Parental Awareness and Attitudes toward Academic Dishonesty

in a Suburban High School Setting

Mike Sykes

The College at Brockport

Table of Contents

Table of Tables

Table 1 displays the level of parental awareness toward academically dishonest behaviors of students and student perceptions of those behaviors.

Table 2 presents the awareness levels of parents regarding specific types of academically dishonest behaviors.

Table 3 shows the attitudes of parents toward academically dishonest behaviors.

Table 4 presents the findings regarding whether or not parents think that students should be punished for academic dishonesty.

Abstract

This study examines the parental awareness and attitudes toward academic dishonesty at the high school level to address a gap in the literature. Little data is currently available regarding the knowledge and views of parents regarding various aspects of academic dishonesty. A quantitative survey was created by the researcher and utilized in both online and paper forms to collect data from parents of students in grades 9-12 in a suburban high school. Results indicate that parents think academic dishonesty is unacceptable and are marginally aware of what specific techniques involved. Parents disagreed with students not being punished for academically dishonest behavior.

Keywords: academic dishonesty, cheating, plagiarism, awareness, attitudes

Literature Review

Academic dishonesty is a widely discussed topic in relation to the achievement and behavior patterns of students in secondary school (Strom & Strom, 2007). High school students often engage in behaviors and practices that are considered academic dishonesty (Josephson Institute of Ethics, 2006: McCabe, 1999; Strom & Strom, 2007). Reasons for engaging in academic dishonesty are numerable; students may cheat for a single, particular reason or may be influenced by social pressures (McCabe, 1999). The problem of academic dishonesty is not contained within the walls of our educational institutions. Students who believe that academic cheating is an acceptable practice may bring these behaviors with them as they move into post-secondary education and into the workplace.

The duties of school counselors address the needs of students in three domains: academic, career, and personal/social (American School Counseling Association, 2005). Academic dishonesty can be a barrier to student success in each of these three domains (Strom & Strom, 2007). It is important for school counselors to be knowledgeable about academic dishonesty in order to address the issue and its potential implications with the stakeholders involved (ASCA, 2005).

Definition of academic dishonesty

Academic dishonesty is the term used to describe behaviors or actions that are commonly considered to be cheating (Strom & Strom, 2007). These behaviors may include, but are not limited to: plagiarism, cheating, fabrication, deception, bribery, or sabotage (Edgren & Walters, 2006; Strom & Strom, 2007). Each type of academic dishonesty is associated with a particular set of behaviors considered to be unethical and unacceptable (Edgren & Walters, 2006; Strom &

Strom, 2007). The three main terms are mentioned most often in the literature: plagiarism, cheating, and ghostwriting.

There are subtle differences in the wording of the definitions of plagiarism, but the overall explanation for the behavior remains similar across sources. Merriam-Webster's online dictionary was the only source reviewed that provided a direct definition of plagiarism, while other sources utilized a brief description of the behavior involved.

Merriam-Webster's online dictionary defines plagiarism as:

1)stealing and passing off the ideas or words of another as one's own, 2) using another's production without crediting the source, 3) committing literary theft, and 4) presenting as new and original an idea or product derived from an existing source .

Plagiarism.org further explains that "plagiarism is an act of fraud. It involves both stealing someone else's work and lying about it afterward." Edgren and Walters (2006) and Villano (2006) describe plagiarism as basically a deceitful practice of trying to fool the audience into believing a body of work was created by the student in question, when it actually originated elsewhere. What used to be a time-consuming, word for word copying of another persons's work, is now replaced by "cut and paste plagiarism" (Edgren & Walters, 2006; Talab, 2004). Most plagiarism today is carried out using computers and students just have to point and click to steal someone else's work and ideas (Talab, 2004). Though the specific tools used to commit plagiarism may be changing with the introduction of technology into society, the underlying practice remains the same; presenting someone else's work as one's own. It is also noted that this behavior is not limited to students, but has been identified in papers submitted by professionals as well.

There is another internet based form of academic dishonesty called "Ghostwriting," which is falls under the category of plagiarism (Yuan, 2006). A Ghostwriter is someone who will provide work to someone else in exchange for money (Edgren & Walters, 2006; Mahon, 2006; Villano, 2006). If a student can afford to pay a Ghostwriter, it seems like a safer option to students because anti-plagiarism programs like TurnItIn.com cannot red-flag original work. There are sites that are referred to as "paper-mills" or "paper warehouses" that have stock papers available for sale; papers are sold online to any person who wants to pay for them (Edgren and Walters, 2006; Villano, 2006). Other sites offer to create an original work that meets the assignment criteria provided by the purchaser (Edgren & Walters, 2006; Villano, 2006).

Cheating is a broad term and is used throughout the research to describe numerous behaviors related to academic dishonesty. Most sources provide a description of behaviors commonly labeled as cheating and Merriam-Webster's online dictionary provides a direct definition. Merriam-Webster online defines cheating as: "1) to practice fraud or trickery and 2) to violate rules dishonestly." Some behaviors commonly associated with the term cheating include, but are not limited to: crib notes copied onto desks, clothing, and labels, copying on tests and assignments, exchanging papers during a test, and newer higher tech methods like texting or emailing during an exam and buying papers online (Edgren & Walters, 2006; Johnson & Martin, 2005). It is apparent that students will often exert great effort in order to cheat, like the case where students stole answers to upcoming exams from inside a school and shared this information with 40 to 60 other students (Zirkel, 2009). Some students will spend money to have someone else take assessments for them. Yuan (2006) reported widespread use of "hired guns" who will take tests for other students in exchange for money.

Students paying someone else to complete work for them is not a brand new practice. Technology, however, has allowed cheating to become more widespread as the internet provides increased opportunity to locate providers of academically dishonest services (Nworie & Haughton, 2008; Yuan, 2006). Prior to the internet, a student would have limited options to locate someone to take a test or write a paper for him or her (Yuan, 2006). There are now over 100 different internet sites offering student test taking services and papermills that will sell stock papers or tailor make an assignment (Yuan, 2006). Students spend can spend an average of 23 hours per week interacting with electronic devices (Nworie & Haughton, 2008). Eighty percent of students used varying types of messaging systems, like text messaging, on a daily basis and greater than 90% used high technology devices to complete assignments (Nworie & Haughton, 2008). Portable devices, such as cellular phones, are now small enough to be hidden from view in a classroom and can access the internet anywhere, anytime (Johnson & Martin, 2005). The increased availability and variety of methods used for academic dishonesty present a problem for those who evaluate and assess students; administrators, teachers, faculty, and professionals must be familiar with each kind of behavior used to cheat in order to identify those responsible (Johnson & Martin, 2005). Whatever methods are being used by students, the incidents of academic dishonesty remain high.

Prevalence of the problem

It has been said that, "cheaters never prosper". If this statement were true, why would any student bother to cheat? Clearly, students perceive benefits since the prevalence of academic dishonesty remains high (Edgren & Walters, 2006; Johnson & Martin, 2005; Josephson Institute of Ethics, 2006; Lathrop & Foss, 2005; McCabe, 1999; Strom & Strom, 2007; Westacott, 2008). A nationwide survey revealed that 60% of 36,000 secondary school students admitted to cheating

on exams and assignments for their classes (The Josephson Institute of Ethics, 2006).   Eighty

percent of students selected as eligible for *Who's Who among American High School Students*

admitted to having cheated on in-class, teacher made assignments and state exams (Lathrop &

Foss, 2005). The rate of academically dishonest behaviors among academically elite students

has increased 10% over the past 20 years (Lathrop & Foss, 2005). Other research reported that

75% of students admitted to cheating, and at least 50%, and perhaps as high as 80% of high

school students have committed other acts of academic dishonesty (Edgren & Walters, 2006;

Johnson & Martin, 2005).

The rates of plagiarism are high in secondary schools (Johnson & Martin, 2005; McCabe,

1999; Strom & Strom, 2007; Villano, 2006). According to the research, two types of plagiarism

are most rampant: 1) cut-and-paste plagiarism and 2) ghostwriting (Villano, 2006). A study of

18,000 high school students that found 60% admitted to plagiarizing (Villano, 2006). This result

is higher than that of the Josephson Institute of Ethics (2006) which found that 33% of high

school student respondents admitted to copying a document from the internet within the last 12

months. Even with differing statistical findings, the rates of plagiarism are one third of students,

on the low end, and could be as high as, two thirds of adolescents committing this act.

One may question survey results regarding academic dishonesty rates as being lower than

the actual number of violators of academic ethical codes as data obtained from surveys may not

represent accurately the total number of students who cheat (McCabe, 1999). The inaccuracy

may be due to students not wanting to report that they engage in academically dishonest

behaviors and the actual number of those who cheat may be even higher than surveyed results

(McCabe, 1999). Though the statistics for the rates of academic dishonesty may differ from one

study to another, the body of research examined concludes that this problem is widespread.

According to Yuan (2006), cheating has become a common business practice in China. Organizers and operators of businesses that offer cheating services have been reported to make enough money to live a life of luxury; they get rich off of helping people cheat (Yuan, 2006). One former professional admits that at one time he was producing written work and selling it to students, and made enough money to purchase his engagement ring for his wife (Mahon, 2006). Strom and Strom (2007) report that many other nations are experiencing increasingly high rates of academic dishonesty and this problem is being examined in Japan, China, Australia, and other developed countries. With the rates of academic dishonesty rising in our nation and others, one may wonder what is causing this situation to occur.

Reasons for this problem occurring

There are multiple factors associated with the high number of students who engage in academically dishonest behaviors (Bracy, 2005; Edgren & Walters, 2006; Josephson Institute of Ethics, 2005; McCabe, 1999). Focus groups were conducted with students to examine the topic of academic dishonesty (McCabe, 1999). This qualitative research was conducted with high school and college students. The results suggested that high school students saw cheating as an acceptable behavior, and one that occurs so frequently that it is just a sign of the times rather than unethical action (Edgren & Walters, 2006; McCabe, 1999). One high school student participant responded, "I think times have changed. Cheating is kind of considered, I don't know, just a kind of daily thing that's out there, almost kind of acceptable. Teachers know it and students know it" (McCabe, 1999, p.2). A team of Harvard researchers examining student academic dishonesty behaviors saw the attitudes toward academic dishonesty as a major problem in education (Bracy, 2005). Howard Gardner, of the Harvard team, reported that students want to be people considered moral in their behavior, and yet, yield to views like those expressed by

respondents in McCabe (1999), who reasoned that cheating is so widespread and common that it must be acceptable. The Josephson Institute of Ethics (2005) found that 83% of students said, "It's not worth it to lie or cheat because it hurts your character" (Question 14). Why then, did 60% of students admit to academically dishonest behaviors on the same survey? One explanation is that Gardner's team's findings suggest that students see themselves as moral and ethical people, and therefore, whatever actions they take must also be moral and ethical (Bracy, 2005; The Josephson Institute of Ethics, 2006).

The results from a poll of high school students reflect that students may be motivated to cheat by the pressure to excel in school and on tests in order to get into a good college (Strom & Strom, 2007; Taylor, Pogrebin, & Dodge, 2002). The pressures for students to perform on assessments are high, and the value placed on instrument scores which are used to measure performance may give students the impression that the end justifies the means (Taylor, Pogrebin, & Dodge, 2002; Westacott, 2008). It is also suggested that the teaching of test taking strategies using programs with titles like "Cracking the SAT," and the availability of Cliff's Notes promote questionable ethics in students (Westacott, 2008, p.23). Westacott suggested that students may see shortcuts to test performance as more acceptable, particularly because they are often taught by teachers and supported by parents; people who students often view as ethical (Westacott, 2008). By teaching students how to take a test rather than focusing on learning the material the assessment will cover, both parents and teachers are subordinating the enjoyment of learning in favor of exam performance (Westacott, 2008).

Teachers are not only teaching to the test, but are also doing little to punish students caught committing academically dishonest acts (Strom & Strom, 2005; Westacott, 2008). Of teachers responding to a survey, 70% reported feeling afraid to report students who cheat

because of fear of parent reactions (Strom & Strom, 2005, p.108). Many teachers now have their

effectiveness defined by the performance of their students, so a teacher who turns in a student for

cheating may view this as hurting his or her own chances of being labeled as "good" (Strom &

Strom, 2005). Both Westacott (2008) and Strom and Strom (2005) concur that the educational

system overvalues assessment performance and this practice may be pressuring, and even

coercing, students into believing academic dishonesty is an acceptable practice.

Another possible underlying cause of the epidemic of academic dishonesty is culture. Fu,

Evans, Wang, and Lee (2008) examined a type of lying called "blue lies." Blue lies are those

told by adults in order to protect the larger group or benefit the common good (Fu, Evans, Wang,

& Lee, 2008). A study was conducted with nine and 11 year old Chinese students to examine the

possible developmental origins of lying, specifically those told to benefit the larger group (Fu et

al., 2008). In situations designed to evaluate participant responses, the children exhibited lying

behaviors. The study also found that as age increases, the child participants were more willing to

lie both as a group, and individually, for the benefit of the group (Fu et al., 2008). It was found

that child acceptance levels of telling "blue lies" in the experiment was an accurate predictor of

lying behaviors in daily activities (Fu et al., 2008). It is suggested that people may lie in order to

protect or advance the standing of a group, no matter the size, either workgroup, classroom, or

nationally (Fu et al., 2008).

As much as the greater national culture is a factor in student choices about academic

dishonesty, school and classroom culture can also influence student perceptions of cheating. A

study was conducted to evaluate the effects of teacher pedagogical skill, interpersonal caring,

and classroom goal structure related to student perceptions of acceptability, likelihood of

cheating, and where the blame is placed (Murdock, Miller, & Kohlhardt, 2004). It was found

that students in classes where teacher instructional skill was poor, little caring was shown for

student well-being, and goals were poorly outlined had higher rates of acceptance of cheating

among students (Murdock, Miller, & Kohlhardt, 2004). The students in these classrooms also

engaged in cheating behaviors more frequently (Murdock, Miller, & Kohlhardt, 2004).

Furthermore, those students accepted less blame for their own academic dishonesty, and placed

more of the blame onto the teacher (Murdock et al., 2004; Taylor, Pogrebin & Dodge, 2002).

While many educators and administrators are not reporting much of the academic

dishonesty that occurs within the classroom and school, students have come to realize that little

is done to punish those who cheat, and adults often look the other way (Simon, Carr,

McCullough, Morgan, Oleson, & Ressel, 2004; Strom & Strom, 2007). Whether faculty are

afraid of harsh parent responses to the reporting of a student, or are concerned about their job

performance because they are evaluated by the test scores of their classes, consequences for

academic dishonesty are often not being administered (Simon, Carr, McCullough, Morgan,

Oleson, & Ressel, 2004; Strom & Strom, 2007). The lack of punitive responses to combat

academic dishonesty may be perceived by students as indifference or even endorsement

(McCabe, 1999; Schmelkin, Gilbert, Spencer, Pincus, & Silva, 2008).

The Theory of Planned Behavior may provide clarity as to the inter-connected nature of

the various antecedents to academically dishonest behavior (Stone, Jawahar, & Kisamore, 2010).

A study was completed examining the efficacy of the Theory of Planned Behavior in predicting

cheating behaviors (Stone, Jawahar, & Kisamore, 2010). The findings suggest that this theory

may successfully incorporate multiple criteria associated with academic dishonesty (Stone,

Jawahar, & Kisamore, 2010). The Theory of Planned Behavior suggests that the intention to

engage in a particular behavior is influenced by: 1) attitudes about the specific behavior, 2) the

norms or expectations related to the behavior, and 3) the perceived difficulty level of carrying

out the behavior (Stone et al., 2010). Student attitudes about academic dishonesty may be a

result of communication, intended or unintended, from parents or cultural beliefs community

wide or nationally, that do not value ethics in school. These communications, or lack thereof,

may form a student perception that behaviors producing higher scores are acceptable in order to

meet expectations (McCabe, 1999). Technological advances have created newer and cleverer

ways in which to cheat, making it easier to engage in the practice of academic dishonesty.

Basically, student beliefs about academic dishonesty and the ethical implications may be effected

by messages communicated purposefully or unintentionally by parents, peers, schools, and

communities; this may make resisting the urge to employ widely available methods of cheating

increasingly difficult. The theory may explain why the reported rates of academic dishonesty are

so high and the effects of this practice can spread far beyond the school walls.

It is questionable whether the punishments placed upon students found guilty of academic

dishonesty really teach them about ethical behavior, or just deter them momentarily (Edgren &

Walters, 2006). Proactive measures may increase student understanding not only of academic

dishonesty, but of what is considered to be ethical and moral behavior (Edgren & Walters, 2006;

LaSalle, 2009). Some studies suggest that increasing student awareness of the issue of academic

dishonesty, and its implications, may help in preventing the occurrence of unethical, cheating

behavior (Edgren & Walters, 2006; LaSalle, 2009).

Another study found that when students have perceptions that there is a high risk of

detection, and severe punishment for cheating, the rates of those behaviors drop from 39.3% to

3.4% (LaSalle, 2009). The research indicates that there is no one single factor that causes

students to cheat and instead academically dishonest behaviors may take place due to the culmination of numerous criteria.

Implications of academic dishonesty and its effects

Students who participate in academically dishonest behaviors, directly or indirectly, are striving to appear cleverer, more able, more competent, and more qualified than they truly are (Westacott, 2008). Students who do not cheat must then compete for jobs, or admissions to colleges and universities against students who have undeservedly high grades and test scores (Westacott, 2008). With high rates of academic dishonesty and low rates of the identification and punishment for such behaviors, cheaters are able to advance undeservedly alongside their honest and hard working counterparts.

Academic dishonesty is "cheating" students out of their education and is just as rampant in colleges and universities. The process in which academic dishonesty occurs is described as cyclical in nature (Happel & Jennings, 2008; Westacott, 2008). Students learn academically dishonest behaviors in secondary school and are awarded grades according to the scores on certain assessments (Happel & Jennings, 2008; Westacott, 2008). With the high percentage of students, considered to be elite, engaging in cheating, it is arguable that the grades on assessments are not based on achievement or active participation in coursework, but rather are measures of how well a student can cheat (Dowling, 2003; Happel & Jennings, 2008; Strom & Strom, 2007). The next phase of the cycle is that the students who engage in academic dishonesty are then selected, perhaps over their more honest cohorts, into more prestigious universities (Happel & Jennings, 2008; Westacott, 2008).

Academic dishonesty then continues at the university level in a manner similar to that of high school; students cheat and plagiarize to raise their scores and professors often do not identify those students responsible so they may be subject to consequences (Happel & Jennings, 2008). Pino and Smith (2003) found that 70% of college students admitted to having committed some act of academic dishonesty. The rate of academic dishonesty in college mirrors that of students in high school, suggesting that the trend of students who cheat, move forward with little consequence (Happel & Jennings, 2008; Pino & Smith; 2003; Westacott, 2008). These professionals involved in the educational system at the secondary and post-secondary levels view academic dishonesty as being systemic in our educational systems, both secondary and post-secondary (Dowling, 2003; Happel & Jennings, 2008). Students who have "earned" good grades through practicing academic dishonesty then move into the workplace.

Academic dishonesty encompasses behaviors that involve unethical actions committed for personal gain; these behaviors are being seen with increasing frequency in businesses globally (Caldwell, 2009; Lucas & Friedrich, 2005; Taylor-Bianco & Deeter-Schmelz, 2007). Corporate scandals in nations around the globe highlight the questionable ethics employed by business decision makers when conducting company transactions and making deals (Taylor-Bianco & Deeter-Schmelz, 2007). Some of the once most respected names in business, like Hewlett-Packard, Adelphia, Worldcomm, and Goldman Sachs, have experienced scandals in which high level executives and shareholders make profits while small investors suffer great losses (Nonis, & Swift, 2001; Taylor-Bianco & Deeter-Schmelz, 2007). The ethical and moral integrity of the business associates can be traced back to the business schools and MBA programs they attended prior to entering the field (Lucas, & Friedrich, 2005; Taylor-Bianco & Deeter-Schmelz, 2007).

There is a connection between the students attending schools in business programs and employees who use deceptive, unethical, and manipulative practices to make a profit; the apparent link is the academically dishonest behaviors employed by students in business programs that are then brought with students into the workforce (Lucas & Friedrich, 2005; Taylor-Bianco & Deeter-Schmelz, 2007). In fact, studies revealed that graduate students in business programs admit to committing acts of academic dishonesty more frequently than their non-business major graduate student counter-parts (Caldwell, 2009; McCabe, Butterfield, & Trevino, 2006; Nonis & Swift, 2001; Taylor-Bianco & Deeter-Schmelz, 2007). Over half of the graduate level business students surveyed cheat to some extent within their programs (Caldwell, 2009; McCabe, Butterfield, Trevino, 2006). With such a high level of unethical behavior in graduate level business students it is not surprising that these behaviors continue once they have entered positions in corporations.

The problem of academic dishonesty is inter-related to several other issues affecting people around the globe. Research suggests that academically dishonest behaviors begin in the school systems and are not dealt with effectively (McCabe, 1999; Strom & Strom, 2007). Professionals in the educational field inadvertently reinforce academic dishonesty by not pursuing consequences for offenders; approximately 95% of students who cheat receive no consequences for their unethical actions (Happel & Jennings, 2008; Strom & Strom, 2007). Students who cheat are then rewarded with diplomas and acceptance into college and university systems or they are hired directly into the work force alongside their honest peers, which is why some argue that grades are no longer accurate indicators for student ability (Westacott, 2008). The students bring these unethical learned behaviors with them into colleges and universities and the cycle of reinforcement continues similar to The Theory of Planned Behavior (Stone et al.,

2010). Students cheat, the faculty does not adequately address the behaviors, students receive no consequences and higher assessment scores, and move into the workforce (Happel & Jennings, 2008; Pino & Smith; 2003; Westacott, 2008). Once in the workplace, the problem of academic dishonesty becomes the use of unethical decisions which may affect millions of people around the globe through the dealings of major corporations (McCabe et al., 2006; Nonis & Swift, 2001). Unethical business practices may ultimately lead to job loss, investment devaluation, bankruptcies, and other economic and social maladies (McCabe et al., 2006; Nonis & Swift, 2001).

A study was conducted to examine student moral identities in relation to their participation in behaviors deemed morally unacceptable (Wowra, 2007). The findings suggested that students who place greater emphasis on their own moral identity, are less likely to engage in behaviors considered to be unethical, such as academic dishonesty (Wowra, 2007). Students who are more sensitive to social evaluation are more likely to engage in behaviors considered to be unethical (Wowra, 2007).

The case of a group of students attending Hanover High School in New Hampshire relates to the struggle faced by students when deciding to follow a strong moral identity or yield to social pressures. Paul and two students agreed to stand guard for six other students who stole exam answers from the high school (Zirkel, 2009). Having second thoughts, Paul and his two friends left the building, however, after running into the six students who stole the answers in the parking lot, Paul and his two friends accepted the answers to the honors math exam (Zirkel, 2009). Approximately 60 students reviewed the exam answers prior to taking the test (Zirkel, 2009). According to the results of the study reported by Wowra (2007), Paul and his two friends seemed to be struggling with their own moral identity versus the pressure of social evaluation.

The courts ruled that all of the students involved were guilty and ordered them to pay hundreds

of dollars in fines, work 25 hours of community service, and write letters of apology to faculty,

administrators, and students (Zirkel, 2009). The town of Hanover remained divided over the

punishment received by students, with some saying it was too harsh and believing the young men

had just given in to the pressures of high stakes assessment (Zirkel, 2009). Other residents

responded that the students got off too easily.

Methods used to commit academic dishonesty

The types of academic dishonesty and methods used to cheat outlined in the research

literature seem to be separated into two distinct categories: low-tech and high-tech. The low-

tech practices are the actions considered tried and true and require only simple tools. Some

students will create crib notes or cheat sheets, with information about subject matter covered on a

test or quiz written on small pieces of paper (Johnson & Martin, 2005). These cheat sheets can

be hidden somewhere on the student's person, like up a shirt sleeve or in a pocket and then

carefully viewed during the examination to retrieve information (Johnson & Martin, 2005).

Other forms of illegal notes and information can be concealed on articles of clothing, like hats

and shoes (Johnson & Martin, 2005). Some students are clever and creative enough to record

information and hide it on drink bottle labels, inside pens, and even on food wrappers (Johnson

& Martin, 2005). The students in Hanover may not have used crib sheets exactly, but they had

prior knowledge of exam answers to be used during a test (Zirkel, 2009). The answers could

have been recorded onto sheets for use when needed. Other low tech options include copying off

of the person sitting nearby or whispering to a classmate during a test (Johnson & Martin, 2005).

Westacott (2008) points out that there are practices employed by teachers that may blur the line between honest methods of helping students prepare for assessment and "cheating" the system. Teachers will hold review sessions the day before the test is given and cover information that will be on the examination the next day (Westacott, 2008). Students are often taught test taking strategies that provide information on how to score higher on assessments, rather than study strategies used to learn the material (Westacott, 2008). Some teachers will allow students to have open note tests and quizzes (Westacott, 2008; Wright, 2009). Other teachers may even leave posters with information related to the test hanging on the classroom walls while students complete the exam (Wright, 2009). It is questionable whether or not students are truly being measured against the assessments when they are aided directly or indirectly, through the action or purposeful inaction of the faculty (Wright, 2009). Some professionals believe that all of the ways in which students are given any assistance in any way while taking an exam is a distortion of their performance (Westacott, 2008; Wright, 2009).

The growing use of technology in the school environment creates many ways in which students are able to use it to commit academic dishonesty (Johnson & Martin, 2005). These high-tech practices can be divided into two subgroups: using technology to access information unethically and using technology to plagiarize (Johnson & Martin, 2005). It is simple for students to use technology to access information in order to cheat. Crib notes no longer have to be written in tiny letters, cleverly hidden, cellular phones can photograph entire pages of notes and information for easy use during a test (Johnson & Martin, 2005). Cellular phones with internet capabilities also allow students to text and email each other during exams. Search engines, like Google and BING can be accessed to look up any information (Johnson & Martin, 2005).

Plagiarism is identified as the most wide spread and growing type of academic dishonesty and students can copy another person's work with great ease (Cooper, 2007; Sisti, 2007). Cooper (2007) discusses plagiarism committed by students in the internet era and a phenomenon called "copy-paste" plagiarism and what Cooper refers to as "patchwork plagiarism." Patchwork plagiarism is where students plagiarize sections of other works and sources in order to complement what they have already written (Cooper, 2007). A study conducted in 2001 found that over 40% of undergraduate students engaged in copy-paste plagiarism, an increase of 30% from McCabe's 1999 study (Sisti, 2007). The results from another study found that 33% of high school students surveyed admitted to plagiarizing an internet document within the past year (The Josephson Institute of Ethics, 2006); though this suggests a drop from the 2001 findings, the rate reflects that one third of all high school students are engaging in plagiarism. Some researchers suggested that there was a positive correlation of rate of academic dishonesty and availability of technology (Johnson & Martin, 2005; Nworie & Haughton, 2008).

Technological advances have made it easier for students to cheat and increased the ways in which they can carry out these behaviors. Simultaneously, detecting academically dishonest behaviors has become more difficult for faculty and staff (Johnson & Martin, 2005; Nworie & Haughton, 2008). Students will use commonly carried devices, like cellular phones, iPods, PDAs, and even the very calculators required for mathematics courses to hide information for use during an assessment (Johnson & Martin, 2005). These devices make it possible for students to email and text during exams and are small enough that detecting the use of them may be difficult to impossible depending on the size of the class (Johnson & Martin, 2005; Nworie & Haughton, 2008). Nworie and Haughton (2008) described the temptation this technology presents to modern students.

Many schools are bringing technology into the classroom to meet the demands of science and technology standards. Some courses are now taught differently and require more high-tech devices in order to complete the requirements (Nworie & Haughton, 2008). Mathematics courses now require the use of special graphing calculators in high school (Johnson & Martin, 2005). The Law of Unintended Consequences, as introduced by Merton in 1936, states that unintended consequences are due to several factors, among which are a lack of knowledge and forethought and the sacrifice of controlled, long-term progress in favor of quick and immediate short-term goals (Nworie & Haughton, 2008). Schools have been bringing in technology and students have been obtaining high-tech devices on their own and the unintended consequences have been increased access to methods of academic dishonesty (Nworie & Haughton, 2008). Many schools are leaving their current educational systems in place while simply adding technology; the education system is not set up to address the possible unintended consequences of technology, like academic dishonesty (Nworie & Haughton, 2008).

As plagiarism is the most prevalent form of academically dishonest behaviors, it is also the practice for which technology has had perhaps the greatest impact. Prior to computers and printers, reports were hand written or typed out word by word so even if someone did plagiarize it was nearly as much work as writing it from scratch. Technology has now made plagiarism as easy as pointing and clicking, which is known as copy-paste plagiarism (Cooper, 2007). The students then justify this behavior through the belief that they wrote their own paper and just included information from an outside source or they "collaborated" with someone else (Cooper, 2007; McCabe, 1999; Moore, 2002). The students are not seeing a breach of ethics in this plagiaristic behavior. This patchwork, or copy-paste, plagiarism is justified by students similarly

to the students in McCabe's focus groups; they view it as commonplace and therefore acceptable to improve performance (Cooper, 2007; McCabe, 1999; Moore, 2002).

Students in the focus groups viewed teachers as unaware and ill educated about technological devices and only understanding their curriculum from the books used in the classroom (McCabe, 1999).   The students, therefore, do not think that they will get caught and one explained how easy it is to copy entire papers, changing only the name on it, and handing it in for a grade. Students further explain how they are not aware of anyone in their school ever being identified as having committed plagiarism (McCabe, 1999). The generation gap may be an obstacle to teacher awareness about the use of technology for academic dishonesty as students have grown up with high-tech devices and are more familiar with them than many teachers (Cooper, 2007).

Businesses have been created to help students commit academic dishonesty through plagiarism by selling papers online from "paper mills" (Talab, 2004). If you have enough money, one could conceivably buy his or her way through school, especially since an estimated 95 percent of cheaters and plagiarists never get caught (Johnson & Martin, 2005; Strom & Strom, 2007). Schoolsucks.com is a popular website used by high school students to find papers and assignments to copy and paste or download and pass off as their own (Talab, 2004). The site's motto is "download your workload" and there are well over 100 of such sites available to students as well as others that tailor papers to student needs (Talab, 2004). Sites like Alltermpapersites.com provide links and information about purchasing papers online or having them created specifically for the criteria provided by the purchaser (Talab, 2004). Students outline the requirements of an assignment to a Ghostwriter, and the paper will be written

specifically to meet the preset criteria (Mahon, 2006; Talab, 2004). Ironically, up to 80% of these "custom" papers are also plagiarized (Talab, 2004).

The use of technology by students to commit academic dishonesty has led to the creation of high-tech methods of identifying plagiarism. Sites like Turnitin.com are effective methods of checking written papers for plagiarism (Talab, 2004). The cost of these programs can vary according to how fees are calculated by the companies themselves. Turnitin.com ranges in price from $1,000 to $10,000 dollars per year per campus; the tools necessary to detect plagiarism can be costly (Talab, 2004). There are some companies that offer software programs at little or no cost, but these services are not as comprehensive as their larger, more expensive counterparts (Talab, 2004). These anti-plagiarism companies are as readily available online as the companies offering students assistance with the practice.

Impact of parental influence

Research has shown that the behaviors of parents, including the parenting style used to socialize children, can have a profound impact on adolescent development and behavior choice (Mackey, Arnold, & Pratt, 2001; Unnever, Cullen, & Agnew, 2006). Two studies were conducted using narratives to assess the level of responsiveness of students to the viewpoints and values of their parents (Mackey, Arnold, & Pratt, 2001). The studies are based on the idea that the mind is organized dialogically, that each person has in inner voice or set of voices used to deal with situations and experiences (Mackey et al., 2001). These voices are developed through experience and interaction with others, like parents and peers, and adolescents use this internal dialogue as they address events and challenges (Mackey et al., 2001). This interaction between inner voice and action, along with analysis of the experiential results, develops into the

adolescent's personal belief system (Mackey et al., 2001). The narratives completed by the

adolescents taking part in the study described the voices of their parents. After examination it

was found that students who identified their parent's as authoritarian were more likely to heavily

consider the internalized parental voice when making decisions (Mackey et al., 2001; Simons-

Morton, Chen, Hand, & Haynie, 2008). The findings suggested that adolescents were more

likely to be responsive to parental influence when parent figures engage in an authoritarian

parenting style.

Parenting style is also related to problem behavior in adolescents. Simons-Morton, Chen,

Hand, and Haynie (2008) researched the relationship between parenting style and the propensity

children possessed toward delinquent behavior. Delinquency is identified as involving deceitful

behaviors and the involvement in academic dishonesty indicates willingness to commit deceitful

acts (Simons-Morton et al., 2008). The findings suggest that both parenting style and parent

responsiveness are associated with adolescent behavior (Simons-Morton et al., 2008). Parental

awareness and monitoring is an important part of parenting style and becomes more involved as

adolescents experience increasing levels of freedom and separation from the home (Simons-

Morton et al., 2008). As parental contact with children steadily decreases into adulthood and

adolescents experience more in closer proximity to peers than parents, student participation in

delinquent behavior may increase without active involvement from parents (Laird, Criss, Pettit,

Dodge, & Bates, 2007; Simons-Morton et al., 2008; Unnever, Cullen, & Agnew, 2006). A

combination of stronger, more authoritative parenting styles and increased parental awareness of

adolescent behavior is associated with decreased levels of student involvement in delinquent

behaviors (Simons-Morton et al., 2008). Parents who communicate more strongly with their

adolescents and are more aware of the location and activities of their students may decrease the

occurrence of delinquent behavior, including academic dishonesty, committed by those students (Laird, Criss, Pettit, Dodge, & Bates, 2007; Simons-Morton et al., 2008; Unnever, Cullen, & Agnew, 2006). Increased levels of parent communication and direct involvement with adolescents decreases the likelihood of relationships with antisocial peers (Laird et al., 2007). The study conducted examined the effect of parental awareness and involvement as mediating factors in adolescent's likelihood of participation in antisocial activities and relationship to peers who exhibit antisocial behavior (Laird et al., 2007).

Parental awareness is cultivated through the practice of monitoring adolescent behavior to develop a detailed understanding of activities and social interactions with which the student is involved (Laird et al., 2007). The monitoring process essentially occurs in three stages (Hayes, Hudson, & Matthews, 2003; Laird et al., 2007). The first stage occurs prior to an adolescent participating in an activity and is when parents set ground rules and explain expectations to the adolescent. This is the voice of the parent that will be internalized by the adolescent and recalled during the experience (Mackey et al., 2001). The second stage is the actual experience of the adolescent relatively free from direct parental control, where he or she employs more self-monitoring and independence. At this point the adolescent will be exposed to the voices of his or her peer group and will measure them against the internalized dialogue of the parents (Hayes et al., 2003; Laird et al., 2007; Mackey et al., 2001). The third and final stage occurs when the adolescent returns home to the parents and discusses with varying degrees of detail the events that occurred when out on his or her own. Three things occur during this phase: 1) the adolescent reveals details of what happened, 2) the parents respond accordingly, and 3) the adolescent responds back to the parents and evaluates the entire process (Hayes et al., 2003; Hayes, L, Hudson, A., & Matthews, 2007; Laird et al., 2007).

According to this model of parental awareness through monitoring, the adolescent should absorb the underlying lessons learned from this experience and incorporate them into his or her person belief system (Hayes et al., 2003; Mackey et al., 2001). It is important that the adolescent is actively involved in the evaluation of the experience and has input into the possible consequences for his or her behavior (DeRoma, Lassiter, & Davis, 2004). Study findings from research on adolescent involvement in decision making and consequences suggested that parents who communicated openly during the third stage of the monitoring process helped to reinforce lessons learned from the experience, thereby influencing the belief system of the adolescent (DeRoma et al., 2004). This monitoring system model takes into account the parent-child relationship being dynamic in nature and inter-related to the environment in which the family unit lives (Hayes et al., 2003; Hayes et al., 2007). One must realize the importance of the inter-connectedness of the family context in relation to the school, peers, and the surrounding community (Hayes et al., 2003; Hayes et al., 2007).

The results of a study found that a significant correlation between the parent-child relationship and adolescent delinquent behaviors (Burt, McGue, Krueger, Iacono, 2006). The parent-child relationship was identified as a mediating factor (Burt, McGue, Krueger, Iacono, 2006). The environment in which the parent-child relationship exists is associated with exposure of the adolescent to delinquent behavior. Effective monitoring practices of parents may prevent adolescents from participation in unethical behavior patterns presented by peers (Burt, McGue, Krueger, Iacono, 2006; Hayes et al., 2003; Hayes et al., 2007).

Connection to school counseling

The American School Counseling Association outlines ethical standards of school counselors associated with academic dishonesty. A section in the preamble explains that every student should know the meaning and impact of the educational choices they make (ASCA, 2005, 142). Students who choose to engage in academic dishonesty may not see the potential impacts of these practices (McCabe, 1999). School counselors should be educating students about ethical decision making in order to effectively address their responsibility to meet the personal and social needs of students (ASCA, 2005). School counselors assist in establishing academic goals for students that are appropriate for student abilities and future career goals (ASCA, 2005).   Unrealistic academic and career goals may pressure students into committing academic dishonesty in order to meet the high demands of course work and assessments (Westacott, 2008). School counselors must assure that students have equal access to technology according to the ASCA standards. Counselors must take actions to protect students from unethical uses of technology, which include those employed to commit academic dishonesty (ASCA, 2005). School counselors should address academic dishonesty in order to meet ethical standards of the profession and prevent students from receiving consequences associated with unethical educational practices (ASCA, 2005).

It is important for counselors to collaborate with students, parents, and the community (ASCA, 2005; Griffin & Steen, 2010). The results of a study suggest that collaboration is an important aspect of a counselor's job in order to meet the expectations of students, parents, and administration (Griffin & Steen, 2010). The ASCA model outlines the responsibilities that counselors have to students, parents, and the community. In order for a counselor to meet the competencies of the national model, one must adhere to the guidelines in forming mutually

beneficial relationships with those stakeholders associated with the school counseling profession (ASCA, 2005).   This relationship is important for the role of school counselors as educators to students and parents alike (ASCA, 2005). Well informed parents and students are better able to participate in a collaborative effort with school counselors and community members to address academic issues, such as academic dishonesty (ASCA, 2005).

School counselors will need to be knowledgeable about academic dishonesty in order to inform others about the issue and its implications. The direct impacts of academic dishonesty could range from minimal to severe and could even result in legal charges (Zirkel, 2009). There are various interventions that could address these impacts. Educating parents about developing a more authoritative parental voice to influence students about ethical decision making and use of the monitoring process could prepare them to address academic dishonesty with their adolescents (Hayes et al., 2003; Laird et. al., 2007). Teachers and administrators could be made more aware of the issue in order to address it with students (Simon et al., 2004; Strom & Strom, 2007; Westacott, 2008). School counselors can play a leading role in collaborating with stakeholders in order to deal with academic dishonesty effectively.

Conclusion

Academic dishonesty rates remain high (Edgren & Walters, 2006; Johnson & Martin, 2005; Josephson Institute of Ethics, 2006; Lathrop & Foss, 2005; McCabe, 1999; Strom & Strom, 2007; Westacott, 2008). There exist innumerable ways in which cheating and plagiarism can be committed and, from the low-tech to the high-tech methods, students are using many varying tools (Edgren & Walters, 2006; Strom & Strom, 2007). What is concerning to many researchers is that students report feeling little guilt about academic dishonesty and will

rationalize their actions (Bracey, 2005; Edgren & Walters, 2006; McCabe, 1999). Respondents in studies seem to view academic dishonesty as something that everyone does to some extent (Bracey, 2005; Edgren & Walters, 2006; McCabe, 1999). Perhaps the message given to students is not so crystal clear when authority figures say one thing and do another (LaSalle, 2009; Westacott, 2008). Students see authority figures fail to identify and report cheaters and plagiarists in their classes, either because they are not aware of students cheating or are concerned about being blamed themselves, so the behaviors continue at the secondary and post-secondary levels (Simon et al., 2004; Strom & Strom, 2007; Westacott, 2008).

The Theory of Planned Behavior provides a model that represents a possible explanation for how the factors associated with academic dishonesty are inter-related and culminate in the level of intent to commit unethical behavior (Stone et al., 2010). It seems as though a cycle has developed about the occurrence of academic dishonesty, where student cheating is not punished and the behaviors continue in settings outside of the school. The research suggests that academic dishonesty is rampant, the consequences faced are minimal, and adolescents believe that it is acceptable behavior.

Higher levels of parental involvement can be a deterrent to delinquent behavior (Hayes et al., 2003; Laird et. al., 2007). Studies have associated effective parental monitoring, a strong parental voice, and greater awareness of student activities and behaviors with lower rates of delinquent behavior. The active involvement of parents who employ proper monitoring practices raises their awareness of the behaviors of students so that effective evaluation of adolescent actions can be taken (Hayes et al., 2003; Laird et. al., 2007). Studies suggest that the processing of experiences as outlined in the monitoring model helps students internalize the voice of their

parents to use when confronted with moral dilemmas. Parental attitudes can be a strong influence to student behavior choice (Hayes et al., 2003; Laird et. al., 2007).

Though much research has been conducted examining academic dishonesty, there is a gap in the literature. This gap in the research is about the involvement of parents regarding academic dishonesty. It is notable that little research exists evaluating the attitudes of parents related to academic dishonesty. There is considerable research, however, supporting the influence that parents have on the development of their children, and the decisions their children make. How parents respond to academic dishonesty may impact students' engagement in academically dishonest behaviors. Evaluating parental attitudes toward academic dishonesty may reveal the values that influence students.

Students seem to be listening to the messages telling them that this behavior is acceptable. The messages parents are sending to students about this practice and its ethical and moral implications could reinforce or counteract the information students are exposed to about academic dishonesty. This situation outlines the need for further examination and study of the parental attitudes of academic dishonesty. The research questions proposed are:

1) How do parents view academic dishonesty?

2) How aware are parents of the methods students use to commit academic dishonesty?

3) Do parents think that students should be punished for academic dishonesty?

Method

The data collection procedures were carried out with a sample population from a suburban high school in the northeastern region of the United States. The researcher used a quantitative survey in an online form and a paper form to collect data from parents of high school students. The survey was created by the researcher to evaluate the awareness and attitudes of high school student's parents toward academic dishonesty. Data collected from the online survey and the paper survey was analyzed using the software program at SurveyMonkey.com.

Setting

This study was conducted at a suburban high school located in the Northeastern United States. There are 4,735 students in the district with an average class size of 22.5 pupils (Gates Chili Central School District: Facts and figures, 2009). At the time of the survey, there are 1697 students enrolled in the high school. There are 432 students in ninth grade, 450 students in tenth grade, 399 students in eleventh grade, and 416 in twelfth grade (Gates Chili Central School District: New York State Testing and Accountability Reporting Tool, 2009). Thirteen percent of students are eligible for free lunch and ten percent of students are eligible for reduced price lunch. Sixteen percent of students are reported to be Black or African American, four percent are reported to be Hispanic or Latino, four percent are reported to be Asian or Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, and seventy-six percent of students are reported to be Caucasian. There are no students identified as belonging to American Indian/Alaskan Native or Multiracial ethnic origins (Gates Chili Central School District: New York State Testing and Accountability Reporting Tool, 2009). There is a ninety-seven percent stability rate for students enrolled in this school, which means that ninety-seven percent of seniors were enrolled at the school the

previous year. The reported annual attendance rate is ninety-five percent, meaning that on average ninety-five percent of students enrolled at the school attended each day. The reported graduation rate for all students is 88 percent (nystart.gov).

The total estimated population for this school district is 35,000 residents. The median household income in the district is $50, 708 according to the 2000 Census data (muninetguide.com). The reported ethnic breakdown of the surrounding community according to the 2000 Census is 86.4 percent Caucasian, 6.1 percent Black or African American, 3.3 percent Hispanic, 2.8 percent Asian and 1.2 percent identified as Other (muninetguide.com).

Instrument

The researcher did not identify an existing survey to evaluate the awareness and attitudes of parents of high school students toward academic dishonesty. An instrument was created by the researcher based on themes identified from a review of available research related to academic dishonesty. The purpose of the survey is to record and examine parental awareness and attitudes toward academic dishonesty. The survey was created using the survey design software program on SurveyMonkey.com. The first page presented the statement of informed consent, which was created using IRB guidelines. Titled Academic Dishonesty, the survey consisted of five major sections. The first four sections contain 23 items measuring parental awareness and attitudes. The first section assesses what types of academic dishonesty parents think are occurring in the high school. The second section assesses what specific behaviors students carry out to commit academic dishonesty. The third section assesses what attitudes parents have about specific academically dishonest behaviors. The fourth section assesses what attitudes parents have about the appropriate consequences for students who commit academic dishonesty. The fifth section

collects demographic information about the participant who completed the survey. Respondents to the online survey clicked the circle corresponding to their desired response along a 5 point Likert-type scale.

Sample of the Study

Two hundred envelopes were mailed to potential research participants. The researcher chose to invite 50 randomly selected student's parents or guardians at each grade level 9-12 to participate in the research by completing the survey. The researcher thought that 50 percent of the people who received the information about the survey would participate. The online survey yielded 9 responses. The researcher printed exact copies of the online survey and distributed those to potential participants during Open House at the school. The paper form of the survey yielded 15 responses. The data collection procedures resulted in 24 completed surveys for use with data analysis.

Procedures

The researcher used the software program at SurveyMonkey.com to create an online form of a survey to assess parental awareness and attitudes toward academic dishonesty. The researcher developed the survey from an intensive review of available existing research relating to academic dishonesty. The school database was used to randomly select participants and print a mailing label with each selected participant's address. The mailing labels were attached to envelopes containing a printed statement of informed consent and a cover letter, which invited parents or guardians to participate in the research by completing the survey. Instructions for accessing and completing the online survey were also included in each envelope. Fifty randomly selected potential participants at each grade level 9-12 were mailed envelopes for a total of 200 potential research participants. The researcher hoped that 50 percent of people who were mailed

information about the online survey would respond by completing the survey online. This

procedure yielded 9 completed online surveys.

The primary researcher decided to distribute more surveys to parents in order to obtain

more completed surveys to use for data analysis. The researcher decided to transfer the online

survey into a paper form and distribute it to parents of students during Open House at the school.

The school administration allowed the surveys to be distributed at the registration table for the

Practice SAT exam. The researcher asked parents who were registering their student(s) for the

PSAT to complete the survey. Those who agreed to participate were handed a survey and a pen

to check the desired responses. The completed surveys were collected immediately by the

researcher. This procedure yielded 15 completed paper surveys.

Analysis

The software program on SurveyMonkey.com automatically recorded respondent data

and calculated percentages for data analysis. The researcher manually entered the responses

from the paper form of the survey into the software program on SurveyMonkey.com. The data

entered from the paper form of the survey was added to the existing data from completed online

surveys. Percentages were calculated according to the data collected from both the online and

paper surveys.

Results

The survey completed by parents was designed to evaluate the awareness level of and attitude toward academic dishonesty committed by high school students. The results of the survey have been analyzed and compiled into 4 charts, each with the corresponding survey items. Findings are represented by the percentage of parents who chose a particular response and the actual number of respondents who selected the response contained in parentheses.

Table 1

As a parent, I think students in high school:

Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	Rating Average	Response Count
cheat on assignments and tests/quizzes	20.8% (5)	29.2% (7)	8.3% (2)	29.2% (7)	12.5% (3)	2.83	24
plagiarize	12.5% (3)	25.0% (6)	16.7% (4)	33.3% (8)	12.5% (3)	3.08	24
copy work from classmates	8.3% (2)	12.5% (3)	8.3% (2)	50.0% (12)	20.8% (5)	3.63	24
think that cheating is okay	41.7% (10)	25.0% (6)	4.2% (1)	25.0% (6)	4.2% (1)	2.25	24
think that plagiarism is okay	37.5% (9)	20.8% (5)	16.7% (4)	20.8% (5)	4.2% (1)	2.33	24
think that academic dishonesty is okay	41.7% (10)	16.7% (4)	20.8% (5)	16.7% (4)	4.2% (1)	2.25	24

Table 1: As a parent, I think students in high school:

This question was designed to assess parental awareness about student academically dishonest actions and attitudes about academically dishonest behaviors. Over 40% of respondents think that students cheat on assignments and plagiarize. Nearly three quarters of respondents agree that students copy work from other classmates. About one-fifth of parents reported thinking that

students believe academic dishonesty is okay. One fifth of parents also reported being undecided

about whether they thought students view academic dishonesty as okay.

Table 2

As a parent, I am aware that students:

Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	Rating Average	Response Count
use cell phones to take pictures of notes to use during tests	16.7% (4)	33.3% (8)	16.7% (4)	29.2% (7)	4.2% (1)	2.71	24
text message answers during a test	16.7% (4)	29.2% (7)	12.5% (3)	37.5% (9)	4.2% (1)	2.83	24
use cell phones and other electronic devices to find answers online during a test	16.7% (4)	45.8% (11)	8.3% (2)	25.0% (6)	4.2% (1)	2.54	24
purchase papers/projects online	8.3% (2)	41.7% (10)	16.7% (4)	29.2% (7)	4.2% (1)	2.79	24
cut and paste information online to turn in as their own work	0.0% (0)	29.2% (7)	12.5% (3)	50.0% (12)	8.3% (2)	3.38	24
hide answers/information on crib notes attached to drink bottle labels, inside pens, and attached to other stationary, personal devices, or clothing	12.5% (3)	37.5% (9)	20.8% (5)	20.8% (5)	8.3% (2)	2.75	24
use cell phones or other electronic devices to email answers or information during a test	16.7% (4)	45.8% (11)	4.2% (1)	25.0% (6)	8.3% (2)	2.63	24

Table 2: As a parent, I am aware that students:

This question assessed parental awareness about the academically dishonest behaviors of

students. Almost 60% of parents reported awareness of student cut and paste plagiarism online.

For all other academically dishonest behaviors listed, approximately 30% to 40% of parents said

they are aware of these student practices. Half of respondents were not aware of students hiding

answers and information on crib notes attached to personal items or clothing.

Table 3							
As a parent, I think it is acceptable for a student to:							
Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	Rating Average	Response Count
plagiarize on a project if they are in danger of failing	75.0% (18)	16.7% (4)	4.2% (1)	4.2% (1)	0.0% (0)	1.38	24
copy a homework assignment only if it is a small one	54.2% (13)	29.2% (7)	4.2% (1)	12.5% (3)	0.0% (0)	1.75	24
allow another student to copy his or her homework	58.3% (14)	25.0% (6)	4.2% (1)	12.5% (3)	0.0% (0)	1.71	24
copy from another student on a test if he/she is in danger of failing	70.8% (17)	25.0% (6)	0.0% (0)	4.2% (1)	0.0% (0)	1.38	24
have someone else write his or her college application essay if it means the student has a better chance of getting into a good college	70.8% (17)	12.5% (3)	8.3% (2)	8.3% (2)	0.0% (0)	1.54	24
cheat on a regent's exam if they need the credit to graduate	75.0% (18)	20.8% (5)	0.0% (0)	4.2% (1)	0.0% (0)	1.33	24

Table 3: As a parent, I think it is acceptable for a student to :

This question assessed parental attitudes toward specific academically dishonest behaviors. No

one strongly agreed that any item was acceptable. More than 10% of respondents reported that

they believe it is acceptable for students to copy a homework assignment or let another student

copy from him or her. Three out of four parents responded that they strongly disagree with a

student plagiarizing on a project or cheating on a regent's exam. The majority of parents

answered that they do not think academic dishonesty is acceptable.

Table 4

As a parent, I think that students should not be punished for:

Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	Rating Average	Response Count
cheating on a test if they are in danger of failing	62.5% (15)	33.3% (8)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	4.2% (1)	1.50	24
plagiarizing on a college application because there is so much competition to get into a good college	54.2% (13)	33.3% (8)	4.2% (1)	4.2% (1)	4.2% (1)	1.71	24
occasional cheating for higher grades, as long as they don't do it all the time	62.5% (15)	33.3% (8)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	4.2% (1)	1.50	24
cheating on the SAT/ACT because a high score is needed to get into a good college	58.3% (14)	37.5% (9)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	4.2% (1)	1.54	24

Table 4: As a parent, I think that students should not be punished for:

This question was created to assess parental attitudes about what, if any, punishments students

should receive for academically dishonest behavior. The three items evaluating parental

attitudes about punishment for cheating for higher grades in classes or on the SAT or ACT

exams revealed that less than 5% of respondents believe students should not be punished.

Almost 10% of respondents reported believing that students should not be punished for

plagiarism on a college application. More than half of all survey participants strongly disagree with students not being punished for academically dishonest behaviors.

Conclusion

According to respondent data, parents do not think that students cheat on tests and quizzes yet are aware of student plagiarism and copying behaviors. The majority of parents do not believe that students think cheating, plagiarism, and academic dishonesty are acceptable. The majority of survey participants were not aware of student academic dishonesty involving cell phones and electronic devices. Conversely, parents were more aware of student abuse of cut and paste plagiarism. The overwhelming majority of parents do not believe it is acceptable for students to commit academic dishonesty. However, more than 10% of parents agreed that it is acceptable for students to cheat on homework assignments. The vast majority of parents do not believe that students should not be punished for academic dishonesty.

Discussion

Academic dishonesty is a pervasive issue in schools and can have a detrimental impact on student academic achievement, social development, and career development (Edgren & Walters, 2006; Johnson & Martin, 2005; Josephson Institute of Ethics, 2006; Lathrop & Foss, 2005; McCabe, 1999; Strom & Strom, 2007; Westacott, 2008). Existing research examined student and teacher awareness and attitudes toward academic dishonesty and scant research exists regarding parental awareness and attitudes. This study was created and implemented in order to examine how aware parents are of academic dishonesty and what attitudes they hold toward such behaviors.

The study examined three research questions:

1) How do parents view academic dishonesty?

2) How aware are parents of the methods students use to commit academic dishonesty?

3) Do parents think that students should be punished for academic dishonesty?

The data collected from an online form and a paper form of the survey indicate that parents do not think that academic dishonesty is acceptable. Parents are more aware of cut and paste plagiarism than other academically dishonest behaviors, yet overall are marginally informed about specific cheating techniques used by students. The overwhelming majority of parents think that students should not go unpunished for committing academic dishonesty.

Interpretation of Findings

According to research findings, parents view academic dishonesty as unacceptable (Table 3). Over 80% of parent respondents reported disagreeing or strongly disagreeing that academically dishonest behavior is acceptable (Table 3). The researcher finds this interesting as the rates of academic dishonesty committed by students is high (Edgren & Walters, 2006; Johnson & Martin, 2005; Josephson Institute of Ethics, 2006; Lathrop & Foss, 2005; McCabe, 1999; Strom & Strom, 2007; Westacott, 2008). While parents do not find academic dishonesty acceptable, many students view the practice as acceptable and consider the practice commonplace (Bracey, 2005; Edgren & Walters, 2006; McCabe, 1999). This could be connected to a lack of parental communication with students about cheating behaviors. Delinquent behavior diminishes in students whose parents engage in effective monitoring practices, openly communicate with students, and are aware of student behavior (Hayes et. al., 2003; Laird et. al., 2007).

Though a vast majority of parents think academic dishonesty unacceptable, some respondents agreed that these behaviors are acceptable. Over 12% of parents stated that it is acceptable for a student to copy homework from someone else or allow someone else to copy from them (Table 3). Over 8% of parents agreed that it is acceptable for students to have someone else write their college admission essay (Table 3). The researcher does not agree that this is significant in the context of research findings because the number of parents that think cheating is acceptable is relatively small. However, this raises the question as to what message parents who view certain cheating behaviors as acceptable are sending to their students. McCabe (1999) found that student attitudes about academic dishonesty may result from intentional or unintentional communication from parental figures. In order for parents to communicate effectively their own views of academically dishonest behaviors, parents would need to be aware of accurate information about those behaviors.

Research results indicate that parents are more aware of certain academically dishonest behaviors and are less aware of others. Fifty-eight percent of parents reported being aware of cut and paste plagiarism committed by students and 33.4% stated knowing about students purchasing papers online (Table 2). No more than 42% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they were aware of other cheating behaviors listed on the survey (Table 2). Less than half of parents responded that they were aware of cheating behaviors, except for cut and paste plagiarism (Table 2). The researcher believes this statistic may explain why the rate of students committing academic dishonesty is high. The results from Table 3 indicate that the majority of parents are opposed to cheating behavior and the results from Table 2 reflect a general lack of awareness about what those behaviors are. Even though parents may voice an opposition to certain cheating practices, they would not be able to communicate directly with students about

behaviors they do not know are occurring. One factor of the Theory of Planned Behavior is the attitudes potential perpetrators hold about the behavior (Stone et. al., 2010). Parents who lack awareness may not adequately voice their opinions in opposition to academic dishonesty (McCabe, 1999) and students may form attitudes similar to peers, many of whom view academic dishonesty as acceptable, instead of listening to parental figures (Mackey et. al., 2001).

Respondent data shows that a majority of parents disagree or strongly disagree that students think cheating, plagiarism, and academic dishonesty is okay (Table 1). This finding is contradictory of existing research concluding that the majority of students view academic dishonesty as acceptable behavior (Bracey, 2005; Edgren & Walters, 2006; McCabe, 1999). The research data (Table 1) reflects that parents are not aware of actual student perceptions of academic dishonesty as outlined in existing research.

The overwhelming majority of parent respondents disagree or strongly disagree that students should not be punished for committing academic dishonesty (Table 4). More than 85% of parents reported that students should be punished for cheating behaviors (Table 4). However, existing data about student and teacher viewpoints regarding punishments for academic dishonesty run contrary to this research finding. Students are aware that little is done to punish those who commit academic dishonesty (Simon et. al., 2004; Strom & Strom, 2007). Educators are not reporting student cheating behavior (Happel & Jennings, 2008; Simon et al., 2004; Strom & Strom, 2007; Westacott, 2008) and the lack of consequences for these unethical behaviors may be perceived by students as an attitude of indifference by adults (McCabe, 1999; Schmelkin et al., 2008). Parents think that students should be punished for academically dishonest behaviors, but it seems that when teachers do not punish students when they are caught, the student view that academic dishonesty is acceptable is reinforced.

Implications for Social Change

If academic dishonesty is to be effectively addressed, cultural change is necessary. The culture of acceptance in the school community must be addressed so that academic dishonesty is routinely identified and reported. The research indicates that parents are supportive of students facing consequences for academically unethical behaviors (Table 4). Were consequences to be strictly attached to cheating behaviors, students may alter their views that it is an acceptable practice (Bracey, 2005; Edgren & Walters, 2006; McCabe, 1999). Students may also perceive increased accountability as parents and authority figures condemning academic dishonesty rather than condoning it. Parents should be educated about the effectiveness of efficient monitoring practices to better broaden their own awareness of student behaviors (Hayes et. al., 2003; Laird et. al., 2007) so that issues like academic dishonesty may be addressed with a stronger parental voice. It seems necessary for parents to become informed about academic dishonesty so that they may collaborate with other stakeholders to address this issue and hold students accountable.

High stakes testing practices may be pressuring students into succumbing to the temptation to cheat in order to better scores on exams (Strom & Strom, 2007; Taylor, Pogrebin, & Dodge, 2002). The focus that teachers place on the test at the end of the year could be giving students tunnel vision; they see the test as a point in time event whose result will indicate how smart or capable he or she is (McCabe, 1999). Westacott (2008) reports how test taking programs with titles like "Cracking the SAT" may send the message that short cuts to test taking are okay to raise scores. Should teachers focus on interaction with subject content rather than test preparation, it seems logical to the researcher that students may not think that so much of their future depends on a couple of test scores. The focus of education would need to shift from test statistics toward the value of the material covered in classrooms and the accomplishments of

students aside from test scores. To reduce the influence of test grades, schools, institutions, colleges, and universities would have to find other ways in which to evaluate student performance and aptitude.

The system of promotion of students from school to college to work would need to be changed. Study results show parents favor consequences for students who are identified as having committed academic dishonesty (Table 4). Those parents would need to be willing to accept that even their own child may have to suffer the consequences associated with cheating if he or she were caught by a teacher. Administrators would need to support teachers in holding students accountable and enforcing any punishments assigned so that students may realize academic dishonesty will not be tolerated and violators will face consequences.

Academic dishonesty has been described as cyclical in nature (Happel & Jennings, 2008; Westacott, 2008). Students report believing that cheating is not a serious violation and is necessary in order to get into a good college (McCabe, 1999). These students bring unethical behavior with them from high school to college and on into the workplace (Lucas & Friedrich, 2005; Taylor-Bianco & Deeter-Schmelz, 2007). Increased effective collaboration by stakeholders at home, in schools, colleges, and the workplace could have a positive impact on altering student perceptions of academic dishonesty as well as reducing the behavior. Those involved would need to increase cooperation and information sharing. The researcher thinks that similarly structured interventions for unethical behavior that focus on education and accountability at the school, university, and employment levels would have a positive impact on addressing academic dishonesty.

Recommendations for Counseling Practice

School counselors can play a central role in the collaborative efforts of parents, students, teachers, and administrators (ASCA, 2005; Griffin & Steen, 2010). The results of the research indicate that parents think students do not see academic dishonesty as acceptable (Table 1). Parents responded that they view academic dishonesty as unacceptable and also stated that students should face consequences for cheating behaviors (Table 4). Parent respondents indicated that they are marginally aware of those specific behaviors (Table 1 & 2). School counselors are in a position to educate parents about academic dishonesty, including student attitudes about the practice and the techniques used. Perhaps parents would be more capable of addressing student views of cheating it they were made aware of the fact that most students view academic dishonesty as acceptable (McCabe, 1999). Counselors would also be able to educate students about the possible consequences of academic dishonesty not only in high school, but post graduation as well. Administrators may be more willing to enforce school policy regarding consequences for academic dishonesty should they be informed of the views of students and parents.

These findings are important for all school faculty members. Administrators who knew that parents want students to be held accountable for cheating behaviors may be more willing to back up punishments assigned by teachers who identify academically unethical student behaviors. Teachers who have been made aware of parent and administrator support may be more apt to identify academically dishonest behaviors and assign consequences. The researcher concludes that a primary requirement for academic dishonesty to be addressed effectively is for the school counselor to assist in the education of the stakeholders involved.

The central position of school counselors related to the stakeholders involved in academic dishonesty and its effects seems to be strategically valuable in order to advocate for social and institutional changes. It seems questionable whether or not efforts of school counselors alone could alter educational policy. However, a more plausible option is that entire school districts joining together to lobby educational policy makers to alter assessment procedures for students may bring about desired change. School counselors would be able to begin the change process within their own schools through awareness campaigns, educational programs, and resources administered to all persons within the building and district.

Should the efforts of school counselors lead to changes in assessment requirements or accountability measures, the thoughts and feelings of students would need tending to. Students who had become accustomed to teachers looking the other way regarding academic dishonesty could experience some anxiety and confusion were a stronger accountability policy set in place. School counselors would need to address transitional issues with students. Teachers and administrators may also experience transitional difficulties and school counselors could assist in helping students come to terms with changing rules to reduce confrontation when consequences become necessary.

Recommendations for Further Study

This research addressed a gap in the literature. The low response rate limits the generalization of findings to the larger population due to a small sample size. Further study into the awareness and attitudes of parents regarding academic dishonesty by gathering data from a much larger sample may add conclusiveness to the data collected herein. The researcher does not recommend using an online form of the survey again as the response rate was about 4.5%.

There may also be some bias in the results obtained from the paper form of the survey as it was administered during Open House near the PSAT sign-up table. The PSAT is open to juniors and sophomores so the parents completing surveys were mostly those with students from only those two grade levels.

It would be of interest to assess what effect parental attitudes about student academic misconduct have upon student attitudes following an open dialogue between the two parties. There is a discrepancy between the perception of academic dishonesty presented by students in the research (McCabe, 1999) and what parents think about student views according to the survey data (Table 1). Examination of the effects of parental monitoring practices relating to student perceptions of academic dishonesty could illuminate the impact of parental monitoring styles. The researcher thinks it would be valuable to evaluate what impact increased parental interaction with students has regarding academic dishonesty.

As school counselors are in a position to facilitate educational programs to inform students, parents, and faculty about academic dishonesty, it would be important to know what influence said programs may have. Further evaluation on student perceptions of academic dishonesty post intervention could be compared to existing research. As McCabe (1999) relied on qualitative measures of assessment, perhaps discussion with parents and students would be prudent. The survey utilized in this study could also be administered to parents after information sessions regarding academic dishonesty to evaluate how their awareness and attitudes may have been affected. The results could be used for comparison to the original administration of the survey to evaluate possible intervention program influence.

The data in Table 4 shows that the majority of parents are in favor of students being punished if identified as having committed academic dishonesty. It may be interesting to evaluate what percentage of parents agrees with student punishments for academic dishonesty following their own student having been given consequences for unethical behavior. The researcher hypothesizes that parental perceptions may change for certain survey items for those respondents whose own child was caught and punished for academic dishonesty.

Conclusion

The results of the study reveal that parents view academic dishonesty as an unacceptable practice, even though they may not be aware of all the various techniques used by students to cheat. The central role of the counselor would allow him or her to provide accurate information to stakeholders and advocate for social changes that may lower the rates of academic dishonesty in school. Study results also show that parents support punishments for offenders. A unified front of parents, teachers, students, and administrators may be effective in identifying students who commit academic dishonesty in order to deliver appropriate consequences. School counselors should increase parental awareness through educational resources to prepare parents to address the various aspects of the systemic problem of academic dishonesty and effectively advocate for higher standards of student conduct and greater consequences for those who engage in the behavior.

References

American School Counselor Association. (2005). *The ASCA National Model: A Framework for School Counseling Programs, Second Edition.* Alexandria, VA. Author.

Bracey, G.W. (2005). A nation of cheats. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 412-413.

Bracey, G.W. (2008). An ounce of prevention. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 225-226.

Burt, S.A., McGue, M., Krueger, R.F., & Iacono, W.G. (2006). Environmental contributions to adolescent delinquency: a fresh look at the shared environment. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 35*, 787-800.

Caldwell, C. (2009). A ten-step model for academic integrity: a positive approach for business schools. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *92*, 1-13.doi:10.1007/s10551-009-0144-7

Cheating. (n.d.) In Merriam-Webster Dictionary online. Retrieved from http://www.merriam-webster.com

Cooper, J. (2007). Patchwork plagiarism. *Knowledge Quest*, *35,* 62-65.

DeRoma, V.M., Lassiter, K.S., Davis, V.A. (2004). Adolescent involvement in discipline decision making. *Behavior Modification*, *28*, 420-437. doi: 10.1177/0145445503258993.

Dowling, W.C. (2003). Meaningless grades and a new dishonesty. *Academic Questions,* 57-62*.*

Edgren, S., & Walters, S. (2006). Academic dishonesty in the 21st century. *The Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, *54*, 56-59.

Fu, G., Evans, A.D., Wang, L., & Lee, K. (2008). Lying in the name of the collective good: a developmental study. *Developmental Science*, *11*, 495-503.

Gates Chili Central School District: facts and figures. (2009). Retrieved from http://www.

gateschili.org/info.cfm?subpage=32493

Gates Chili Central School District: New York State Testing and Accountability Reporting Tool.

(2009). Retrieved from https://www.nystart.gov/publicweb/District.do?year=2009&

county=MONROE&district=260401060000

Griffin, D., & Steen, S. (2010). School-family-community partnerships: applying Epstein's

theory of the six types of involvement to school counselor practice. *Professional*

School Counseling, 13, 218-226.

Hayes, L., Hudson, A., & Matthews, J. (2003). Parental monitoring: A process model of parent-

adolescent interaction. *Behavior Change*, *20*, 13-24.

Hayes, L., Hudson, A., & Matthews, J. (2007). Understanding parental monitoring through

analysis of monitoring episodes in context. *International Journal of Behavioral and*

Consultation Therapy, *3*, 96-108.

Johnson, S.A., & Martin, M. (2005). Academic dishonesty: A new twist on an old problem.

Athletic Therapy Today, *4*, 48-50.

Laird, R.D., Criss, M.M., Pettit, G.S., Dodge, K.A., & Bates, J.E. (2008). Parent's monitoring

knowledge attenuates the link between antisocial friends and adolescent delinquent

behavior. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, *36*, 299-310.

LaSalle, R.E. (2009). The perception of detection, severity of punishment and the probability

of cheating. *Journal of Forensic Studies in Accounting and Business*, 93-111.

Lathrop, A., & Foss, K. (2005). *Guiding students from cheating and plagiarism to honesty and integrity: strategies for change*. Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.

Lucas, G.M., & Friedrich, J. (2005). Individual differences in workplace deviance and integrity as predictors of academic dishonesty. *Ethics and Behavior*, *15*, 15-35.

Mackey, K., Arnold, M.L., & Pratt, M.W. (2001). Adolescent's stories of decision making in more and less authoritative families: Representing the voices of parents in narrative. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, *16*, 243-268.

Mahon, R.L. (2006). Try the guillotine. *The Clearing House*, *79*, 271-273.

McCabe, D.L. (1999). Academic dishonesty among high school students. *Adolescence*, *34*, 681-687.

McCabe, D.L., Butterfield, K.D., Trevino, L.K. (2006). Graduate business programs: prevalence, causes, and proposed action. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *5*, 294-305.

Moore, B.J. (2002, September/October). Truth or consequences. *About Campus*, *7,4,*25-28.

Murdock, T.B., Miller, A., & Kohlhardt, J. (2004). Effects of classroom context variables on high school student's judgments of the acceptability and likelihood of cheating. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *96*, 765-777.

Nonis, S., & Swift, C.O. (2001). An examination of the relationship between academic dishonesty and workplace dishonesty: a multicampus investigation. *Journal of Education for Business*, 69-77.

Nworie, J., & Haughton, N. (2008). Good intentions and unanticipated effects: the unintended consequences of the application of technology in teaching and learning environments. *Tech Trends*, *52*, 52-58.

Plagiarism. (n.d.) In Merriam-Webster Dictionary online. Retrieved from http://www.merriam-webster.com

Simons-Morton, B., Chen, R., Hand, L.S., & Haynie, D.L. (2008). Parenting behavior and adolescent conduct problems: Reciprocal and meditational effects. *Journal of School Violence*, *7*, 2-25.

Sisti, D.A. (2007). How do high school students justify internet plagiarism?. *Ethics and Behavior*, *17*, 215-231.

Stone, T.H., Jawahar, I.M., & Kisamore, J.L. (2010). Predicting academic misconduct intentions and behavior using the theory of planned behavior and personality. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, *32*, 35-45. doi:10.1080/01973530903539895

Strom, P.S., & Strom, R.D. (2007). Cheating in middle school and high school. *The Educational Forum*, *71*, 104-116.

Talab, R. (2004). A student online plagiarism guide: detection and prevention resources (and copyright implications!). *Tech Trends*, *48*, 15-18.

Taylor, L., Pogrebin, M., & Dodge, M. (2002). Advanced placement-advanced pressures: academic dishonesty among elite high school students. *Educational Studies*, *33*, 403-422.

The Josephson Institute of Ethics. *2006 Josephson Institute report card on the ethics of American youth: part one-integrity* [Data file]. Retrieved from http://josephsoninstitute.org/pdf/ReportCard_press-release_2006-1013.pdf

The Josephson Institute of Ethics. *Josephson Institute of Ethics releases study on high school character and adult conduct* [Data file]. Retrieved from http://josephsoninstitute.org/surveys/index.html

Unnever, J.D., Cullen, F.T., & Agnew, R. (2006). Why is "bad" parenting criminogenic?: implications from rival theories. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, *4*, 3-33.

Villano, M. (2006). Fighting plagiarism: taking the work out of homework. *T.H.E. Journal*, *33*, 24-40.

Westacott, E. (2008). Academic dishonesty and the culture of assessment. *Journal of the National Collegiate Honors Council*, 21-27.

What is Plagiarism?. (n.d.) Retrieved April 23, 2010, from http://www.plagiarism.org/learning_center/what_is_plagiarism.html

Wowra, S.A. (2007). Moral identities, social anxiety, and academic dishonesty among American college students. *Ethics and Behavior*, *17*, 303-321.

Wright, R.J. (2009). Methods for improving test scores: The good, the bad, and the ugly. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, *45, 3,* 116-121.

Yuan, D. (2006, November 16). Exam cheating in china highly organized. *The Epoch Times*. Retrieved from http://www.theepochtimes.com/news/6-11-16/48218.html

Zirkel, P.A. (2009). Test-taking accomplice-ments?. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 693-694.

Appendix A

STATEMENT OF INFORMED CONSENT

The purpose of this research project is to examine the awareness and attitudes of suburban parents toward academic dishonesty at the high school level. This research project is also being conducted in order for me to complete my master's thesis for the Department of Counselor Education at the College at Brockport SUNY.

In order to participate in this study, your informed consent is required. You are being asked to make a decision whether or not to participate in the project. If you want to participate in the project, and agree with the statements below, your completion of the survey signifies your consent. <u>You may change your mind at any time and leave the study without penalty, even after the study has begun</u>.

I understand that:

1. My participation is voluntary and I have the right to refuse to answer any questions.
2. My name will not be written on the survey. There will be no way to connect me to my written survey. If any publication results from this research, I would not be identified by name. My confidentiality cannot be guaranteed due to the limited protections of the internet.
3. There will be no anticipated benefits because of my participation in this project. There is a minor risk in the time that it takes to complete the survey.
4. My participation involves reading a written survey of 23 questions and answering those questions in writing. It is estimated that it will take 10 minutes to complete the survey.
5. Approximately 200 people will take part in this study. The results will be used for the completion of a master's thesis by the primary researcher.
6. Data will be kept on a computer used only by the primary researcher and is password protected. Data will also be stored on Surveymonkey.com in a password protected account. Only the primary researcher will know and use that password. Data and consent forms will be deleted when the research has been accepted and approved.

<u>I am 18 years of age or older.</u> I have read and understand the above statements. All my questions about my participation in this study have been answered to my satisfaction. I agree to participate in the study realizing I may withdraw without penalty at any time during the survey process. Completing the survey online indicates my consent to participate.

If you have any questions you may contact:

Primary researcher	Faculty Advisor
Michael Sykes	Dr. Summer Reiner
585-760-4017	Counselor Education, 585-395-5497
msyke1@brockport.edu	sreiner@brockport.edu

Appendix B

Parent Survey: Academic Dishonesty at the High School level

Directions: This survey should take only 4 minutes to complete. To complete the survey, circle the number directly underneath your chosen response. Please complete the demographics section at the end of the survey.

Plagiarism – passing off the published work of others as your own, not citing sources

Cheating – obtaining information/answers unethically, i.e., cheat sheets, copying from another person, getting specific correct answers ahead of time

Copying – reproducing the work of others and passing it off as your own

I think students in high school:	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. cheat on assignments or tests/quizzes.	1	2	3	4	5
2. plagiarize.	1	2	3	4	5
3. copy work from classmates.	1	2	3	4	5
4. think that cheating is okay.	1	2	3	4	5
5. think that plagiarism is okay.	1	2	3	4	5
6. think that academic dishonesty is okay if it gets them something, like better grades or acceptance into a good college.	1	2	3	4	5

As a parent, I am aware that students:	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
7. use cell phones to take pictures of notes to use during tests.	1	2	3	4	5
8. text message answers during a test.	1	2	3	4	5
9. use cell phones and other electronic devices to find answers online during a test.	1	2	3	4	5
10. purchase papers/projects online.	1	2	3	4	5
11. cut and paste information online to turn in as their own work.	1	2	3	4	5
12. hide answers/information on crib notes on drink bottle labels, inside pens, and attached to other stationary or devices.	1	2	3	4	5
13. use cell phones or other electronic devices to email answers or information during a test.	1	2	3	4	5

It is acceptable for a student to:	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
14. plagiarize on a project if they are in danger of failing.	1	2	3	4	5
15. copy a homework assignment only if it is a small one.	1	2	3	4	5
16. allow another student to copy his or her homework.	1	2	3	4	5
17. copy from another student on a test if he/she is in danger of failing.	1	2	3	4	5
18. have someone else write his/her college application essay if it means the student has a better chance of getting into a good college.	1	2	3	4	5
19. cheat on a regent's exam if they need the credit to graduate.	1	2	3	4	5

Students should not be punished for:	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
20. cheating on a test if they are in danger of failing.	1	2	3	4	5
21. plagiarizing on a college application because there is so much competition to get into a good college.	1	2	3	4	5
22. occasional cheating for higher grades, as long as they don't do it all the time.	1	2	3	4	5
23. cheating on the SAT/ACT because a high score is needed to get into a good college.	1	2	3	4	5