Research examining the prevalence of college cheating found 81.7% of participants reporting engagement in a form of cheating during their undergraduate career (Yardley, Domenech Rodríguez, Bates, & Nelson, 2009), confirming the common belief of rampant dishonesty in academia today. The Teen Ethics Survey (Deloitte & Touche USA LLP, 2007) reported that 71% of teens feel fully prepared to make ethical decisions in the workplace, yet 40% believe that lying, cheating, plagiarizing, and even violence are sometimes necessary to succeed in school. Of teens who believe academic dishonesty is acceptable on some level, a personal desire to succeed was cited as the primary justification 54% of the time. As cheating persists in academia, understanding the motives behind cheating behaviors can shed light into possible solutions. Yardley et al. (2009) cited that the most common reasons for cheating were time constraints and assisting a friend, whereas pressure from family or having to retake the class were least likely to be the motivating factor. The pressure to succeed and specifically to reach a standard of perfection can arise from many sources, including oneself or society (Hewitt & Flett, 1991). The present study examined perfectionism as a possible predictor for academic dishonesty due to similarities in motivations for academic cheating and perfectionism.

**Academic Dishonesty**
Recent research on academic dishonesty has examined different predictors for a wide range of behaviors classified as academic cheating. The most commonly reported form of academic dishonesty is copying homework, followed by plagiarizing, and then submitting someone else's paper as one's own (Thorpe, Pittenger, & Reed, 1999). Predictors of academic dishonesty previously examined in past
research include demographic variables, scholastic ability, and personality.

**Demographic and scholastic predictors.** Men report being more likely to cheat, consider cheating, and confess to cheating at higher rates than women (DeAndrea, Carpenter, Shulman, & Levine, 2009; Thorpe et al., 1999). Yet a study by Kisamore, Stone, and Jawahar (2007) suggested that males are less likely to believe that cheating occurs than females. Furthermore, older students may be less likely to consider cheating or suspect others of cheating (Kisamore et al., 2007). Research also suggests that individuals with low overall scholastic competence, especially those with low verbal scores, are prone to cheating behaviors (Nathanson, Paulhus, & Williams, 2006).

**Personality.** In recent years, the role of individual personality characteristics on academic dishonesty has been evaluated extensively. Nathanson et al. (2006) examined many variables including demographic variables, the Big Five Personality dimensions, and scholastic competence and found that the “Dark Triad” of narcissism, Machiavellianism, and subclinical pathology were the best predictors of cheating.

De Bruin and Rudnick (2007) suggest that individuals with low conscientiousness are more likely to procrastinate or put forth low effort on academic tasks, which may lead to cheating. This result may occur because their lack of discipline may not create as much concern about breaking rules because cheating provides a solution to their dilemma. Nathanson et al. (2006) did not find support for an association between conscientiousness and cheating. A possible explanation for this discrepancy is that the trait of conscientiousness encompasses many components, some of which may possibly conflict. DeYoung, Quilty, and Peterson (2007) differentiate the components of conscientiousness initially proposed by Roberts, Chernyshenko, Stark, and Goldberg (2005) as industriousness, characterized as one’s need for achievement and orderliness, which emphasizes cautiousness and methodicalness in one’s ability to plan. The ambition aspect of industriousness could potentially be related to a motivation to cheat because of a desire to succeed at all costs. This possible relationship may be negated by the effects of the orderliness component, which may cause a lack of motivation to cheat because the individual may feel confident and competent in his or her abilities due to successful preparation.

As technology has advanced in recent years, the Internet has had a more prominent role in the classroom and has led to increased opportunities for plagiarizing and cheating. Karim, Zamzuri, and Nor (2009) reported that neuroticism has a positive association with usage of the Internet for dishonest behaviors and that the perceived anonymity of the Internet could lead to the decreased accountability of students, which can be directly related to attitudes toward the acceptability of cheating.

Despite the considerable amount of research conducted in the area of personality and cheating, a relationship that has not been examined thoroughly is the relationship between cheating and the multidimensional trait of perfectionism. The only known study that examined the role of perfectionism in academic cheating found no significant correlation between the three dimensions of perfectionism and cheating. In this study by Nathanson et al. (2006), the course exams taken by college undergraduates were evaluated by a computer software program, S-Check, to identify the pairs of students who cheated on the test based on the similarity of their answers. The students also completed personality and demographic measures. Relationships between the different predictors (e.g., Big Five personality dimensions, overall cognitive ability, verbal ability, narcissism) and cheating were examined. Despite finding significant correlations with other personality variables, such as the “Dark Triad,” no association between perfectionism, as measured by the Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (MPS; Hewitt & Flett, 1991), and cheating was identified. However, this study involved a naturalistic observation in a college classroom where the prevalence of cheating, about 4%, was much smaller than self-reported rates. Additionally, the system used to identify academic dishonesty was a computer program that was only able to identify cheating pairs and was unable to differentiate between the active cheater (the person doing the cheating) and the passive cheater (the person whose work was being copied). The present study aimed to address these limitations.

**Perfectionism**

Perfectionism is widely regarded as a multidimensional trait based on three characteristics: to whom the perfectionistic behavior is attributed, the object at which the behavior is directed, and the behavior’s adaptive (positive) and maladaptive (negative) aspects (Hewitt & Flett, 1991; Slaney, Rice, Mobley, Trippi, & Ashby, 2001). Perfectionist cognitions arise when an individual observes a discrepancy...
between his or her own high standards and actual behavior (Rudolph, Flett, & Hewitt, 2007). The Hewitt and Flett model of perfectionism (1991) is comprised of self-oriented perfectionism, other-oriented perfectionism, and socially-prescribed perfectionism as measured by the MPS (Hewitt & Flett, 1991). The components of the model were based on the differences between to whom the perfectionistic behavior is directed and to whom the perfectionistic behavior can be attributed.

**Self-Oriented perfectionism.** Self-oriented perfectionism is defined as “setting exacting standards for oneself and stringently evaluating and censuring one’s own behavior,” (Hewitt & Flett, 1991, p. 457) which is motivated by the desire to be perfect in conjunction with the avoidance of failure (Hill, Hall, & Appleton, 2010). Self-oriented perfectionism is associated with the worrying accompanying test anxiety (Stoeber, Feast, & Hayward, 2009).

**Socially-Prescribed perfectionism.** Socially-prescribed perfectionists perceive others’ imposing high standards and expectations upon themselves (Hewitt & Flett, 1991). Individuals with high scores of socially-prescribed perfectionism are hesitant to try new activities due to the possibility of failure (Kobori, Yamagata, & Kijima, 2005). Socially-prescribed perfectionism is also associated with total levels of test anxiety (Stoeber et al., 2009a).

**Other-Oriented perfectionism.** The third dimension of perfectionism is other-oriented perfectionism. This will not be examined in the present study as other-oriented perfectionists project their high standards and expectations outward onto others (Hewitt & Flett, 1991) and based on this research, it would not be expected to be related to the cheating behavior of an individual.

**Motivations for Perfectionism**

Stoeber et al. (2009a) suggest that people with different types of perfectionism have different motivations for their perfectionist behavior. They assert that self-oriented perfectionism is positively correlated with autonomous reasons for studying, while socially-prescribed perfectionism is associated with controlled reasons for studying. Self-oriented perfectionists are intrinsically motivated to study based on their desire to achieve perfection, while socially-prescribed perfectionists are extrinsically motivated by pressures to achieve perfection placed on them by others (e.g., parents, teachers, friends). Furthermore, when self-oriented perfectionism is controlled for, socially-prescribed perfectionism has a negative correlation with intrinsic motivation, consistent with previous research (Conroy, Kaye, & Fifer, 2007) suggesting that socially-prescribed perfectionists are primarily concerned with the fear of failure and living up to the standards others set for them.

**Maladaptiveness of Perfectionism**

Some suggest that self-oriented perfectionists have maladaptive coping strategies due to excessive self-doubts, critical parents with high expectations, and concerns over making mistakes and are therefore more prone to distress and experience more anxiety (Martiment & Ferrand, 2007; Rice & Mirzadeh, 2000; Rudolph et al., 2007). Conroy et al. (2007) suggest that high levels on any of the three subscales of perfectionism can have a negative impact on academic goals, which suggests that all three dimensions are somewhat maladaptive and calls into question whether adaptive perfectionism can exist if all three exhibit maladaptive behavior to varying degrees.

In contrast, Miquelon, Vallerand, Grouzet, and Cardinal (2005) suggest that some adaptive self-oriented perfectionist qualities exist, such as better academic adjustment. The self-determined motivation toward academic activities exhibited by self-oriented perfectionists was found to be associated with better academic adjustment. Therefore, the performance of self-oriented perfectionists is suggested to be positive, yet the impact on their stress and anxiety levels may still be maladaptive. Further research is needed to reconcile these conflicting findings.

The Big Five Traits that are correlated with perfectionism are conscientiousness (self-disciplined, aims for achievement), extraversion (outgoing, seeks company of others), agreeableness (friendly, cooperative), and neuroticism (experiences unpleasant emotions easily, such as depression or anxiety). Openness to experience (inventive, appreciates variety of experiences) has not been shown to be associated with perfectionism. Neuroticism is the best predictor of an increase in socially-prescribed perfectionism over time (Stoeber, Otto, & Dalbert, 2009). Consequently, conscientiousness is the best predictor of increase in self-oriented perfectionism over time (Stoeber et al., 2009b).

**Overview of the Current Study**

Both academic cheating behaviors and perfectionism have been shown to be correlated...
Relationship Between Perfectionism  
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with personality traits (e.g., neuroticism and conscientiousness). The motivations to engage in academic dishonesty have great similarities with the motivations of perfectionism, such as not feeling prepared, yet experiencing an overwhelming pressure to succeed. However, these two constructs have yet to be examined in order to gain a broader insight into a greater range of academic cheating behaviors. The present study assessed cheating on course examinations, as previously investigated by Nathanson et al. (2006), as well as other examples of academic cheating (e.g., homework assignments, plagiarism). The present study employed self-report to examine the relationship between perfectionism and cheating. The present study also examined the link between pressures to succeed, manifested in the trait of perfectionism, and the prevalence of academic cheating.

Due to the relationships established between the personality traits of conscientiousness and neuroticism and cheating and perfectionism, the following hypotheses were formulated. Based on research conducted by Karim et al. (2009), which suggests low conscientiousness scores are predictive of academic dishonesty, as well as Stoeber et al.’s research (2009b) that shows a correlation between high conscientiousness and self-oriented perfectionism, it was hypothesized that self-oriented perfectionism scores would be negatively associated with frequency and recency of reported cheating. Additionally, Karim et al. (2009) suggested high neuroticism scores were predictive of cheating, and Stoeber et al.’s research (2009b) found neuroticism to be positively correlated with socially-prescribed perfectionism. Therefore, it was also hypothesized that high socially-prescribed perfectionism scores would be positively correlated with frequency and recency of reported cheating. These hypotheses are important to evaluate in order to further understand the role of perfectionism in instances of academic dishonesty.

Method

Participants
The sample consisted of 83 participants from a psychology participant pool. Participants ranged in age from 18 to 24 years of age with an average age of 18.8 (SD = 1.13) and the majority of the sample (76.8%) was comprised of 18 (n = 43) and 19 (n = 20) year olds. Participants took part in the study in fulfillment of a course requirement and registered online. Women comprised 73.2% of the sample and men comprised 26.5% of the sample.

Seventy-three percent of the sample identified as White (n = 60), 14.1% as Asian American (n = 12), 1.2% American Indian/Alaska Native (n = 1), 4.8% Black or African American (n = 4), and 6.0% Other (n = 5). The sample predominantly reported their ethnicity as non-Hispanic or Latino (n = 67, 81.9%) with 18.1% of participants identifying as Hispanic or Latino (n = 15). The majority of participants were first-year students (n = 45, 54.9%), 25.6% were sophomores (n = 21), 15.7% were juniors (n = 13), and 3.6% were seniors (n = 3). One participant’s data were excluded from the analyses due to failure to complete the battery of questionnaires.

Materials
Participants completed a packet of questionnaires that included measures of demographics, perfectionism, and academic dishonesty.

Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (MPS; Hewitt & Flett, 1991). The MPS is a 45-item questionnaire that measures self-oriented perfectionism (e.g., “I must always be successful at school or work”), socially-prescribed perfectionism (e.g., “The people around me expect me to succeed at everything I do”), and other-oriented perfectionism (e.g., “I have high expectations for the people who are important to me”) using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (disagree) to 7 (agree). Previous research has shown the MPS to be valid (three MPS scales correlate with other measures of perfectionism) and internally reliable (Cronbach alpha values for the three subscales well above .70; Hewitt & Flett, 1991; Stoeber et al., 2009a; Stoeber et al., 2009b). In the present study, the internal reliability coefficient was .92 for the full 45-item scale, and the self-oriented, other-oriented, and socially-prescribed subscales had respective Cronbach’s alpha values of .91, .76, and .85. The coefficients for all subscales are well within the acceptable levels for research purposes.

Academic Dishonesty Questionnaire. The Academic Dishonesty Questionnaire (ADQ) consists of 11 two-part items created for the present research (see Appendix). The first part asks the participants to estimate how frequently they have engaged in a behavior in their lifetime (e.g., “I have submitted someone else’s paper as my own”). The second part uses a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (never engaged in behavior) to 5 (within the past academic semester) to measure how recently the participant engaged in academic cheating. Data from the recency subscale were separated into two groups—those who reported engaging
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in the behavior at any point during their lifetime and those who reported never engaging in the behavior, due to the high number of participants who were first-year students in their first college semester. The administration of the questionnaires took place in the first month of the semester, and the previous academic semester for the first-year students was their final semester of high school. The first-year students would not have been able to provide answers 4 (since entering college) or 5 on the ADQ, therefore answer choices 2 (before high school) through 5 were combined into one category. Cronbach’s alpha values for the recency and frequency subscales were .78 and .62 respectively. The internal consistency value is acceptable for the recency subscale and questionable for the frequency subscale.

**Procedure**

Participants were given the MPS, ADQ, and a demographic questionnaire in person to complete in that specific order.

**Results**

**Prevalence of Cheating**

Ninety-eight percent of the sample reported engaging in one or more academic cheating behavior at some point during their life. The most common form of cheating behavior was allowing someone else to copy their homework (95.1%). Other common forms of cheating were copying someone else’s homework (91.1%), receiving information about a test prior to taking the test (82.9%), and giving information about a test prior to taking the test (75.6%). The recency breakdown of each behavior can be found in Table 1.

**Primary Correlations**

The primary analyses examining the correlations between the total score on the ADQ and the self-oriented and socially-prescribed subscales of perfectionism were not significant, \( r(80) = -.183, p = .100 \); \( r(80) = .013, p = .910 \); see Figures 1 and 2). The total score on the ADQ was calculated as the sum of the 11 behaviors the participant reported engaging in at some point in his or her life for a maximum score of 11. Consistent with prior research, the subscales of the MPS were highly intercorrelated (see Table 2).

**Analyses of Individual Items**

Each individual item of the ADQ was then analyzed separately by using \( t \) tests to identify differences in perfectionism scores between those who reported engaging in the behavior at some point during their life and those who reported never engaging in the behavior (see Table 1) and correlating the frequency of engagement in the behavior with the subscales of perfectionism.

Self-oriented perfectionism scores of individuals who reported engagement in “submitting someone else’s paper as my own” were significantly different from those who did not report engagement, \( t(80) = 2.51, p = .014, d = .56 \). The mean self-oriented perfectionism score of individuals who reported engagement (\( M = 38.50, SD = 2.12 \)) was lower than those who did not report engagement (\( M = 55.83, SD = 9.69 \)). Self-oriented perfectionism scores were also shown to be significantly lower for individuals reporting instances of being “dishonest in reporting attendance for an internship, service-learning, or similar requirement for a course” (\( M = 49.60, SD = 11.48 \)) than those who did not report engagement (\( M = 56.21, SD = 9.52 \), \( t(80) = 2.006, p = .048, d = .45 \). Also, socially-prescribed perfectionism scores positively
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**TABLE 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Before College</th>
<th>Since Entering College or Within Past Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>97.6%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>93.9%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. “Before College” percentages include “Before High School” and “While in High School.” For individual item analyses, recency was dichotomized into “Never Engaging in Behavior” or “Previously Engaging in Behavior,” combining “Before College” and “Since Entering College” categories.
correlated with frequencies of dishonest attendance reporting, \( r(78) = .23, p = .044 \).

**Demographic Correlations and Analyses**

Reported GPA was not significantly correlated with any of the perfectionism subscales; however, GPA negatively correlated with the total score on the ADQ, \( r(79) = -.234, p = .036 \). No other demographic variables, including biological sex, were found to have significant relationships with any of the perfectionism subscales or academic dishonesty scales. Contrary to prior research (DeAndrea et al., 2009; Thorpe et al., 1999), no significant difference in reporting academic cheating was found between males and females, \( t(80) = 0.325, p = .787 \).

**Discussion**

The objective of this study was to investigate possible relationships between perfectionism (self-oriented and socially prescribed) and academic cheating. Results showed no relationship between overall academic cheating and perfectionism. Therefore, the initial hypotheses were not supported.

Despite the lack of support for a negative relationship between self-oriented perfectionism and overall academic cheating, significantly lower self-oriented perfectionism scores were found for those individuals who reported submitting someone else’s paper as their own and having been dishonest in reporting attendance for an internship, service-learning, or other requirement for a course. The higher self-oriented perfectionism scores of participants who did not engage in these two specific behaviors could suggest an adaptive quality of self-oriented as suggested by the adaptive vs. maladaptive theory of perfectionism (Frost, Marten, Lahart, & Rosenblate, 1990). Initially seen as measuring a negative attribute, self-oriented perfectionism has displayed the possibility of possessing adaptive qualities in the present study as well as in prior literature (Miquelon et al., 2005; Rudolph et al., 2007). As previously mentioned, a potential basis behind a possible negative relationship between self-oriented perfectionism and reported engagement in cheating behaviors could be the preparedness associated with the orderliness component of conscientiousness (DeYoung et al., 2007).

No overall significant difference was found between socially-prescribed perfectionism and engagement in academic cheating. However, the frequency of engagement in dishonest reporting of attendance for a course requirement had a significant positive correlation with socially-prescribed perfectionism. Only ten participants reported engaging in this behavior so further analysis with a larger sample of participants who have engaged in this behavior before would be beneficial.

Consistent with past research suggesting a relationship between academic cheating and cognitive/scholastic ability (Nathanson et al., 2006), higher GPA scores were correlated with lower total scores on the ADQ.

**Limitations**

Limitations of the present study include a reliance on self-report measures that may or may not accurately reflect the actual engagement in academic cheating behaviors since these behaviors are not typically socially desirable. The questionnaire order was not counterbalanced in the administration of the surveys; therefore a priming effect could have occurred (i.e., taking the MPS beforehand potentially influenced the participants’ responses on the ADQ). Additionally, the frequency subscale had a questionable value for internal consistency, which limits the potential for significance. The ADQ also did not include any items directly related to dishonest Internet usage, which has become a resource for academic dishonesty in recent years. In addition, the percent of the sample that reported engagement in select cheating activities since entering college or within the past academic
semester was very small (see Table 1). The respective number of participants who reported that they had “cheated off of someone on a test” or “let someone cheat off of me on a test” since entering college or within the past academic semester were two and five. Only one participant reported that they had “submitted someone else’s paper as my own” since entering college and one participant reported that they had “let someone submit my paper as their own” within the past academic semester. Two participants reported that they had “plagiarized another’s work” and five reported that they had “looked at study material during a test” since entering college or within the past academic semester. Zero participants answered that they had reported dishonest attendance since entering college, yet a positive correlation was present between socially-prescribed perfectionism and engagement in reporting dishonest attendance. Due to the small percentage of individuals who reported engaging in these academic cheating behaviors since entering college, it may be difficult to generalize the correlations between perfectionism and the engagement in those behaviors in college.

The low number of participants who reported engagement in academic cheating behaviors since entering college could possibly be attributed to the timing of the data collection. The majority of the sample, 54.9%, classified themselves as first-year students and the surveys were administered within the first six weeks of their attendance at the university. Therefore, their academic experience was still quite limited, as many of the participants had not yet taken a college exam. Also, the most recent academic semester for students classifying themselves as first-year students would have occurred during the second semester of their senior year of high school. To avoid possible inconsistencies in evaluation for cheating recency within the participant pool, the recency scale was dichotomized. Because the academic atmosphere and expectations differ from high school to college, generalizing the results of the present study to colleges and universities must be done with caution.

**Conclusion**

The adaptiveness and maladaptiveness of perfectionism still remains unclear. Further research in the area of academic cheating and perfectionism should study the adaptive and maladaptive dimensions of perfectionism and their relationship with academic cheating. Another area of possible research is the examination of the relationship between perfectionism and broader dishonest behaviors beyond cheating in academia, for example in the workplace.

Whether the pressure originates from within oneself or society, college students at a private university feel the desire to be perfect as suggested by the sample averages for each subtype of perfectionism being higher than the population means (see Table 2). Results of the present study indicate that partial relationships between perfectionism and academic cheating exist and further research can show to what extent the different types of perfectionism relate to engagement in academic cheating behaviors in college.

**TABLE 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Self</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.604**</td>
<td>.533**</td>
<td>-.183</td>
<td>55.40</td>
<td>9.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Other</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.410**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>54.26</td>
<td>9.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Social</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51.79</td>
<td>9.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ADQT</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>2.095</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**FIGURE 2**

Scatterplot Demonstrating Correlation Between Total Score on the ADQ (ADQTOT) and Socially-Prescribed Perfectionism (SSP) Score
Overall, the alarming 98% of the sample reporting engagement in one or more of the cheating behaviors reiterates the importance for studying academic dishonesty in order to maintain the future integrity of academic institutions and curb the rampant cheating found today.
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## APPENDIX A

### Academic Dishonesty Questionnaire

On a scale from 1 to 5, rate how recently you have engaged in the following behaviors to the best of your knowledge:

- 1—never engaged in this behavior
- 2—engaged in behavior before high school
- 3—engaged in behavior while in high school
- 4—engaged in behavior since entering college
- 5—engaged in behavior within the past academic semester

**Fill in each blank with how many times, to the best of your knowledge, you have engaged in the following behaviors over the course of your lifetime.**

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I have copied someone’s homework. &amp; 5. I have submitted someone else’s paper as my own. &amp; 9. I have given information about a test before another has taken it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have engaged in this behavior ___ time(s) in my life. &amp; I have engaged in this behavior ___ time(s) in my life. &amp; I have engaged in this behavior ___ time(s) in my life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. I have let someone copy my homework. &amp; 6. I have let someone submit my paper as his or her own. &amp; 10. I have looked at study material while taking a test.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have engaged in this behavior ___ time(s) in my life. &amp; I have engaged in this behavior ___ time(s) in my life. &amp; I have engaged in this behavior ___ time(s) in my life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. I have cheated off of someone on a test. &amp; 7. I have plagiarized another’s work. &amp; 11. I have been dishonest in reporting attendance for an internship, service-learning, or similar requirement for a course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have engaged in this behavior ___ time(s) in my life. &amp; I have engaged in this behavior ___ time(s) in my life. &amp; I have engaged in this behavior ___ time(s) in my life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. I have let someone cheat off of me on a test. &amp; 8. I have received information about a test before I have taken the test from another who has already taken the test.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have engaged in this behavior ___ time(s) in my life. &amp; I have engaged in this behavior ___ time(s) in my life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>