ADDRESSING ACADEMIC DISHONESTY: THE IMPLICATIONS FOR BUSINESS SCHOOLS, PROFESSORS, AND STUDENTS

Jacqueline K. Eastman, Valdosta State University
Rajesh Iyer, Valdosta State University
Kevin L. Eastman, Florida State University

ABSTRACT

There is growing concern that academic dishonesty is becoming a bigger problem due to changes in technology, making it easier for more students to cheat. Additionally, there is strong concern that while students, faculty, and administrators know academic dishonesty is occurring, they are doing little to stop it. For academic dishonesty to be addressed effectively, efforts are needed at multiple levels including the Business School, Marketing Department, individual Marketing professors, as well as by the students themselves. This paper provides a review of the literature in these areas.

INTRODUCTION

Many in the educational system are concerned with the problem of academic dishonesty and the rate at which it is increasing (McCabe and Trevino 1997; Park 2003; Pullin, Ortloff, Casey, and Payne 2000; Williams and Hosek 2003). The estimate of how many students cheat ranges dramatically. McCabe and Trevino (1997, p. 379) offer a range from 13 percent to as high as 95 percent and Park (2003) states it is at least 50 percent of students. In the business literature, Kidwell, Wozniak, and Laurel (2003) and Chapman, Davis, Toy, and Wright (2004) found that 75 percent of students reported cheating; this is similar to the 63 percent found by Nonis and Swift (1998). Finally, there is concern that academic dishonesty is increasing due to technology making cheating easier (Born 2003; Park 2003; Scanlon 2004).

This issue is critical for business schools as it seems to mirror the growing concerns of ethical problems in the business community (Chapman et al. 2004; Kidwell et al. 2003). Those who cheat in college are more likely to cheat on the job (Swift and Nonis 1998). Thus, there is an increased need for business schools to address academic dishonesty because what students learn as acceptable behavior in the classroom impacts their expectations of what is acceptable professionally. Furthermore, the costs for not addressing this issue are enormous (Kidwell et al. 2003; Rawwas, Al-Khatib, and Vitell 2004; Williams and Hosek 2003). In this paper, we present a comprehensive literature review regarding what is academic dishonesty and how Business Schools, professors, and students can address the problem.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Plagiarism is typically seen as a form of fraud and intellectual theft (Isserman 2003, p. B12). Park (2003, p. 472) defines it as "literary theft, stealing (by copying) the words or ideas of someone else and passing them off as one's own without crediting the source." The issue is not whether one is original in his/her ideas, but that one does not give proper credit for those ideas (Isserman 2003; Taylor 2003). Per Park (2003, p. 475), plagiarism would include stealing, buying, copying, or using material from another source and passing it off as one's own work as well as paraphrasing material without appropriate documentation. Plagiarism, though, may not be intentional, such as improper citation (Burnett 2002; Park 2003, p. 476).

Plagiarism needs to be seen within a broader context of cheating that includes other unethical practices such as cheating on tests/ assignments, falsifying data, misusing resources, taking credit for others' work, and manipulating academic staff (Park 2003). Academic dishonesty has been defined by Lambert et al. (2003, p. 98), as behavior that breaches "the submission of work for assessment that has been produced legitimately by the student who will be awarded the grade, and which demonstrates the student's knowledge and understanding of the context or processes being assessed." The most common forms of academic dishonesty are copying sentences without proper citation, working on individual assignments with others, having someone check over a paper before submitting it (if that is not permitted by the instructor), and getting questions/ answers on a test from someone else (Brown 1996; Kidwell et al. 2003).

CONTEXTUAL PROCESS TO CHEATING

McCabe and Trevino (1997) found that cheating was influenced by a number of individual (age, gender, and grade-point-average) and contextual factors (including peers, Greek membership, and perceived penalties for academic dishonesty). They found that "the most powerful influential factors were peer-related contextual factors . . . Academic dishonesty was lower when respondents perceived that their peers disapproved of such misconduct, was higher among fraternity/sorority members, and was higher when students perceived higher levels of cheating among their peers (McCabe and Trevino 1997, p. 391)."

Brown (1996) found few differences by major for academic dishonesty, while others found that business students ranked highest for self-reported levels of cheating, followed by engineering and humanities (Meade 1992; Park 2003). In a study of discarded cheat sheets, Pullen et al. (2000) found significantly more business cheat sheets compared to other disciplines. In terms of GPA, students with a lower GPA are more likely to cheat as they have more to gain and less to lose than students with a higher GPA (Straw 2002).

In terms of age and class, the literature suggests that younger, immature students cheat more than older, mature students; upperclassmen cheat less than lowerclassmen (McCabe and Trevino 1997; Park 2003; Straw 2002). Lambert et al. (2003) found that older students were more likely than younger students to view scenarios of academic dishonesty as serious offenses, while Kuther (2004) found that upperclassmen saw a bigger ethical problem with professors ignoring cheating than did freshmen. Brown (1995) found the ethics of graduate business students similar to undergraduates, despite graduate students perceiving themselves as more ethical.

In terms of gender, McCabe and Trevino (1997) found that men reported a higher level of academic dishonesty than women. Buckley, Wiese, and Harvey (1998) also found that males had a higher probability of engaging in unethical behavior. Leming (1980) found that under a low-risk condition, women cheated more than men, but that a higher risk of punishment reduced the risk of cheating only for women. Finally, Lambert et al. (2003) found that females were more likely to view scenarios of academic dishonesty as serious cheating.

In terms of extracurricular activities, students involved in activities, such as greek organizations, are more likely to cheat (McCabe and Trevino 1997; Park 2003; Straw 2002). Fraternities are environments where norms, values, and skills associated with cheating can be easily shared as they provide access to resources (e.g., old test files) that facilitate cheating (McCabe and Trevino 1997, p. 383).

Thus, there are some findings that have been replicated in the literature on who is more likely to cheat, such as that men (McCabe and Trevino 1997; Buckley et al. 1998), those in greek social organizations (McCabe and Trevino 1997; Park 2003; Straw 2002), and those students who are younger (McCabe and Trevino 1997; Park 2003; Straw 2002) are more likely to cheat. These findings, however, are not conclusive enough so that professors can determine ahead of time who is more likely to cheat in their class; i.e., professors cannot simply assume that the younger fraternity men in the class will cheat while everyone else will not. Thus, professors need additional help in predicting and preventing cheating from occurring.

PREDICTORS OF CHEATING

Students and universities tend to view academic dishonesty in very different ways. For students, it is evaluated primarily in terms of its effect on their peers, with a strong consensus that the least acceptable forms of behavior are those that hurt other students (Ashworth and Bannister 1997, p. 187). Payne and Nantz (1994) note that students saw a real difference between cheating on exams (seen as blatant cheating) and other forms of cheating, such as plagiarism (seen as not really cheating). Cheating may be more likely where students feel anonymous, not part of the academic community, and where students feel they are getting a low quality educational experience (Ashworth and Bannister 1997). Additionally, "the variables that seem to facilitate cheating include increased class size, decreased surveillance, test importance and difficulty, close seating arrangements, and grading on a curve" (Chapman et al. 2004, p. 238).

In looking at why students cheat, Williams and Hosek (2003) stress that students, even dishonest ones, are rational and that the decision to cheat is a conscious decision that the benefits of cheating outweigh the risks. Per Pullen et al. (2000, p. 616), "causal factors run the gamut from large classes, impersonal relationships with professors, competition for jobs, gaining higher GPAs in order to enter graduate school, to a culture that appears to accept cheating readily as a normal part of life." The literature offers the following additional reasons for why students cheat: a lack of understanding of what is plagiarism (Park 2003); efficiency gain (Park 2003; Payne and Nantz 1994); time management problems (Lambert et al. 2003; Park 2003; Payne and Nantz 1994); personal values (Park 2003; Payne and Nantz 1994); defiance/lack of respect for authority (Park 2003); negative attitudes towards teacher/class (Park 2003; Payne and Nantz 1994); temptation/opportunity (Park 2003); a lack of deterrence (Park 2003; Payne and Nantz 1994); a personal crisis (Lambert et al. 2003); peer pressure (Payne and Nantz 1994), and cheating seen as having a minimal effect on others (Payne and Nantz 1994).

Thus, the literature illustrates that there are a wide range of factors that can predict cheating. While some of

these factors are under the direct control of faculty, such as students not understanding what is plagiarism and temptation/opportunity (Park 2003), the vast majority are not as they represent issues occurring within the student, such as personal values or a personal crisis (Lambert et al. 2003; Park 2003; Payne and Nantz 1994). This again illustrates the difficulty that faculty may have in determining ahead of time, who is more likely to cheat in their class.

IMPACTS OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

McCabe and Trevino (1993) discuss the impact on academic dishonesty if students perceive that others will report cases of their academic misconduct. If students see their peers successfully get away with cheating, they are more likely to cheat (McCabe 1999; McCabe and Trevino 1993, 1997). Per Chapman et al. (2004), there is a robust false consensus effect in that students significantly over-estimate the degree to which others cheat so they perceive cheating as a normative behavior and believe their own behavior is more honest than their peers. Finally, Chapman et al. (2004, p. 243) found that "students were much more likely to cheat with a friend versus an acquaintance."

A major factor impacting whether students are actually punished for cheating is faculty support and understanding of academic integrity policies. How strong an honor code is perceived to be by the students varies as faculty may not even be aware of these policies and may be lax in enforcing them (McCabe and Trevino 1997) due to the heavy time requirements of reporting/going through a university judicial process (Auer and Krupar 2001) and concerns with court challenges of institutional disciplinary procedures (Williams and Hosek 2003). As a result, there may be inconsistent penalties and sporadic enforcement of academic policies which could impact their effectiveness (Williams and Hosek 2003). Thus, Williams and Hosek (2003) stress the need for a deterrence model to reduce academic dishonesty instead of punishment.

While the web is a resource for both students and faculty, some are concerned that students have become so used to downloading music without paying for it, that they may not see the need to reference online material (Park 2003); this generation of students may have a different idea of what is considered 'fair use' (Scanlon 2004). The web could be increasing the problem of plagiarism because it makes illicit cutting and pasting so easy; a quarter of college students surveyed have plagiarized from the Internet, but students perceive that significantly more students than that are doing so (Scanlon 2004, pp. 161–162). Additionally, while term paper mills have existed for years, the ease of getting papers has increased with various web sites (e.g., buypapers.com) (Born 2003; Park 2003). Per Scanlon (2004), the concern is that if students perceive that Internet cheating is commonplace, they will be more likely to engage in it.

Thus, in addressing the impact of academic dishonesty, the literature consistently illustrates the importance of peers and their perceptions (Chapman et al. 2004; McCabe and Trevino 1993; Scanlon 2004) as well as the importance of a consistent process in address academic dishonesty (McCabe and Trevino 1997; Williams and Hosek 2003). It is critical that academics understand the implications of these impacts to effectively address academic dishonesty.

DISCUSSION OF IMPLICATIONS

Academic dishonesty is a major issue that administrators, professors, and students need to be concerned with and it has to be addressed on multiple levels from the Business School level, to the department level, to individual professors, as well as the students. In this discussion, we will present recommendations from the literature on how to address academic dishonesty on these different levels.

BUSINESS SCHOOL LEVEL

While a university overall needs to have consistent, enforceable academic dishonesty policies, "Colleges can no doubt begin to reduce the potential for cheating through a comprehensive approach that emphasizes academic integrity policies, the dissemination of such polices to teachers and students, instructional precautions on exams and student assignments, and adherence to reporting and disciplinary procedures" (Payne and Nantz 1994, p. 90), there is also a unique responsibility that the business school has due to the ethical concerns that exist in the business community (Kidwell et al. 2003). Buckley et al. (1998) suggests that there is even more unethical behavior in academics than business due to the fact that there are more severe sanctions in the business community than there are in the academic community. At the very least, business school administrators have a responsibility to ensure that there are sanctions for academic dishonesty and that these sanctions are enforced. While Leming (1980) found that a higher risk of punishment reduced cheating only for women, it is important to note that women are a significant and growing segment of business school enrollments (AACSB 2000). Women make up almost half of the undergraduate business school degrees awarded (AACSB 2000) and over a third of MBA degrees (AACSB 2000; Griffith 2003). Thus, even if it will not have an equal impact on all students, when academic dishonesty occurs, retribution needs to be applied in a professional, timely fashion, and cheaters need to be ostracized (Rawwas et al. 2004).

Reducing cheating, however, will also require a determined prevention effort (Allen et al. 1998). A social norm campaign may be effective (Chapman et al. 2004) to

correct the false consensus belief (i.e., that everyone is doing it) to try to change behaviors (i.e., it is not socially acceptable normative behavior). An additional issue is that students may not understand academic dishonesty and how it impacts them. To address this, Williams and Hosek (2003) offers several suggestions including, telling students what is academic dishonesty, changing the culture of acceptance of unethical behavior, increasing the probability of being caught and punished as well as increasing the penalties for academic dishonesty. At the very least, Business Schools need to ensure that they are strictly enforcing their university's academic dishonesty policy, but due to the unique ethical issues in the business community, they need to do more.

One thing that a Business School can do is to develop and publicly utilize a code of honor. An honor code has several dimensions including an agreement not to cheat, enlisting students to monitor each other and letting faculty know when cheating has occurred, and making clear the punishment for cheating (Spangenberger and Obermiller 1996, p. 97). While this code cannot conflict with what is being done on the overall university level, it can expound on it to address the additional issues and values unique to the business community. To be effective, this honor code has to be more then symbolic (Rawwas et al. 2004). For example, Park (2003, pp. 482–483) describes what is being done at Duke University's Center for Academic Integrity; this includes identifying values and behaviors to be promoted, rather than just listing behaviors to be prohibited, and requiring students (as part of becoming a Business School student) to sign a pledge that they will uphold academic integrity and not cheat or plagiarize. The signing of this academic code of honor can be public as part of a ceremony for becoming part of the Business School (Taylor 2003). Finally, students need to play an active role in the administration of this honor code such as with utilizing or forming "student groups to monitor and promote the code" (Chapman et al. 2004, p. 247).

Thus, the literature discusses a variety of ways that Business Schools can address academic dishonesty from better educating students on what is academic dishonesty (Williams and Hosek 2003), to a social norm campaign (Chapman et al. 2004), to use of a honor code (Chapman et al. 2004; Spangenberger and Miller 1996; Park 2003; Taylor 2003). At a minimum, there needs to be consistently enforced sanctions when academic dishonesty occurs (Rawwas et al. 2004). Additional research though is needed to better determine if and how these approaches work and in what situations, or for what students, would these different approaches be more effective.

MARKETING DEPARTMENT LEVEL

Given that there is some research that indicates that marketing students cheat more than other business students (Chapman et al. 2004), there is an increased level of responsibility for marketing departments to specifically address academic dishonesty rather than leave it up to the overall college or university level to address. First, departments may need to hold workshops to address this issue (Chapman et al. 2004) so that the entire department can develop a united front and consistent behaviors/responses with addressing this issue. At a minimum, departments need to make sure that all faculty are aware of the university's policy regarding cheating (Nonis and Swift 1998).

Second, a department may need to develop marketing ethics courses/modules/cases to stress the importance of marketing ethics. Singhapakdi (2004) found that students' perception of the importance of ethics as well as of ethical problems significantly predicts their ethical intention. This suggests that to improve marketing students' ethical behavioral intentions, marketing courses need to stress the importance of marketing ethics (such as its relationship with a marketing orientation and internal marketing) and to teach students how to recognize and address ethical problems (Singhapakdi 2004). Marketing faculty must make it clear that ethical behavior is not just the moral thing to do, but that it makes good business sense as relationships are based on trust (Singhapakdi and Vitell 1994). Similarly, Rogers et al. (1993) stress the need for marketing courses to emphasize key heart traits (such as idealism, compassion, and generosity) as well as head traits. Additionally, Singhapakdi (2004) stresses the need for marketing faculty to discourage relativistic decision making among students; this can be done through teaching codes of ethics and behaviors held by professional marketing associations. Finally, Rawwas et al. (2004) stress the need for ethics education to boost idealism.

Thus, in addressing academic dishonesty on the marketing department level, the literature suggests two major approaches. The first approach involves the need for a department as a whole to better understand and have a united front against academic dishonesty (Chapman et al. 2004; Noonis and Swift 1998). The second approach addresses the need to emphasize ethics in the marketing curriculum (Rawwas et al. 2004; Singhapakdi 2004; Singhapakdi and Vitell 1994). Future research is needed to determine though if academic dishonesty occurs less frequently in marketing departments that are united in their approach to academic dishonesty and/or who emphasize ethics as part of their curriculum.

MARKETING PROFESSOR LEVEL

While professors may not be able to dictate university policy and how it is carried out, there are still many things they can do to address this problem. First, they must understand and be consistent with overall policies and they need to communicate this to the students through the syllabus and in discussing expectations at the start of the term (Burnett 2002) as well as throughout the semester (McLafferty and Foust 2004). Per Spangenberg and Ober-

miller (1996), most professors assume that students know what is cheating and what the consequences are and therefore few faculty make this explicit in their syllabus and instructions. Per Nonis and Swift (1998), the two most effective deterrents to cheating was the professor announcing the penalties for cheating and requesting that the students not cheat. Thus, professors must increase awareness among students about what is academic dishonest behavior and why it will not be tolerated (Allen et al. 1998; Born 2003; McLafferty and Foust 2004; Swift and Noonis 1998), and follow through consistently with their policies (Chapman et al. 2004).

Second, professors can address academic ethics through how they treat students (Brown 2000). "Students agreed that professors must demonstrate respect for students, teach objectively, and grade honestly, and they should not tolerate cheating or plagiarism . . . students expect professors to act with professionalism, to employ a vast base of content knowledge, and to show concern for student welfare" (Kuther 2004, p. 153). Faculty need to build a trusting student-faculty relationship (Born 2003) in which faculty work to develop a better rapport with their students (McLafferty and Foust 2004). Students suggest that they would be less likely to cheat in a class in which they feel the professor was truly interested in their learning and treated the students with respect (Chapman et al. 2004). Finally, Scribner (2003, p. 34) stresses that students need to be taught how to synthesize ideas and facts as well as faculty need to model ethical behavior for their students. McLafferty and Foust (2004) discuss the need to teach students how to properly cite sources using a consistent style (such as APA) as the different citation styles required by various professors can confuse students (Auer and Krupar 2001).

Third, faculty need to address how they can prevent academic dishonesty from occurring in the first place through how they structure their course and assignments as prevention is preferable to policing students (McLafferty and Foust 2004). "When students are instructed appropriately and given certain types of assignments, plagiarism is minimized or rendered virtually impossible" (McLafferty and Foust 2004, p. 186). Freedman (2004, p. 548) discusses the hundreds of hours and technological support it can take professors to detect plagiarism from online sources and the impact that this reactive stance puts on the mentoring relationship faculty need to have with students; instead he proposes the focus would be better spent on prevention and promoting creativity and originality in students.

The literature offers many tips for how faculty can prevent academic dishonesty. In terms of papers/projects, Born (2003) stresses the need for faculty to be proactive such as by treating a paper as a process not a product (i.e., break a project up into several steps with drafts submitted along the way (McLafferty and Foust 2004; Scribner 2003; Swift et al. 1998; Williams and Hosek 2003) and assigning activities in groups. Additionally, Williams and Hosek (2003) recommend making paper/project topics more specific so that they cannot easily be purchased. Swift, Denton, and Nonis (1998) recommend discussing the ethics of term paper purchasing, advising students that professors monitor term paper mill sites, and inform students that these papers are often poor quality. Marketing faculty may also need to get an in-class writing sample the first day to compare it to other work later in the semester (Auer and Krupar 2001; Swift et al. 1998).

Additionally, assignments need to be more creative so students are able to express themselves in more meaningful ways and cannot take a "cut and paste" approach to completing the assignment (Cummings 2003; Scribner 2003); likewise faculty may want to have a narrow focus to their topics and be very specific in terms of format (Swift et al. 1998). Scribner (2003, p. 32) lists practices that are most likely to enable students to plagiarize: assignments that don't keep up with advances in the field, utilizing the same assignment repeatedly, making unrealistic assignments, failing to teach the skills needed to successfully complete the assignment, not taking the time to check students' sources, and accepting papers with incomplete citations. Finally, Pfeffer (2003, p. 60) recommends that faculty need to stress to students that work shouldn't just be performed in order to get something (such as a grade), but serve as a reflection of their skills and character. It is not enough for professors to scrawl a grade on a paper without giving students the time, attention, and feedback so that they learn something and why that is important (Howard 2002).

In terms of tests, Born (2003) recommends designing questions that require discussion rather than memorization, assigning different questions to different students, giving more frequent tests/quizzes, not allowing make-up tests (one way this can be addressed is through having a comprehensive final that can be used to replace a missing test grade), and updating the test materials faculty use. Chapman et al. (2004) stress the concern that web-based tests may be encouraging students to cheat and suggests that to address this, faculty need strict time limits, post answers only after everyone has completed the test, and use a large database of questions in which each student gets a unique test selected. For detecting cheating on multiple-choice exams, Thompson (1994) describes a procedure utilizing a spreadsheet program that compares results for pairs of adjacently seated students.

If prevention tactics are not enough, there are things professors can do to detect academic dishonesty once it has occurred. With technology, it is easier for faculty to determine if their students have plagiarized (Park 2003) as now educators have access to the same information that students do (Swift et al. 1998). McLafferty and Foust (2004, p. 187) note that there are three tools that can be used to investigate Internet copying: search engines (by inserting a unique phrase from the paper), plagiarism web

sites (such as the fee-based subscription of Turnitin.com that compares submitted papers with online sources and papers in their database) (Anonymous 2003) and Plagiserve, and software that checks for identical wording between specific sources (such as to determine if students are recycling papers within a course from semester to semester). Additional web sites and software are described by Auer and Krupar (2001) and Swift et al. (1998).

Some signs that indicate whether a student has used the Internet to plagiarize or obtain a paper include advanced jargon, hard-to-obtain materials listed in the bibliography or invalid hyperlinks, unusually high or low quality compared to the student's previous writing, the writing quality is inconsistent within the paper, unusual formatting, unverified quotations, and the paper does not fit well with the topic assigned (Anonymous 2003, p. 45; McLafferty and Foust 2004).

Thus, to address academic dishonesty, the literature has a significant number of articles with a variety of suggestions for faculty. Overall, professors need to understand and communicate academic dishonesty policies (Allen et al. 1998; Burnett 2002; McLafferty and Foust 2004; Noonis and Swift 1998; Spangenberg and Obermiller 1996; Swift and Noonis 1998), structure their class assignments to discourage academic dishonesty (such as with the use of new, creative and/or specific topics each term and treating papers as a process not a product) (Born 2003; Cummings 2003; Freedman 2004; McLafferty and Foust 2004; Scribner 2003; Swift et al. 1998; Williams and Hosek 2003), develop respectful and mentoring relationships with students (Born 2003; Brown 2000; Chapman et al. 2004; Kuther 2004; McLafferty and Foust 2004), and finally monitor students and their work to ensure that cheating did not occur (McLafferty and Foust 2004; Swift et al. 1998; Thompson 1994). While it may be difficult for an individual faculty member to measure if any of these ideas decrease cheating or the desire to cheat, the literature needs to continue to offer best practices in teaching to enhance the classroom experience and discourage academic dishonesty.

STUDENT LEVEL

As suggested by McCabe and Trevino (1997, p. 393), "the context created by an academic institution can have a powerful impact on academic dishonesty"; an educational institution needs to create a culture where students disapprove of cheating and it is seen as the exception rather than the norm. To make this happen, an academic code cannot be pushed on the students (McCabe and Trevino 1997); rather the students must take an active role in developing it (McCabe and Makowski 2001). McCabe and Makowski (2001, pp. 17, 19) suggest that "when

students are asked to take responsibility for upholding academic integrity on their campus, they rise to the challenge." This suggests that students need to have a greater level of responsibility for academic honesty on their campus through the use of honor codes, a strong and active involvement in the judicial process on campus, and more collaboration with faculty in addressing academic dishonesty issues (McCabe and Makowski 2001, pp. 20–21). Additionally, universities must work more closely with the greek system and other student organizations to increase their emphasis on academics and decrease their support for cheating (McCabe and Trevino 1997).

Thus, future research is needed to measure and determine if the levels of academic dishonesty are lower at universities that take a more student-centered approach as described above to address academic dishonesty compared to universities that take a more top-down, administrator, approach to academic dishonesty.

CONCLUSION

Faculty are a key component in preventing and dealing with academic dishonesty (Allen et al. 1998; Burnett 2002). It is the faculty who set the tone and expectations in the classroom, who create the exams and assignments, who monitor the work product of their students, and who are responsible for mentoring their students. The best tool against plagiarism is prevention and for faculty, prevention is a preferable to policing students. Thus, while faculty now have additional technological tools to determine academic dishonesty (Freedman 2004), many in the literature feel that upfront communication with students and proactive tactics to prevent problems may be more effective (Born 2003; McLafferty and Foust 2004).

For academic dishonesty is to be addressed effectively however, a multidimensional approach is needed in which faculty have the support and help of their College, in which their Department is united to prevent academic dishonesty and promote ethical behavior, and in which the students are part of an overall culture that discourages academic dishonesty. Future research is needed though to better understand and determine what techniques and approaches work to discourage academic dishonesty and for what kind of students and situations are they most effective. As academic dishonesty is too important an issue to ignore, especially for business schools, continued discussion and research on this topic is needed. This paper hopes to stimulate this discussion and research by reviewing the literature on what is academic dishonesty, what can influence and predict cheating, the impact of academic dishonesty, and what the literature suggests can be done to address academic dishonesty.

REFERENCES

AACSB (2000), "Men, Women, and Business School – Gender Trends in Management Education," *Newsline,* (Winter), retrieved September 26, 2006 at [http://www.aacsb.edu/publications/printnewsline/n12000/wngender.asp].

Allen, Jeff, Donald Fuller, and Michael Luckett (1998), "Academic Integrity: Behaviors, Rates, and Attitudes of Business Students Toward Cheating," *Journal of Marketing Education,* 20 (1), (May), 41–52.

Anonymous (2003), "Academic Librarians Launch a Strategic Campaign," *Academic Libraries,* (June/July), 44–45.

Ashworth, Peter and Philip Bannister (1997), "Guilty in Whose Eyes? University Students' Perceptions of Cheating and Plagiarism in Academic Work and Assessment," *Studies in Higher Education,* 22 (2), (June), 187.

Auer, Nicole J. and Ellen M. Krupar (2001), "Mouse Click Plagiarism: The Role of Technology in Plagiarism and The Librarian's Role in Combating It," *Library Trends,* 49 (3), (Winter), 415–32.

Born, Apiwan D. (2003), "How to Reduce Plagiarism," *Journal of Information Systems Education,* 14 (3), (Fall), 223.

Brown, Bob S. (1995), "The Academic Ethics of Graduate Business Students: A Survey," *Journal of Education for Business,* 70 (3), (January/February), 151–57.

_____ (1996), "A Comparison of the Academic Ethics of Graduate Business, Education, and Engineering Students," *College Student Journal,* 30 (3), 294–301.

_____ (2000), "The Academic Ethics of Graduate Business Students: 1993 to 1998," *The Journal of Applied Business Research,* 16 (4), (Fall), 105–12.

Buckley, M. Ronald, Danielle S. Wiese, and Michael G. Harvey (1998), "An Investigation Into the Dimensions of Unethical Behavior," *Journal of Education for Business,* 73 (5), (May/June), 284–90.

Burnett, Sara (2002), "Dishonor & Distrust," *Community College Week,* 14 (24), 6.

Chapman, Kenneth J., Richard Davis, Daniel Toy, and Lauren Wright (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), (December), 236–49.

Cummings, Kate (2003), "Pushing Against Plagiarism Through Creative Assignments," *Library Media Connection,* (March), 22–23.

Freedman, Michael P. (2004), "A Tale of Plagiarism and a New Paradigm," *Phi Delta Kappan,* (March), 545–48.

Griffith, Victoria (2003), "An End to the Female Minority: GENDER GAP: The Forte Foundation is Addressing the Problem of Why So Few Women Apply to Business Schools, Writes Victoria Griffith," *Financial Times,* (January 13), 11.

Howard, Rebecca Moore (2002), "Don't Police Plagiarism: Just Teach!" *www.eddigest.com,* (January), 46–49.

Isserman, Maurice (2003), "Plagiarism: A Lie of the Mind," *Chronicle of Higher Education,* 49 (34), (May 2), B12.

Kidwell, Linda Achey, Karen Wozniak, and Jeanne Phoenix Laurel (2003), "Student Reports and Faculty Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty," *Teaching Business Ethics,* 7, 3 (August), 205–14.

Kuther, Tara L. (2004), "A Profile of the Ethical Professor," *College Teaching,* 51 (4), 153–60.

Lambert, Kelly de, Nicky Ellen, and Louise Taylor (2003), "Cheating – What Is It and Why Do It: A Study in New Zealand Tertiary Institutions of the Perceptions and Justifications for Academic Dishonesty," *Journal of American Academy of Business,* 3 (1/2), (September), 98.

Leming, James S. (1980), "Cheating Behavior, Subject Variables, and Components of the Internal-External Scale Under High and Low Risk Conditions," *Journal of Educational Research,* 74 (2), (November/December), 83–87.

McCabe, Donald L. and Linda Klebe Trevino (1993), "Academic Dishonesty: Honor Codes and Other Contextual Influences," *Journal of Higher Education,* 64 (5), 520–38.

_____ and _____ (1997), "Individual and Contextual Influences on Academic Dishonesty," *Research in Higher Education,* 38 (3), 379–96.

_____ (1999), "Academic Dishonesty Among High School Students," *Adolescence,* 34 (136), (Winter), 681–87.

_____ and Andrew L. Makowski (2001), "Resolving Allegations of Academic Dishonesty: Is There a Role for Students to Play," *About Campus,* (March/April), 17–21.

McLafferty, Charles L. and Karen M. Foust (2004), "Electronic Plagiarism as a College Instructor's Nightmare – Prevention and Detection," *Journal of Education for Business,* (January/February), 186–89.

Meade, J. (1992), "Cheating is Academic Dishonesty Par for the Course," *Prism,* 1 (7), 30–32.

Nonis, Sarath A. and Cathy Owens Swift (1998), "Deterring Cheating Behavior in the Marketing Classroom: An Analysis of the Effects of Demographics, Attitudes, and In-class Deterrent Strategies," *Journal of Marketing Education,* 20 (3), (December), 188–99.

Park, Chris (2003), "In Other (People's) Words: Plagiarism by University Students – Literature and Lessons," *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education,* 28 (5), 471–88.

Payne, Stephen L. and Karen S. Nantz (1994), "Social Accounts and Metaphors About Cheating," *College*

Teaching, 42 (3), (Summer), 90.

Pfeffer, Jeffrey (2003), "Teaching the Wrong Lesson," *Business 2.0,* 4 (10), (November), 60.

Pullin, Robert, Victor Ortloff, Saundra Casey, and Jonathon B. Payne (2000), "Analysis of Academic Misconduct Using Unobtrusive Research: A Study of Discarded Cheat Sheets," *College Student Journal,* 34 (4), (December), 616.

Rawwas, Mohammed Y.A., Jamal A. Al-Khatib, and Scott J. Vitell (2004), "Academic Dishonesty: A Cross-Cultural Comparison of U.S. and Chinese Marketing Students," *Journal of Marketing Education,* 26 (1), (April), 89–100.

Rogers, Hudson P., C.M. Kochunny, and Alphonso Ogbuehi (1993), *Journal of Marketing Education,* (Spring), 11–19.

Scanlon, Patrick M. (2004), "Student Online Plagiarism: How Do We Respond," *College Teaching,* 51 (4), 161–65.

Scribner, Mary Ellen (2003), "An Ounce of Prevention: Defeating Plagiarism in the Information Age," *Library Media Connection,* (February), 32–34.

Straw, D. (2002), "The Plagiarism of Generation 'Why Not'?" *Community College Week,* 14 (July 8), 4–7.

Taylor, Kelley R. (2003), "Bracing for Cheating and Plagiarism," *www.eddigest.com,* (November), 54–59

Singhapakdi, Anusorn and Scott J. Vitell (1994), "Ethical Ideologies of Future Marketers: The Relative Influences of Machiavellianism and Gender," *Journal of Marketing Education,* (Spring), 34–42.

_____ (2004), "Important Factors Underlying Ethical Intentions of Students: Implications for Marketing Education," *Journal of Marketing Education,* 26 (3), (December), 261–70.

Spangenberg, Eric and Carl Obermiller (1996), "To Cheat or Not to Cheat: Reducing Cheating by Requesting Self-Prophecy," *Marketing Education Review,* 6 (3), (Fall), 95–103.

Swift, Cathy Owens and Sarath Noonis (1998), "When No One is Watching: Cheating Behaviors on Projects and Assignments," *Marketing Education Review,* 8 (1), (Spring), 27–36.

_____, Luther (Trey) Denton, and Sarath A. Nonis (1998), "Cheating, Internet Style: Guarding Against On-Line Term Paper Mills," *Marketing Education Review,* 8 (2), (Summer), 19–27.

Thompson, Kenneth N. (1994), "A Procedure for Identifying the Possibility of Student Answer Copying on Multiple-Choice Examinations," *Marketing Education Review,* 4 (Summer), 6–13.

Williams, Melanie Stallings, and William R. Hosek (2003), "Strategies for Reducing Academic Dishonesty," *Journal of Legal Studies Education,* 21 (1), 87.