes responses from each of the four undergraduate colleges: College of Arts and Sciences (22.0 percent), College of Business Administration (38.8 percent), College of Engineering (16.4 percent) and the College of Pharmacy (22.8 percent).The sample includes freshmen (28.5 percent), sophomores (25.1 percent), juniors (29.6 percent), and seniors (16.9 percent). Due to rounding, the reported percentages do not add to 100 percent.

In addition to questions pertaining to gender, class year, and college of enrollment, the survey asks two questions directly referring to cheating and four questions that refer to unauthorized assistance in and out of the classroom. A third battery of questions asks respondents to identify specific behaviors from a list of thirteen behaviors. Included among the behavior questions are three behaviors that are not obvious examples of academic dishonesty. These questions are designed to impose greater cognitive engagement by respondents when assessing each behavior. In effect, the survey includes ten questions specific to behaviors associated with academic dishonesty. The survey asked students to respond "Yes" (engaged behavior at least once) or "No" (never engaged behavior) to all thirteen behaviour questions.

Three of the remaining ten questions refer to behaviors that are not viewed universally as academic dishonesty. Specifically, 43 percent of the sample acknowledges access to and use of a test file, while 50.4 percent provided graded work to others, and 53.3 percent received graded work from others. Providing and receiving graded work is a more intimate exchange than using a test file, which is often associated with a membership organization or some other group affiliation. Access to a test file and sharing graded material violate a basic fairness principle when access to graded material is not permitted and made available to all students. Those with access to graded work derive an advantage over students without similar access. It is important to acknowledge that a single college in a university may view certain behaviors differently; however, the survey results indicate that one-quarter to one-third of the pharmacy students did not participate in these behaviors, which is suggestive that the behaviors are not encouraged by the faculty or administration of the college. Table 1 shows the proportion of pharmacy, CEPC, and non-pharmacy, CSAC, students admitting to these behaviors of academic dishonesty.

Using the distinct batteries of questions, aggregate variables are created as measures of academic dishonesty. CHEATALL (94.2 percent) aggregates respondents that acknowledge academic dishonesty with an affirmative response to any question among the three batteries and is therefore the most broadly defined aggregate measure of academic dishonesty. CHEAT (75.3 percent) combines respondents that acknowledge "cheating" when asked directly. UNAUTH (82.9 percent) combines respondents that acknowledge receiving or providing unauthorized assistance and BEHAVE (89.3 percent) reflects the proportion of respondents that admit to at least one recognized behavior of academic dishonesty.

The three aggregate variables reflect proportions ranging from 75.3 percent to 94.2 percent of respondents admitting to academic dishonesty directly or through acknowledgement of a behavior associated with academic dishonesty. The individual magnitudes and the range may reflect unclear expectations and a lack of expectationsof institutions without an honor code (McCabe and Trevino 1993). The proportion of respondents that acknowledge academic dishonesty when asked directly is 75.3 percent, which is comparable to earlier published results (Baird 1980; Slobogin 2002; McCabe 2005). The empirical component of this study contrasts the responses of the pharmacy students subject to the CSAC and CEPC and the balance of the sample who were subject to only the CSAC.

5. Results

The test statistic used to assess the relationship between categorical variables is the Chi-Square statistic. A statistically significant Chi-Square at the 5 percent level of significance in combination with a negative correlation, Pearson's phi, of moderate to strong association represent empirical support of the hypotheses. The Pearson phi is calculated to assess the correlation of dichotomous variables. The Pearson phi ranges from -1 to 1 which indicates the direction of the association in contrast to the more common Cramer's V which reports the correlation from 0 to 1. The magnitudes of the two measures of association are identical.

To test whether students subject to the CEPC differ significantly from students who are subject to the CSAC, aggregate measures of academic dishonesty (CHEAT, UNAUTH, BEHAVE)are constructed from each of the three batteries of questions. Only students enrolled in the pharmacy college are subject to the CEPC, so the categorical variable, PHARM, identifies these students. Separate cross-tabulations are performed using each of the aggregate measures with PHARM to determine if there is a statistically significant relationship.Results is reported in Table 1.

Table 1: Survey Results – College of Pharmacy vs. Other Colleges

Variable	Pharmacy	Other	Chi-Square	Phi	p-value
CHEAT	83.6%	72.9%	2.925	0.103	0.087*
UNAUTH	80.3%	83.6%	0.369	-0.037	0.544
BEHAVE	90.2%	89.1%	0.812	0.014	0.812
CHEAT out of class	83.6%	72.0%	3.392	0.111	0.066*
UAUTHREC out of class	59.0%	62.1%	0.197	-0.027	0.657
UAUTHPROV out of class	73.8%	75.7%	0.095	-0.019	0.758
CHEAT in class	21.3%	28.0%	1.101	-0.063	0.294
UAUTHREC in class	18.0%	25.2%	1.364	-0.070	0.243
UAUTHPROV in class	19.7%	42.5%	10.581	-0.196	0.001***
UAUTH REC in & out class	62.3%	67.3%	0.529	-0.044	0.467
UAUTH PROV in & out class	73.8%	79.0%	0.744	-0.052	0.388
HONOR SOCIETY	41.7%	29.5%	3.124	0.110	0.077*
PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION	67.8%	39.5%	14.688	0.238	0.000***
COPY	63.9%	60.0%	0.307	0.034	0.579
PLAGIARISM/FAILURE TO CITE	26.2%	25.1%	0.031	0.011	0.861
COMPLETED BY OTHER	6.6%	12.4%	1.628	-0.078	0.202
PROVIDED ANSWERS TO OTHERS	57.4%	61.1%	0.279	-0.032	0.597
USED “TEST FILE”	68.9%	35.5%	21.416	0.281	0.000***
WROTE ANSWERS ON ARM, DESK, ETC.	4.9%	12.3%	2.724	-0.100	0.099*
PROVIDED GRADED WORK TO OTHER	72.1%	44.1%	14.899	0.234	0.000***
RECEIVED GRADED WORK FROM OTHER	75.4%	46.9%	15.431	0.238	0.000***
UTILIZED ELECTRONIC DEVICE	13.7%	20.9%	2.732	-0.100	0.098*
ALTERED RESPONSE AFTER GRADED	14.8%	14.2%	0.011	0.006	0.916

* Statistically significant at the 10 percent level
** Statistically significant at the 5 percent level
*** Statistically significant at the 1percent level

A cross tabulation using CHEAT and a categorical variable identifying pharmacy students, PHARM, generates a Chi-Square value of 2.925, which is not statistically significant at the 5 percent level of significance, however, the p-value (.087) is significant at the 10 percent level of significance. Of note, the correlation (phi = .103) fails to support hypothesis #1. The negligible positive correlation indicates that a higher proportion of pharmacy students directly admit to cheating as compared to the rest of the students. Similar analyses are conducted using aggregate measures for unauthorized assistance, UNAUTH, and behaviors associated with academic dishonesty, BEHAVE. In both cases neither result is statistically significant at a conventional level of significance. These results indicate that the students subject to the college’s expanded CEPC do not report less academic dishonesty compared to students who are subject to the university’s CSAC.

A series of cross tabulations using components of the two aggregate measures, CHEAT and UNAUTH, provides additional insight. With two exceptions, pharmacy students are not statistically different from students from the three other colleges. The first exception is that pharmacy students differ from their peers in that a larger proportion (83.6 percent) admits to cheating out of class compared to colleagues (72 percent) across campus. The Chi-Square statistic, 3.392, approaches statistical significance at the 5 percent level (p = .066). The positive value of the correlation (phi = .111) fails to provide support for the hypothesis that the CEPC is associated with less cheating. As before, the positive correlation indicates that a higher proportion of pharmacy students admit to cheating out of class compared to all other students.

Students subject to the CEPC report providing less unauthorized assistance in class compared to peers in other colleges. The Chi-Square statistic, 10.581, is statistically significant (p = .001), and, although weak in magnitude, the negative correlation, phi =-.196, supports hypothesis #2. The battery of questions examining specific behaviors reveals some support of hypothesis #3. There is no statistical difference or notable correlation between CEPC and CSAC students with regard to copying, plagiarism, having someone complete an assignment, providing answers to

others, and altering graded work to secure additional credit. These results fail to supporthypothesis #3 that the CEPC will be associated with reduced behaviors of academic dishonesty. However, CEPC students differ from their CSAC classmates at the 10 percent level of significance in that fewer report using unauthorized electronic devices and writing answers on their person (e.g. arm) or equivalent (e.g. desk). In both cases the negligible negative correlation (phi = -.100) offers very limited support for the hypothesis. In contrast, statistically significant larger proportions of CEPC students report use of a "test file," providing graded work, and receiving graded work. Each of the Chi-Square results is significant at the 1 percent level, despite weak correlation of the positive phi correlation. These results fail to support hypothesis #3 that the CEPC will be associated with reduced behaviours of academic dishonesty.

Table 2: Chi-Square Results -- Honor Society Membership

Variable	Honor Society Member				
	No	Yes	Chi-Square	Phi	p-value
CHEAT	74.4%	79.8%	0.809	0.058	0.346
UNAUTH	83.0%	82.1%	0.026	-0.010	0.871
BEHAVE	90.9%	84.5%	2.290	-0.094	0.130
CHEAT out class	73.9%	78.6%	0.679	0.051	0.410
UNAUTHREC out class	65.3%	54.8%	2.699	-0.102	0.100*
UNAUTHPROV out class	75.6%	73.8%	0.094	-0.019	0.759
CHEAT in class	26.1%	28.6%	0.171	0.026	0.679
UNAUTHREC in class	21.4%	24.4%	0.286	-0.033	0.593
UNAUTHPROV in class	36.4%	36.9%	0.007	0.005	0.932
UNAUTH REC in & out class	69.9%	59.5%	2.742	-0.103	0.098*
UNAUTH PROV in & out class	77.8%	76.2%	0.088	-0.018	0.766

* Statistically significant at the 10 percent level

In addition to asking respondents to identify their college of enrollment, the survey asked respondents to indicate whether they are members of an honor society (e.g. Rho Chi) or a professional association (e.g. American Pharmacist Association). The college's website reveals that there are fourteen student organizations in some way specific to pharmacy students. A review of each student organization description and website, when available, reveals that two organizations appear to be honor societies while eight of the organizations appear to be professional associations. Not one professional association website refers to a code of professionalism, conduct, ethics or integrity; however, the honor society websites mention "ethical character" and "ethical standards."Given the "ethical" requirement of honor society membership, we examine the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 4: Members of an honor society acknowledge cheating less than non-members.

Hypothesis 5: Members of an honor society acknowledge providing and receiving less unauthorized assistance than non-members.

Hypothesis 6: Members of an honor society acknowledge fewer behaviors associated with cheating than non-members.

Cross-tabulations comparing honor society membership with various measures of academic dishonesty reveal that members of an honor society are not statistically different from non-members. Only two comparisons relating to receiving unauthorized assistance generate Chi-Square values significant at the 10 percent level, but the corresponding negative correlations are in the range considered negligible. These results suggest that there is little to no difference in academic dishonesty between non-members and members of an honor society. Table 3reports the results.

The analysis reveals that there is no statistical difference in academic dishonesty between non-members and members of an honor society. Might there be an effect on academic dishonesty between honor society members subject to the CSAC compared to honor society members subject to the CEPC? To examine this question, three hypotheses are tested:

Hypothesis 7: Honor society members required annually to sign the expanded Code of Ethical and Professional Conduct acknowledge cheating less than honor society member's subject only to the Code of Student Academic Conduct.

Hypothesis 8: Honor society members required annually to sign the expanded Code of Ethical and Professional Conduct acknowledge providing and receiving less unauthorized assistance than honour society members subject only to the Code of Student Academic Conduct.

Hypothesis 9: Honor society members required annually to sign the expanded Code of Ethical and Professional Conduct acknowledge fewer behaviors associated with cheating than honor society member's subject only to the Code of Student Academic Conduct.

To explore the potential effect of honor society membership, cross-tabulations comparing CSAC and CEPC students are conditioned using honor society membership. Using honor society membership to condition the comparison of CSAC and CEPC students reduces the count in the cells of the contingency table. An implication of the lower counts is lower Chi-Square statistics despite large observed percentage differences. The results reveal that none of the three aggregate measures of academic dishonesty differ among honor society members subject to the CSAC and CEPC. Moreover, each of the correlations using aggregate measures of academic dishonesty and Pharm is negligible. Three defined measures of academic dishonesty are significant at the 10 percent level of significance with corresponding negative correlations between the measure of academic dishonesty and Pharm. As seen in Table 1and again in Table 3, the most prominent statistically significant difference between CSAC and CPEC students is specific to providing unauthorized assistance in class. Whether or not conditioned by honor society membership, the measure is statistically significant (p = .01). The results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: College of Pharmacy vs. Other Colleges -- Conditioned by Honor Society Membership

Variable	Pharmacy	Other	Chi-Square	Phi	p-value
CHEAT	88.0%	76.3%	1.496	0.133	0.221
UNAUTHOR	72.0%	86.4%	0.235	-0.172	0.628
BEHAVE	92.0%	81.4%	1.521	0.135	0.217
CHEAT out class	88.0%	74.6%	1.879	0.150	0.170
UAUTHREC out class	44.0%	59.3%	1.664	-0.141	0.197
UAUTHPROV out class	64.0%	78.0%	1.772	-0.145	0.183
CHEAT in class	20.0%	32.2%	1.281	-0.124	0.258
UAUTHREC in class	8.0%	27.1%	3.812	-0.213	0.051*
UAUTHPROV in class	16.0%	45.8%	6.680	-0.282	0.010***
UAUTH REC in & out class	48.0%	64.4%	1.962	-0.153	0.161
UAUTH PROV in & out class	64.0%	81.4%	2.916	-0.186	0.088*

* Statistically significant at the 10 percent level
** Statistically significant at the 5 percent level
***Statistically significant at the 1 percent level

6. Discussion

The analysis does not reveal that the CEPC has the expected effect as posited in the hypotheses. A growing literature advocates the merits of statistical non-significance in social science research. Ziliak and McCloskey (2008) and Abadie (2020) have advanced understanding of missed opportunity in economics due to a bias toward statistically significant results, while Berkson (1938) addresses the chi square statistic specifically and Andrews and Kasy (2019) examine the implications for academic publishing. The absence of statistical support of the hypotheses suggests that the requirement to sign the more rigorous and expanded code of conduct is not associated with less academic dishonesty when compared to the other colleges. With 80-90 percent of respondents acknowledging academic dishonesty, the authors are compelled to conclude that the CEPC does not have the intended effect of reducing academic dishonesty.

Where statistically significant differences exist, the evidence suggests that CEPC students acknowledge more academic dishonesty out of the classroom than their peers. The relative strength of these findings indicates that admitting to academic dishonesty out of the classroom dominates the overall effect. The mixed results require further research; however, some insight may be gleaned from responses to an open-ended question included as part of the survey. Sixty-two (23 percent) of the completed surveys include a response to the open-ended question. Twelve (19 percent) of the comments come from respondents identifying as Pharmacy majors. The sample is too small to justify a systematic text analysis; however, a cursory review of the responses reveals that five of the twelve open-ended responses refer to helping others or to affecting learning outcomes. The five responses are presented below in no particular order.

1. I think getting old exams quizzes/assignments from students who previously took the course is a way for me to study not an intentional way of cheating.
2. This campus has a very "open" environment based on mutual trust and desire to help one another. It may not always be the moral thing.

3. Trying to help fellow classmates/under classmen by giving resources
4. With Sharing old quizzes I use it more as a study tool like take the test and see how I did what the previous grading method. I ask the instructor questions if Im sopost to do the assyment a cetin way[*sic*].
5. Anything that is "out of class" (arrow pointing up) the chance of cheating. In class work people rarely cheat. old exams + materials give me a better understanding + help me learn

Typically, helping others and efforts to learn are admirable attributes; however, when the behaviors violate an academic code of conduct, the student engages academic dishonesty. While many of the responses to the open-ended question provide more instrumental (e.g. desire for high grades, pressure, low likelihood of detection) justifications for academic dishonesty, it is evident that more virtuous considerations may also motivate violation of the academic codes of conduct. This study cannot determine whether the more virtuous motivations are sincere or whether the explanations are illustrative of neutralizing behavior (Conerud & Rosander, 2009); however, students are aware that helping others and certain behaviors out of class meet the standard of academic dishonesty. The choice may not be difficult, but awareness of the violation reveals that students acknowledge more than one code. Students are simultaneously subject to an academic code of conduct as well as informal expectations assigned or imposed by other students.

The annual requirement to sign the more rigorous and expanded code of conduct may be effective, but the effectiveness is unobserved in the data. Students subject to the CEPC may systematically exhibit greater integrity by answering the questions more truthfully than the students under the CSAC, who may underreport academic dishonesty. If either or both conditions are true, the calculation of the Chi-Square statistic and the p-value will be affected. The data collected for this study does not permit examination of this possibility; however, investigation of this possibility represents an opportunity for further research.

While not tested in this study, the results suggest that clarifying expectations and defining academic dishonesty are of central importance when formulating academic dishonesty policy. This study presents evidence that students subject to the more rigorous and expanded CEPC admit to less “unauthorized” behavior in class, but also admit to more behaviors of academic dishonesty out of the classroom. Further research is needed to understand the observed dissonance between student attitudes and admitted behaviors relating to academic dishonesty.

7. Limitations

The present study relies on a relatively small sample, although comparable and smaller samples are found in the literature (Eberhardt *et al.*, 2003; Williams & Janosik, 2007; Eastman *et al.*, 2008; Jurdi*et al.*, 2011; Trushell & Byrne, 2013; Krueger, 2014). Surveys collecting self-reported information are associated with shortcomings. Respondents do not always answer honestly and may answer questions differently at any given time or on any given day.For example, self-reporting of cheating may differ from actual cheating.

An additional limitation of the survey is the apparent oversampling of pharmacy students who are members of the honor society. According to the description of the honor society, the top twenty percent of students are eligible for the honor society; however, forty percent of the sample of pharmacy students indicates membership in an honor society (Table 1). Table 3 indicates that a higher proportion of pharmacy honor students report cheating when asked directly. If academic dishonesty is concentrated among honor students, then the oversampling of pharmacy honor students will bias the empirical results. Exploring this possibility represents additional research opportunities.

The study does not consider other characteristics that may distinguish students enrolled in the college of pharmacy from other students. The study limits the focus to students subject to two academic codes of conduct reporting academic dishonesty. While the culture of the colleges and self-selection can be expected to affect the results, limiting the study to a single campus controls forvariation that is expected across multiple campuses.

8. Conclusion

This study examines academic dishonesty at an institution with two separate codes of academic conduct. A more rigorous and expanded code of conduct includes a professional code of conduct and applies to students in the college of pharmacy. Students in the three other undergraduate colleges are subject only to the university code of student academic conduct. The empirical results demonstrate that students subject to the more rigorous and expanded code of conduct do not report engaging academic dishonesty less than the students subject only to the university code of conduct. Students subject to the more rigorous and expanded code of conduct notably admit to more academic dishonesty outside the classroom.

Specifically, students acknowledge behaviors associated with helping others and promoting learning, albeit in violation of the academic dishonesty code. While not directly competing, the two academic codes of conduct have indistinguishable effects on academic dishonesty. This study’s findings suggest that the university and college may

benefit by reassessing and realigning the codes of conduct to conform to the cultural norms promoted on campus and in the individual colleges.

9. Literature Cited

Abadie, A. (2020). Statistical non-significance in empirical economics. American Economic Review Insights, 2(2), 193–208.

Andrews, I., &Kasy, M. (2019). Identification of and correction for publication bias. American Economic Review, 109(8), 2766–94.

Baird, J. S. (1980). Current trends in college cheating. Psychology in the Schools, 77(4), 515-522.

Barnard-Brak, L., Schmidt, M.,&Wei, T. (2013). How effective is honor code reporting over instructor-implemented measures? A pilot study. Journal of College and Character, 14(3), 231-240.

Berkson, J. (1938). Some difficulties of interpretation encountered in the application of the chi-square test. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 33(203), 526–536.

Brooks, C. M., Cunningham, R., Hinson, N., Brown, S., & Weaver, B. (1981). Student attitudes toward a medical school honor code. Journal of Medical Education, 56(8), 669-671.

Burrus, R. T., Jones, A. T., SackleyW. H., &Walker, M. (2015). Faculty observable and self-reported responsiveness to academic dishonesty. Administrative Issues Journal, 5(1), 89-104.

Burrus, R. T., Shuhmann, P. W., &McGoldrick, K. (2007). Self-reports of student cheating: Does a definition of cheating matter? Journal of Economic Education, 38(1), 3-16.

Canning, R. R. (1956). Does an honor code reduce classroom cheating? An experimental answer. Journal of Experimental Education,24(4), 291-296.

Cheung, J. April 11, (2014). The fading honor code. The New York Times.[Online] Available: https://www.nytimes.com/2014/04/13/education/edlife/the-fading-honor-code.html

Colnerud, G. & Rosander, M. (2009). Academic dishonesty, ethical norms and learning. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 34(5), 505-517.

Drake, C. A. (1941). Why students cheat. Journal of Higher Education, 12(8), 418-420.

Eastman, K. L., Eastman, J. K., &Iyer, R. (2008). Academic dishonesty: An exploratory study examining whether insurance students are different from other college students. Risk Management and Insurance Review, 11(1), 209-226.

Eberhardt, D., Rice,N., & Smith, L. (2003). Effects of Greek membership on academic integrity, alcohol abuse, and risky sexual behavior at a small college. NASPA Journal, 41(1), 135-146.

Fleischmann, S. (2006). Teaching ethics: More than an honor code. Science and Engineering Ethics, 12(2), 381-389.

Goldsen, R. K., Rosenberg, M., Williams, Jr., R. M., &Suchman, E. A. (Eds.). (1960). What college students think.D. Van Nostrand and Co.

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

Hollinger, R. C. &Lanza-Kaduce, L. (1996). Academic dishonesty and the perceived effectiveness of counter-measures: An empirical survey of cheating at a major public university. NASPA Journal, 33(4), 292-306.

Jendrek, M. P. (1989). Faculty reactions to academic dishonesty.Journal of College Student Development,30(5), 401-406.

Jordan, A. E. (2001). College student cheating: The role of motivation, perceived norms, attitudes, and knowledge of institutional policy. Ethics and Behavior, 11(3), 233-247.

Jurdi, R., Hage,S., &Chow, H. P. H. (2011). Academic dishonesty in the Canadian classroom: Behaviors of a sample of university students. Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 41(3), 1-35.

Klocko, M. N. (2014). Academic dishonesty in schools of nursing: A literature review. Journal of Nursing Education, 53(3), 121-125.

Konheim-Kalkstein, Y. L., Stellmack, M. A., &Shilkey, M. L. (2008). Comparison of honor code and non-honor code classrooms at a non-honor code university.Journal of College and Character, 9(3),1-13.

Krueger, L. (2014). Academic dishonesty among nursing students. Journal of Nursing Education, 53(2), 77-87.

LaDuke, R. D. (2013). Academic dishonesty today, unethical practices tomorrow? Journal of Professional Nursing, 29(6), 402-406.

Mabins, M., Gokun, Y., Ryan, M., & Divine, H. (2014). Pharmacy educators' experience and views on academic dishonesty. Currents in Pharmacy Teaching and Learning, 6(2), 185-193.

McCabe, D. (2005). Levels of cheating and plagiarism remain high. The Center for Academic Integrity. [Online] Available: http://www.academicintegrity.org/cai

McCabe, D., & Pavela.G., March 11, (2005). New honor codes for a new generation. Inside Higher Ed. [Online] Available: https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2005/03/11/new-honor-codes-new-generation

McCabe, D. &Trevino, L. (1993). Academic dishonesty: Honor codes and other contextual influences. Journal of Higher Education, 64(5), 522-538.

McCabe, D. & Trevino, L. (1996). What we know about cheating in college. Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 28(1), 28-33.

McCabe, D., Trevino, L, &Butterfield, K. (1999). Academic integrity in honor code and non-honor code environments.Journal of Higher Education, 70(2), 211-234.

McCabe, D., Trevino, L., &Butterfield, K. (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), 357-378.

Scheers, N. &Dayton, M.(1987). Improved estimation of academic cheating behavior using the randomized response technique. Research in Higher Education, 26(1), 61-69.

Schwartz, B., Tatum, H., &Hageman, M. (2013). College students' perceptions of and responses to cheating at traditional, modified, and non-honor system institutions. Ethics & Behavior, 23(6), 463-476.

Sierles, F., Hendrickx, I, &Circle, S.(1980). Cheating in medical school. Journal of Medical Education, 55(2),124-125.

Slobogin, K. April 5, (2002). Survey: Many students say cheating's OK. CNN.com. [Online] Available: http://www.cnn.com/2002/fyi/teachers.ednews/04/05/highschool.cheating/

Tatum, H.&Schwartz, B. (2017). Honor codes: Evidence based strategies for improving academic integrity. Theory into Practice, 56(2), 129-135.

Trushell, J.& Byrne, K. (2013). Education undergraduates and ICT-enhanced academic dishonesty: A moral panic? British Journal of Educational Technology, 44(1), 6-19.

Warner, S. L. (1965). Randomized response: A survey technique for eliminating evasive answer bias. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 60(309), 63-69.

Williams, A. &Janosik, S.(2007). An examination of academic dishonesty among sorority and non-sorority women. Journal of College Student Development, 48(6), 706-14.

Ziliak, S. &McCloskey, D. (2008). The cult of statistical significance: How the standard error costs us jobs, justice, and lives.University of Michigan Press.