

The Profession

Princeton University Press
Malcolm DeBevoise
41 William Street
Princeton, NJ 08540
Phone: (609) 258-4922
Fax: (609) 258-6305

Routledge
Cecelia Cancellaro
29 W. 35th Street
New York, NY 10001
Phone: (212) 244-3336, ext. 342
Fax: (212) 563-2269

Rowman & Littlefield
Jonathan Sisk
4720 Boston Way
Lanham, MD 20706
Phone: (301) 306-0400
Fax: (301) 459-2118

Sage Publications
Mitch Allen
1630 N. Main Street, Suite 367
Walnut Creek, CA 94596
Phone: (510) 938-7243
Fax: (510) 933-9720

St. Martin's Press
Don Reisman (college)
Simon Winder (scholarly)
175 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10010
Phone: (212) 674-5151
Fax: (212) 420-9314

M.E. Sharpe
Michael Weber
80 Business Park Drive
Armonk, NY 10504
Phone: (914) 273-1800
Fax: (914) 273-2106

University of South Carolina Press
David Caffry

1716 College Street
Columbia, SC 29208
Phone: (803) 777-4859
Fax: (803) 777-0160

Southern Illinois University Press
Richard DeBacher
Box 3697
Carbondale, IL 62901
Phone: (618) 453-6625
Fax: (618) 453-1221

Stanford University Press
Muriel Bell
Stanford, CA 94305
Phone: (415) 725-0824
Fax: (415) 725-3457

Temple University Press
Michael Ames
1601 N. Broad Street, USB 306
Philadelphia, PA 19122
Phone: (215) 787-8787
Fax: (215) 787-4719

University of Texas Press
Theresa May
Box 7819
Austin, TX 78713
Phone: (512) 320-0668
Fax: (512) 471-4278

Transaction Publishers
Irving Louis Horowitz
Rutgers University, Bldg. #4051
New Brunswick, NJ 08903
Phone: (908) 932-2280
Fax: (908) 932-3138

University Press of America
Maureen Muncaster
4720 Boston Way
Lanham, MD 20706
Phone: (301) 306-0400
Fax: (302) 459-2118

West Publishing Co.
Clyde Perlee
P.O. Box 5090
Thousand Oaks, CA 91359
Phone: (818) 707-0026
Fax: (818) 707-7016

Westview Press
Jennifer Knerr
5500 Central Avenue
Boulder, CO 80301
Phone: (303) 444-3541
Fax: (303) 449-3356

University of Wisconsin Press
Barbara Hanrahan
114 N. Murray Street
Madison, WI 53715
Phone: (608) 262-4928
Fax: (608) 262-7560

Yale University Press
John Covell
302 Temple Street
New Haven, CT 06511
Phone: (203) 432-0902
Fax: (203) 432-0948

About the Authors

Christopher J. Kelaher did his undergraduate work at the University of Dayton and received a master's degree in political science from the University of Wisconsin. Edward Artinian has been a member of APSA since 1961; he did his undergraduate work at Brown University and received a master's degree in business from Columbia University.

An Epidemic of Cheating?*

Donald Chisholm, *University of California, Los Angeles*

An essay final exam is given, the exams graded and returned to the students. One, dissatisfied with her grade, steals her roommate's exam, puts the cover from her bluebook on it, and tells the instructor that there must have been an error in the way her grade was recorded.

A student copies an entire article from the *American Political Science Review* and turns it in as his own. The instructor is initially impressed with the paper, but becomes sus-

picious when the student discusses how he computed the tau-beta's.

Each member of a group of five students in one course prepares for a single section of the syllabus, and then trades answers with other members of the group during the final exam.

These tales are true. They happen to come from my experiences at several universities. Unfortunately, these are not rare, isolated occurrences. To judge from reports in the popular

press, we are mired in an ever deepening morass of academic dishonesty. "An Epidemic of College Cheating!" declares one recent article in the *Los Angeles Times*.¹ A second trumpets: "Study Finds Cheating Joins 3 Rs as a Basic College Skill."² The *Chronicle of Higher Education* reports "Survey at Rutgers Suggests that Cheating May Be on the Rise at Large Universities."³ A Maryland university official tells us that "Honesty is becoming a more negoti-

able notion; it's not an absolute today at all."⁴

I personally doubt that we are more awash in dishonesty than our predecessors.⁵ But we don't actually know. Simon would call this an "ill structured" problem, one whose contours we do not understand.

Perhaps we do not like to discuss the issue, let alone deal with it effectively, because we would have to admit that the world does not measure up to the professional myths that we cherish. It costs us emotionally to confront a student we suspect, or know in fact, has cheated in some manner. We might be in error, and if we are correct, students may respond with histrionics, protestations of innocence, accusations of "How can you do this to me?" We can decide it's not worth the cost. Besides, we reason, the students are only hurting themselves.

Moreover, universities and colleges, especially private ones, have a vested interest in *not* talking candidly about the problem of dishonesty. It may reduce their attractiveness to potential students in what has become a highly competitive market. Neither do we teach graduate students about the problem in any systematic way. (But then, we don't do much systematically to educate them in any of the arts of the academic profession.)

One consequence of these factors is that we tend to treat cases individually rather than as instances of types or categories of problems. Faculty do not have a sufficiently elaborated repertoire of response that differentiates among different sorts of dishonest acts and deals with them appropriately. Often we leave the problem to our deans of students.

Why should we care? We have a moral obligation to maintain equity for individual students who do not cheat. Those who behave honestly in our courses deserve no less. There is also defense of the integrity of our institutions: that grades mean something about accomplishment and having gone through a process as important as any final result. It is a curious goal displacement when grades supplant learning. Others may depend on the knowledge generally associated with degrees received by our students. What is more, we are

teaching our students citizenship for their later lives as we convey the substance of our courses.

I proceed from the assumption that dishonesty probably cannot be eliminated, but its incidence can be reduced. Some academic dishonesty is inevitable as is some unemployment, despite our best efforts. We might call this structural dishonesty. I assume, for example, that in every large class one or more students will in some way attempt a dishonest act.

A student brings a grade card to a final exam, with crib notes written so faintly in pencil that they are not visible beyond a distance of a few feet. He is discovered when a teaching assistant follows him and another student observes the first student throwing away the grade card.

The odds are, as for home and auto burglary, that if a student really wants to cheat, he or she will find a way. I see our basic responsibility as making it more difficult for students to cheat, without assuming that we can completely eradicate the problem.

Who and Why

It is my impression that academic dishonesty knows no boundaries with respect to gender,⁶ ethnicity, or social class; that it involves students of the A-/B+ range, those on the cusp of grades sufficient for graduate school admission but who are very concerned about their chances, as well as C-/D+ students. Students involved in sports activities are no more likely to commit dishonest acts than others.⁷ It seems to exist in

advanced undergraduate as well as introductory courses. The population is most probably a mix of first-time offenders and hard-core recidivists, with a floating group of occasional offenders.

Students who "copy" from published work are often unsure of themselves. Lacking self-confidence, they borrow others' work without nefarious intent. Students with a high need for approval are more likely to be dishonest. On the other hand, a negative correlation exists between intelligence and dishonesty. Similarly, those with lower G.P.A.s are more likely to cheat than those with higher. As we would expect, students with greater capacity for moral reasoning are less prone to cheat (Leming 1978); but even among students who recognize and accept general norms of honesty, there are those who believe violation of those norms is justified in certain circumstances, a phenomenon known as "neutralization."⁸ Older students are less likely to cheat than younger ones, irrespective of year in school. And some students come to believe that "everyone does it."⁹

More generally, students may lack knowledge or understanding about what academic dishonesty is, where the boundaries are, how it is defined. Students are taught different, looser standards in high school and have to learn university standards. A significant portion of university students find themselves under family/parental pressure to perform at unrealistic levels beyond their abilities. This seems particularly prevalent among children of immigrants who want so much for their children to succeed in their new home. Parents may implicitly or explicitly condone dishonest behavior.¹⁰ This factor often combines with the desire of some students to gain admission to professional and graduate schools, for which their academic performance is only marginally qualifying. Other students may suffer from poor preparation prior to arrival at the big "U," and find themselves barely keeping their heads above water. As faculty, we tend to underestimate the extent of negative stress for students.¹¹ Unfortunately, a small number of students may develop habitual patterns of dishonest

behavior; instead of establishing good study habits, they invest energy in dishonest schemes of one stripe or another.

Large lecture courses no doubt cause feelings of alienation and hostility; lack of personal ties with the instructor lead to the notion that it does not matter if one cheats or that cheating is appropriate payback for the impersonal quality of instruction, particularly if students perceive the instructor as a poor teacher. The obverse side is that instructors in large lecture courses, even with teaching assistants, may face a difficult time monitoring examinations, especially given the physical layout of many classrooms.

Professors and teaching assistants often neither make clear what constitutes plagiarism (including rules for citation) nor do they call students on this point when they evaluate their papers. This is especially troublesome in introductory courses. These failures do no one any good; the problems are being passed along to someone else. This aspect of the problem may be explained in part by different perception between faculty and students about what constitutes dishonesty. Barnett and Dalton (1981) found consensus between faculty and students on some behaviors and substantial disagreement on others as to what constituted dishonest acts.¹²

Just as some instructors acquire reputations for being easy graders or great lecturers, some are widely and accurately known for failing to police adequately their exams or papers. Then there are the faculty who use the same exam questions year in and year out, or the same paper assignments. Make no mistake about it, even in large public universities, faculty quickly acquire reputations that circulate extensively in the student population. If students believe cheaters are not caught, or that they will not be punished appropriately, the temptation to cheat may prove irresistible. Although punishments for dishonesty are increasing in severity, it is still the case that very few students are expelled, and on most campuses not many are even suspended for a term.¹³

Students cannot fail to be aware of faculty members caught fabricating

research results or plagiarizing the work of others. Sadly, some university professors engage in dishonest research practices, and it becomes public knowledge. One Harvard psychiatrist recently resigned after a faculty group found that he had plagiarized in four articles.¹⁴ Or in the larger society, well known and respected public figures are caught in some dishonest act: Martin Luther King, Jr. plagiarized in his dissertation; Senator Joseph Biden cribbed material for a campaign speech. These role models signal to our stu-

A student graduates from a liberal arts college never having actually written a paper on her own; rather, she either purchased ready-made papers or paid to have them written to her specifications. Her parents knew about the papers and helped her to pay for them.

dents that honesty is a relative, negotiable thing, even for individuals in positions of trust.

Group and peer pressures found in student social organizations appear to contribute to student attitudes about cheating. Many residential social organizations keep extensive files of previous exams and papers for particular courses and instructors. On the face of it, these are only study guides, but they give a distinct advantage to members of those organizations over students who do not have access to those files. When instructors use the same examination questions year after year, the inequity becomes enormous. Social organizations can spawn organized groups of cheating students and may create considerable pressure on their members to participate in dishonest acts. These factors reflect a larger pathology—a corporate attitude that dishonesty is a normal part of college

life.

Finally, there are for-profit paper mills selling papers from their inventory or custom papers written for specific paper assignments in particular courses. Some mills have the temerity to go through university parking lots, placing their advertisements on all automobiles, even those belonging to faculty. They offer one-day turnaround, and accept all major credit cards.¹⁵ While hired papers have probably always existed as a form of cottage industry, written by individual entrepreneurs, the mills make the activity an unacceptable insult to our institutions. That we tolerate their existence must convey to our students that we at least tacitly condone such activities.¹⁶ Particularly vulnerable are international students who are often the target population of the paper mills' marketing departments.

Dimensions of Dishonesty

What forms does academic dishonesty take? Two dimensions of severity suggest themselves: systematic or premeditated versus spur-of-the-moment acts and direct injury to others versus indirect damage.

Systematic and premeditated dishonesty includes:

On in-class examinations:

- a. Cheat sheets brought to exams and all their permutations, such as using crib notes hidden earlier in nearby restrooms, or writing notes on desks prior to the exam, not to mention the old standby of writing notes on one's hand or arm or the top of one's shoes. The high-tech version is to bring to the exam an electronic calculator with relevant formulae pre-programmed into it.
- b. Theft of exams from faculty (or other) offices.
- c. Bringing "cooked" bluebooks with prepared answers or extensive notes to exams.
- d. Group effort on an in-class examination in which division of labor is used to reduce the amount of material for which each student must prepare.
- e. Use of a ringer to take an exam for a student.

- f. Taking an exam late in order to acquire copies of the exam from students who took it at the appointed time.
- g. Altering answers on an exam after it has been graded and resubmitting it for reevaluation.
- h. Use of unauthorized materials in files at residential social organizations, or otherwise gaining access to previous exams not authorized by the instructor.

On take-home examinations:

- a. Theft of time by turning them in late.
- b. Group efforts on take-home examinations where individual work is expected.
- c. Plagiarism.

On papers:

- a. Purchasing stock papers from firms or other students, or commissioning papers written to order.
- b. Using other's work without attribution, e.g., copying from published sources.
- c. Adding items that were not actually used to bibliographical lists.
- d. Turning in the same paper to two different instructors for two different courses, either during the same term or in succeeding terms.
- e. Two students together write one paper and each turns it in to a different teaching assistant in a large lecture course.
- f. Fabricating research results: survey data, experiments, or interviews, for example.
- g. Use of unauthorized materials in paper files at residential social organizations or other unauthorized access to previous papers.

Miscellaneous acts:

- a. Sabotaging another student's lab experiment or computer work, etc.
- b. Theft of reserve reading materials, cutting articles out of journals, etc., in order to deny their use by other students.

Spur of the moment, target of opportunity acts include:

- a. Theft of other students' papers.
- b. Roving eyes during exams; probably the most common form of dishonesty.
- c. Conversation during an exam.

- d. Tolerating or facilitating dishonest behavior by other students; failure to report such activity.
- e. Pretending to have handed in an exam or a paper, then claiming that it must have been lost by the instructor.

Damage done by dishonest acts takes indirect and direct forms. Indirect forms include: the loss of integrity of the institution, its external reputation in the academic community and among the broader public; and the loss of faith of students in the institution, its internal legitimacy, with possible alienation from that institution. Widespread dishonesty encourages the attitude that cheating is acceptable.

A student copies portions of a book, strings them together into a paper, and turns the material in as his own original work.

This becomes an issue of the values we are teaching to students.

Other acts of dishonesty actively and directly injure other students. Theft of other students' papers causes the honesty of innocent students to be questioned and creates anxiety for the victims. Sabotaging others' research or monopolizing course materials does the same. When a course is graded strictly on a curve, as a zero sum game, when some students' grades go up as a result of dishonesty, others are hurt proportionately. My own view is that dishonest acts that directly damage other students are deserving of closer attention and more severe punishment than those which only indirectly hurt others. The same holds true for premeditated versus impromptu acts of dishonesty.

Responses to Dishonesty

There are three basic approaches to dishonesty: enforcement and punishment, education and clarification, and counseling and rehabilitation. We will be most effective using some

combination of the three; the hard part is to find the proper mix.

Prevention, Enforcement, and Punishment

Enforcement and punishment is the approach most of us first think of as a response to cheating. Students must know there will be consequences if they engage in dishonest acts. But one cannot spend all one's time as a police officer. Although enforcement and punishment does work, there is a point of diminishing return—when coercion begins to corrode class morale. At some point we must place a degree of trust in students. It also seems to me that some element of compassion may not be out of line, especially where it appears that the offense resulted more from ignorance than malice.

These qualifications notwithstanding, we must make reasonable efforts to enforce standards of academic honesty. At a minimum, we can reduce the propensity to act dishonestly. As instructors, we need to put more thought and effort into designing and administering exams and papers. Each type of paper assignment or exam presents different opportunities or attractions for dishonesty.¹⁷ Of exams, in-class essays are those on which it is the most difficult to cheat, while multiple-choice or true-false exams are the easiest. Merely electing to use the former is going to preclude some forms of cheating.

For essay exams, one may permit students to bring one page or one 3 × 5 card with notes. Or one may use open-book and open-note exams. To eliminate "cooked" bluebooks, one may supply bluebooks to students at exam time; this is an approach taken by many universities as a matter of general policy. Or you can ask students to bring their own bluebooks, which you collect and pass out in random order. A variation of this is to collect the bluebooks and stamp them with some unusual stamp ("4th Class Printed Material" is my personal favorite); then, of course, you accept only bluebooks so stamped, so that none may be substituted. It is also useful to insist that no pages be pulled out of bluebooks; only intact books will

be accepted. You can require that students start their exams on the second (or whatever) page of the bluebook (alternatively, have them write upside down in the book).

Different versions of the same short-answer or multiple-choice exam can be used, interleaving them so that no two people sitting next to each other have the same version. This requires only varying the order of questions and, with word processors, this is a minor task. You can apprise your students of this gambit or let them discover it on their own. One method is to use a different color of paper for each version. A student whose wrong answers match the pattern of another version of the exam is a likely culprit. Or, if you use a single version, students with the same pattern of wrong answers who sat together also warrant investigation.

Requiring positive ID from students before in-class exams are administered should prevent ringers. UCLA puts this suggestion in its instructions to summer session faculty, as well as in its teaching assistant handbook and guide for instructors. This is particularly important in large lecture courses where one cannot be expected to recognize every single student. Students can sign in on a course roster or the identification of the person who turns in the exam can be checked.

Make sure the exam is administered in a classroom large enough for adequate spacing between students to reduce the temptation for roving eyes. It may require requesting a special room if your institution does not automatically provide one. Do not only stay at the front of the classroom while the exam is in progress; wander around in an unpredictable pattern. I insist that my teaching assistants do the same.

As soon as papers or exams are received from students, I always log them in on the grade roster, so that there can be no doubt about when and if they were actually turned in. I assign each exam or paper with an inventory number that is recorded in the grade roster. Never give the same exam for a make-up (either before or after) as you do for the regular exam, nor use the same exam two terms or years running. Collecting

the exam questions with the bluebooks can reduce the number of your exams in general circulation. One can grade the in-class exams, let the students see them in class, and then keep them. Although this seems a little extreme to me, some of my colleagues use this approach.

To minimize the advantage to students who gain access to previous exams, I supply all students with a set of study questions the week prior to midterm and final exams. The questions are comparable to (but not identical to) those essay questions that will appear on the exam and are of sufficient number that it is prac-

A student hands in a blue book that answers a different question than was posed on the final exam. It turns out that the question she answered was asked the year before for the same course.

tically impossible for students to write out complete answers to each. This device also serves to educate my students about how I ask questions, e.g., how I expect them to think about the material. Some faculty hand out the questions that will be asked on the final exam at the beginning of the term. The potential problem with this device is collaboration among students, which is impossible to police.

In large lecture courses where teaching assistants grade and evaluate students, it is worth discussing with those assistants what constitutes dishonesty and how you expect them to deal with it should they suspect its occurrence. It is a mistake to assume that graduate students know all about the problem and are conversant with the procedures for handling it. Encourage them to talk with each other and with you about suspicions they may have. Although some institutions have training programs for new teaching assistants that address these issues, I believe it is best to

assume no knowledge and to talk through the issues with your graduate students.¹⁸

For papers, I try to change assignments each time a course is taught. This is work, but probably worth the effort. The assignment need not be changed 100 percent. Another option is to make the assignments sufficiently unique that it is impossible to use an old paper from another student or a paper purchased from a mill. I always require early in the term a paper proposal from each student, specifying the topic, the approach, and the bibliographical references.

This serves the dual function of compelling the students to think early and seriously about their papers and reducing their ability to buy a paper near the due date. It also allows me to see if they are on the right track and to follow their progress. One might also require that students turn in their working notes and rough drafts with their papers. Requiring that students make oral presentations on their papers is another way to reduce the temptation to purchase a paper; it is difficult to explain a paper one has not written.¹⁹

I require that papers be turned in only in person to me or placed under my office door; in any event, I do not permit papers to be submitted in such a way that they are accessible to other students. I do not accept photocopies of papers, although in the age of the word processor and printer, any number of "originals" may be generated. It is worth comparing the typefaces on cover pages with those in the body of the papers. I also require students to turn in two copies of their papers. I grade one and return it; I keep the other for my files. For this to work, the word has to get out among students that you do this, and that your files of papers are extensive and very well organized. If similar paper assignments are given in the future, you may reference earlier papers, should you see something that looks familiar. In a similar vein, it helps to talk to your colleagues who teach courses in the same subfields, especially if you have doubts about a paper's origins.

Has a paper been plagiarized? How does one know? The language is better than one would expect from

the level and ability of the student. The paper may be based on research the student could hardly have had the time and skill to perform. The paper is not quite on the subject, or uses sources outside the expected range. Sometimes this manifests itself in the use of an analytic scheme that is substantially different than that employed in the course, but is more sophisticated than a student might be expected to develop independently. Be sure to check the references and citations to make sure they fit; require that course materials (lectures and reading) be used in the papers. Strangely enough, dishonest students often include the sources they have plagiarized, making it relatively easy to track them down.

What about late papers or requests for late exams? It is difficult to distinguish students with genuine problems: cars do get wrecked, relatives suffer severe illnesses, students have other traumas. I no longer try to discriminate, reasoning that sooner or later dishonest behavior will catch up with them and they will pay the price. This still leaves the issue of maintaining equity for other students who turn their work in on time and take the scheduled examinations. I do not believe there is an optimal solution to this difficulty.

Suppose, having taken all of the above precautions, you strongly suspect or know for a fact that a student has committed some act of academic dishonesty. What is the next step? There is the issue of due process for students. We are the masters of our classrooms, but is it fair for us to act as prosecutor, judge, and jury? Universities are increasingly concerned about due process, because of their susceptibility to legal action by aggrieved students, a venue that takes almost all control out of the hands of the university and gives it to the court.

Since *Dixon v. Alabama State Board of Education* (1961), public institutions have had to establish procedures that do not violate students' due process rights (Jendrek 1989). But trial-type proceedings, with counsel, rules of evidence, and high standards of proof are generally not required. Indeed, complex procedures are apt to be time-consuming, costly, and counterproductive. Courts have

decided that universities have the right to establish appropriate sanctions for academic dishonesty and that some elements of due process are not always required. However, if an institution establishes rules and rights for such cases, they must then be followed. Moreover, the seriousness of the potential sanction dictates the required level of due process. The heavier the sanction, the greater the

Students turn their research papers in to a teaching assistant's mailbox. One student steals another's paper. She hands in a paper later that closely paraphrases the stolen paper, after having given a series of excuses as to why she couldn't turn the paper in on time. She never returns the stolen paper. She is caught when the teaching assistant grades a new copy of the stolen paper and its paraphrased version back to back.

due process required. Generally, this means students must be informed in advance about charges and the time and site of proceedings. They must be supplied with written copies of the charges and evidence against them and afforded ample time to prepare a response. "Beyond a reasonable doubt" is not required, only "clear and convincing" evidence; that is, a lower standard of proof is accepted.²⁰

Although some institutions leave cases of academic dishonesty in the hands of individual instructors—up to a decision on suspension—many institutions have adopted procedures that take roughly the following form. The instructor notifies the student of

the suspicion of some dishonest act and allows the student to respond. Surprisingly, many students admit their culpability almost immediately. The case, with supporting documents, then goes to a college office, often the dean of student affairs, or it may require a consultation with the chair of the department. The dean schedules and holds a hearing or a counseling session in which the student is afforded the chance to present his or her side of the matter. The student, if found guilty of the charges, usually has an avenue of appeal to a Student Conduct Committee comprised of faculty and, sometimes, students and administrators as well. At this stage, the student may be represented by another person, including an attorney. Ultimately, the final authority to overturn a guilty finding rests with the chancellor of the institution.

But this raises the cost for the instructor of dealing with cases of dishonesty thereby lessening the probability that they will be pursued. At UCLA only about 100 cases of academic dishonesty found their way into formal proceedings during the 1990-91 academic year; this in an undergraduate population of more than 22,000. At Berkeley during the 1984-85 school year only 33 cases were referred to the university's office of student conduct,²¹ suggesting that most cases of academic dishonesty, even if detected, do not find their way into any institutionalized process. On the other hand, about 95% of the cases that go through the formal process at UCLA result in guilty verdicts, a figure that ought to encourage faculty to pursue that venue.

Three other factors may account for the low figures cited. Involving others and introducing the constraints of institutional rules reduce the power and discretion of the instructor; instructors are prone therefore to deal with cases informally on their own (Jendrek 1989). Additionally, faculty, especially in the more senior ranks, often do not know about the formal processes in place within their institutions. This suggests the importance of educating faculty.²² Finally, some faculty are loath to follow formal procedures out of concern that it may damage

the student's reputation or ability to gain employment.

Certainly, any deterrent effect of proscriptions against cheating will be a function of students' knowledge about and belief in the probability of being caught and punished at some level that is more costly than they are prepared to accept. Students must know not only what constitutes academic dishonesty, but that it will not be tolerated and there will be consequences.

What penalties are appropriate if a student is found guilty of academic dishonesty? These depend on the severity of the offense and the procedures required at a given institution. Students may be failed on the particular assignment, failed in the course, placed on academic probation or censured, suspended from school (usually a term or a year), or expelled from the institution. Increasingly, students are being sentenced to specified hours of community service, in addition to or in lieu of other penalties.²³ Presumably, the more premeditated the act and the more it directly damages other students, the more severe ought the penalty to be, just as it is in the criminal code.

Education and Clarification

Ultimately, preventive efforts, enforcement, and punishment do not do the job. The Friedrich-Finer debate of 50 years ago about how best to promote the accountability of civil servants informs on this point. One author argued that only external checks can do it, via control and enforcement mechanisms. The other responded that it comes from an attitude that has been fostered and inculcated within the individual bureaucrat. Supporting this notion is Chester Barnard's observation that the one fact we can know for certain about authority is that it is rarely obeyed in specific circumstances; when it is, it is by the decision of the individual to grant authority to a particular communication. In light of these conditions, education and clarification have an important role to play in preventing dishonest acts.

Student attitudes about honesty are formed over a period of years, most notably in high school. It is especially important therefore to

begin socializing students to the appropriate norms as soon as they come to the "Big U." Instructors of fall quarter introductory courses comprised largely of freshmen play a special role. In addition to teaching students the substance of the course material, one is also teaching them to be college students. Similarly, freshman orientations are excellent places to educate students about the nature of academic dishonesty and its consequences.²⁴

We need to convey to our students a number of things. We ought to

A student, asked by her best friend to turn in her paper for her, substitutes the title page for one with her own name, and turns in her friend's paper as her own. The instructor discovers the switch when he calls the best friend to find out where her paper is.

carefully define what behavior falls outside the pale, to make clear at the outset what we expect. Some institutions use a formal honor code, with proscribed actions and their consequences clearly spelled out. More specifically, faculty can announce what the penalties are for turning in papers late, or for missing exams. Some faculty do not give make-up examinations for any reason. I do, but always use different questions than those on the regular exam.

One can provide a positive role model by discussing the relevant issues in terms of one's own professional life; for example, what is appropriate to cite and how. I always tell my students to err in the direction of over-citation so as to eliminate any possible misunderstandings about where one's work came from. A hand-out containing definitions of plagiarism and other forms of dishonesty may also be effective. As

well, we need to make clear what collaboration is and whether it is permissible.

For in-class exams, I generally announce at the beginning of the exam period what behaviors are proscribed: roving eyes, any discussion, collaborative efforts, etc., in a friendly, slightly apologetic, but firm manner. Some institutions require their students to affirm on each assignment that it is entirely their own work.

More generally, students have to be made to understand that education is really about the process of learning the material and doing the research. That is the essential part of any course. No matter the genuine importance of grades for everything from scholarships to graduate school admission, in the long run it is the "getting there" that matters. Cheating circumvents that process, thereby robbing the student of the most crucial component of education. Perhaps the idea that college is no more than an exercise in credentialing has led to this attitude. It is useful to explain clearly to your students why they are being given a particular assignment, what role it plays in their education, what sorts of things you expect them to learn from it. This ought to convey to them the intrinsic value of the process as opposed to the grade and credit they will earn. Try to communicate to your students your excitement about your own work. Essentially, we have to make it difficult, if not impossible, for students to rationalize their dishonesty as being okay or nothing that other students aren't already doing, or that it doesn't really matter.

Aside from efforts at enforcing and educating, perhaps the best shield against academic dishonesty is to promote respect and personal attachment in the classroom. Know your students' names when possible. Talk to them, reduce their feelings of anonymity. This is readily achieved through some easy banter before beginning each class. Show that you are enthusiastic and really care about teaching in general and their class and them in particular. My hypothesis is that students will be less prone to cheat if they like, value, and respect their instructor and if they want that instructor's respect. If you

establish such bonds with the students, they will come to feel that cheating will directly damage you by violating a personal trust. This means maintaining contact throughout the term with your students and letting them know that you are interested in their progress. Oftentimes what to us may seem a small amount of attention may have very salutary effects on our students. One way to do this is to require every student to confer with you sometime during the term.

When Education Doesn't Work: In Lieu of Punishment

It may prove more useful in the long run for the student who has committed the dishonest act to see about some form of rehabilitation and, if another student has been actively injured, some form of formal apology. One might, in lieu of other punishment, supervise the research and writing of a new paper or exam by the offending student, perhaps one of greater difficulty or length than the original assignment. This tactic is predicated on teaching students how properly to conduct themselves and to show them that indeed they are capable of so doing.

On the other hand, most of us are not practicing psychologists and are not in the business of providing long-term therapy. We might, as I have on occasion, urge or require likely students to seek some sort of professional counseling. In one case, I had a student arrange for counseling through the university health service and had her come back to see me several times during the following quarter so that she knew someone cared. Most universities now have formal programs for students with such problems, programs that address stress and time management, or that help students to cope with family pressures for unreasonably high levels of performance. These do appear to be helpful; we ought to think of using them more often. Information on counseling services (including student learning centers) could be included in hand-outs on course assignments, etc. I look at this approach as a long-term strategy for getting at the roots of individual factors that would otherwise propel students toward dishonesty.

Summary

Dishonesty is a problem endemic to the academy. It is not a unitary phenomenon, but takes a variety of forms. The diverse causes are to be found in both individual and situational factors, many of which are beyond the control of faculty members. Moreover, it is an unpleasant topic that most of us would rather not consider. Nonetheless, for several reasons we have a professional obligation to address the problem. Within the reach of faculty can be found an assortment of tactics effective for reducing the incidence of dishonesty in its myriad forms and which do not necessitate major alterations in the usual conduct of our courses. A multi-pronged approach involving education and clarification, counseling and rehabilitation, combined with prevention, enforcement, and punishment is most likely to reduce the problem of dishonesty to a manageable extent.

Notes

*My gratitude to Joel Aberbach and Richard Sklar for their helpful comments on an earlier version. Assistant Dean Melora Sundt of the UCLA Office of the Dean of Students offered many useful ideas and also made their research files available to me, which expedited my work on this essay considerably.

1. *Los Angeles Times*, 27 May 1990, p. E-14.

2. *Los Angeles Times*, 22 November 1990, p. A-5.

3. 24 October 1990, pp. A31-A32.

4. *Los Angeles Times*, 27 May 1990, p. E-14.

5. However, a 1988 survey of over 200,000 freshmen at 402 institutions conducted jointly by the American Council of Education and the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA found that 36.6% cheated while 57.1% admitted copying another student's work, up from 30.4 and 52.7, respectively in 1987. "Nationwide study reveals more freshman cheating," *U. The National College Newspaper*, October 1989, p. 1. A survey at Rutgers reported that one-third of students in an anthropology course admitted to "hard-core cheating," defined as cheating in eight or more courses during four years of college. "Survey at Rutgers Suggests that Cheating May be on the Rise at Large Universities," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 24 October 1990, pp. A-31, A-32.

6. Steininger, Johnson, and Kirts (1964) contend that males report more, but females lie more about having cheated; while Haines et al. (1986) found no gender differences. A report on student academic dishonesty at

Berkeley said that 72% of the students referred for formal disciplinary action were males. "Report Cites High-Tech Cheating at UC," *San Francisco Chronicle*, 8 February 1986.

7. See Bushway and Nash (1977) for a discussion of the relationship between personal traits and cheating behavior.

8. Haines et al. (1986) define neutralization as general support for a social norm, but a belief that violation is okay in certain specific circumstances.

9. They might be right. Leming (1978) cites Hartshorne and May (1928-30) to the effect that nearly everyone cheats at some time, depending upon the situation.

10. Some parents go so far as to pay for their children's college papers, admonishing them only not to get caught.

11. This is also argued by Barnett and Dalton (1981). As more and more students must work full- or part-time to pay for their college education we can only expect overall levels of stress to increase.

12. For example, only 60% of students thought that getting questions or answers about an exam from someone who has already taken it was dishonest while 78.7% of faculty considered it cheating. For copying a few sentences of material from a source without footnoting it in a paper, the numbers were 45.0 and 74.2, respectively, p. 548. Hawley (1984) also discusses student attitudes toward cheating.

13. UCLA, however, suspends approximately 50 to 70% of those students found guilty of academic dishonesty.

14. "Noted Harvard Psychiatrist Resigns Posts After Faculty Group Finds He Plagiarized," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 7 December 1988, pp. A-1, A-6. See also *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, "U.S. Has Barred Grants to 6 Scientists in Past 2 Years," 3 July 1991, pp. A-1, A-6, A-7.

15. For a profile of a "ghostwriter" who works for a major paper mill, see "The Campus Ghostwriter," *Los Angeles Times*, 1 March 1989, pp. IV-1, IV-2.

16. The Los Angeles County District Attorney's office is presently pursuing a civil action against one of the most notorious paper mills in the area, but no resolution has been reached.

17. See Chisholm (1990) for a discussion of the design, administration, and grading of examinations.

18. The Office of the Dean of Students at UCLA publishes "Confronting Plagiarism: An Instructor's Guide to UCLA Policies," an eight-page flyer useful for educating instructors, especially graduate students, on the contours of the problem.

19. This idea comes from UCLA's "Confronting Plagiarism."

20. See "Legal Implications," *Perspective* 4 (February 1989), pp. 1-3, and 4 (April 1989), pp. 7-8 for more detailed explications of current law on issues of due process for students. UCLA relies on "a preponderance of evidence" as its standard in cases of academic dishonesty. UCLA has devised a formal "Student Conduct Code of Procedures," advises students of their responsibilities and rights of due process in cases of misconduct. It is published in the campus newspapers each term and in the *Guide for New Students* pro-

vided at student orientations.

21. "Report Cites High-Tech Cheating at UC," *San Francisco Chronicle*, 8 February 1986.

22. UCLA publishes an annual *Teacher's Guide* for faculty with sections defining academic dishonesty and outlining the university's procedures for handling cases. I did not read this guide until I sat down to edit this essay.

23. At Berkeley, the most common sentence is up to 30 hours of community service, the next most common is suspension for one semester. "Report Cites High-Tech Cheating at UC," *San Francisco Chronicle*, 8 February 1986.

24. Some institutions resist doing so for fear that it will somehow convey the "wrong" message to its incoming students. I do not subscribe to this opinion.

References

Barnett, David C. and Jon C. Dalton. 1981. "Why College Students Cheat," *Journal*

of College Student Personnel (November): 545-51.

Bushway, Ann and William R. Nash. 1977. "School Cheating Behavior," *Review of Educational Research* 47: 623-32.

Chisholm, Donald. 1990. "Between Leibnitz and Voltaire: Exams and Grading in a Less than Perfect World," *PS* 23: 600-04.

Haines, Valeri J., George M. Diekhoff, Emily E. LaBeff, and Robert E. Clark. 1986. "College Cheating: Immaturity, Lack of Commitment, and the Neutralizing Attitude," *Research in Higher Education* 25: 342-54.

Hawley, Christopher S. 1984. "The Thieves of Academe: Plagiarism in the University System," *Improving College and University Teaching* 32: 35-39.

Jendrek, Margaret Platt. 1989. "Faculty Reactions to Academic Dishonesty," *Journal of College Student Development* 30: 401-06.

Johnson, Charles D. and John Gormly. 1972. "Academic Cheating: The Contribution of Sex, Personality, and Situational Variables," *Developmental Psychology* 6: 320-25.

Leming, James S. 1978. "Cheating Behavior, Situational Influence, and Moral Development," *Journal of Educational Research* 71: 214-17.

Steininger, M., R. E. Johnson, and D. K. Kirts. 1964. "Cheating on College Examinations as a Function of Situationally Aroused Anxiety and Hostility," *Journal of Educational Psychology* 55: 317-24.

About the Author

Donald Chisholm is an assistant professor in the department of political science at the University of California, Los Angeles, and a frequent contributor to *PS*.

The Comparative Study of Constitutions: Suggestions for Organizing the Inquiry¹

Donald L. Robinson, *Smith College*

Americans have a special incentive—almost a vocation—to understand constitutionalism. The United States was the first modern nation to base its government on a written constitution. Ever since the founding, the Constitution has had a unique place in the nation's consciousness. It has been the adhesive of American nationality. Not land (our territory has changed over the years), not blood (we are all immigrants), but a commitment to the Constitution binds us together. The Constitution is a symbol for what makes us a nation: a shared commitment to government by consent, its powers enumerated, checked and balanced, its commands articulated in a rule of law.

Recent developments around the world have highlighted the tension between constitutionalism and democracy.² Ever since its founding as an independent nation, America has been committed to both, though in varying degrees. The commitment

to democracy was set forth in the Declaration of Independence and the Gettysburg Address. The commitment to liberty, established in a written constitution and in bills of rights and defended by a powerful legal community, goes even deeper. For Americans, democracy is a quest, of varying intensity; constitutional government is the steady commitment.

The American commitment to constitutionalism is not only deep and proprietary; it is confident. We often quote Gladstone's aphorism about our constitution being the "most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man." There have been problems in American life over the years, and to correct some of them, we have had to amend the Constitution. The basic framework endures, however, and we believe it confirms the wisdom of its framers.³

In light of our own experience and our sense of ourselves as a "city on the hill," it has seemed perfectly

natural for Americans to take a special interest in constitution-making in other countries. Some of our intellectuals have insisted that constitutions are cultural artifacts, and that it is as foolish to try to transplant our Constitution to alien settings as it would be to import constitutional arrangements from abroad.⁴ Over the years, however, some American lawyers and political scientists have operated on different assumptions. In Latin America during its several epochs of constitution-making, in Japan and Germany following World War II, in Africa as the shackles of colonialism were broken in the 1960s, Americans have been willing to give advice and lend a hand in preparing drafts.⁵

The Bicentennial of the Constitution stimulated some reflection on these efforts. So did the drive of many nations in the Third World—in Latin America, Africa, and Asia—to throw off repressive regimes and embark upon the quest for more