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ABSTRACT
The present study examined self-control, attitude toward academic dishonesty, and perceived opportunity in predicting academic dishonesty. Using a dataset that consisted of 853 survey responses, results showed that attitude toward academic dishonesty mediated the relationship between self-control and academic dishonesty and also between perceived opportunity and academic dishonesty.

PRESS PARAGRAPH
Academic dishonesty is a persistent and pervasive problem on college campuses. Researchers have suggested a variety of factors that influence academic dishonesty. The purpose of the present study is to examine the topic of academic dishonesty within the theoretically rich and broader context of deviant behavior and delinquency. Like academic dishonesty, deviant behavior has been associated with a variety of factors including age (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990), gender (Mears & Ploeger, 1998), association with delinquent peers (Empey & Stafford, 1991), self-control and perceived opportunity (Grasmick & Tittle, 1993), and organizational identification (Eve & Bromley, 1981). However, research on deviant behavior (unlike research on academic dishonesty) is often placed in the context of empirically supported theories (Bolin & Heatherly, 2001).

One theory in particular seems to offer the hope of clarifying the nature of academic dishonesty. According to the general theory of crime (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990), lack of self-control, perceived opportunity, and the interaction between them are the major causes of all deviant behavior, including academic dishonesty. People who lack self-control have personalities that predispose them toward committing deviant acts (Arneklev, Grasmick, Tittle, & Bursik, 1993). When opportunities for deviance present themselves, people who lack self-control are unable to resist the temptation.

If previous findings on academic dishonesty are reinterpreted in the context of the general theory of crime, a clearer picture of the phenomena begins to emerge. The opportunity for academic dishonesty on a college campus is omnipresent. This opportunity is increased further by (a) joining a fraternity/sorority, (b) associating with peers that cheat and/or approve of cheating, and (c) attending a large state-supported school (McCabe & Trevino, 1997). An individual without self-control is very likely to cheat in such a tempting environment.

The present study examines the roles of self-control, attitude toward academic dishonesty, and perceived opportunity in predicting academic dishonesty. Using a dataset that consisted of 853 survey responses, results showed that attitude toward academic dishonesty mediated the relationship between self-control and academic dishonesty and also between perceived opportunity and academic dishonesty. Implications of these findings are briefly discussed.
Predictors of Academic Dishonesty: Self-Control, Perceived Opportunity, and Attitudes

Academic dishonesty is a persistent and pervasive problem on college campuses around the United States. Over sixty years ago, Drake (1941) reported that 23 percent of undergraduate students had engaged in some form of academic dishonesty or cheating. While there is some debate as to whether the problem has grown since then (for a review see Brown & Emmett, 2001), recent estimates of the incidence of cheating on college campuses suggest that the majority of all students cheat at some point in their college careers (Davis, Grover, Becker, & McGregor, 1992; Sierles, Hendrickx, & Circle, 1980; Stern & Havlicek, 1986).

In an effort to understand this problem, researchers have identified a variety of factors that correlate with academic dishonesty. For example, most researchers agree that men, students at large state-supported institutions, and students with lower academic abilities cheat more often than women, students at small private colleges, and students with higher academic abilities do (Brown & Emmett, 2001; Davis et al., 1992). McCabe and Trevino (1997) found that age, fraternity/sorority membership, peer approval of dishonesty, and peer cheating were also associated with higher rates of cheating. Unfortunately, research into the causes of academic dishonesty has been largely focused on describing relationships between variables without regard to theoretical integration or explanation of the phenomenon.

The purpose of the present study is to examine the topic of academic dishonesty within the theoretically rich and broader context of deviant behavior and delinquency. Like academic dishonesty, deviant behavior has been associated with a variety of factors including age (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990), gender (Mears & Ploeger, 1998), association with delinquent
peers (Empey & Stafford, 1991), self-control and perceived opportunity (Grasmick & Tittle, 1993), and organizational identification (Eve & Bromley, 1981). However, research on deviant behavior (unlike research on academic dishonesty) is often placed in the context of empirically supported theories (Bolin & Heatherly, 2001).

One theory in particular seems to offer the hope of clarifying the nature of academic dishonesty. According to the general theory of crime (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990), lack of self-control, perceived opportunity, and the interaction between them are the major causes of all deviant behavior, including academic dishonesty. People who lack self-control have personalities that predispose them toward committing deviant acts (Arneklev, Grasmick, Tittle, & Bursik, 1993). When opportunities for deviance present themselves, people who lack self-control are unable to resist the temptation.

If previous findings on academic dishonesty are reinterpreted in the context of the general theory of crime, a clearer picture of the phenomena begins to emerge. The opportunity for academic dishonesty on a college campus is omnipresent. This opportunity is increased further by (a) joining a fraternity/sorority, (b) associating with peers that cheat and/or approve of cheating, and (c) attending a large state-supported school (McCabe & Trevino, 1997). An individual without self-control is very likely to cheat in such a tempting environment.

While the absence of self-control appears to be a valid explanation for cheating that takes place impulsively in response to a perceived opportunity, the general theory of crime does not explain why students with self-control do not cheat (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990). Having self-control might lead students to deliberately (rather than impulsively) cheat in circumstances that are common on college campuses today: detection is unlikely, opportunity is high, norms favor cheating, and cheaters have an advantage in the race for a high GPA (Graham, Monday, O’Brien,
& Steffen, 1994; Wood, Pfefferbaum, & Arneklev, 1993). In short, lack of self-control should be sufficient to explain cheating in an opportunity-rich environment, but having self-control does not seem sufficient to explain why some students do not cheat when cheating may be in their best interest (Vazsonyi, Pickering, Junger, & Hessing, 2001). In support of this assertion, Grasmick and Tittle (1993) found that a substantial proportion of variance in deviant behavior is left unexplained by self-control and opportunity alone; the general theory of crime could not fully explain the phenomenon. If Grasmick and Tittle’s results are hold for all deviant behaviors, then an additional variable or variables (beyond self-control and perceived opportunity) may also be needed to explain academic dishonesty.

Some evidence suggests that this additional variable may be an attitude toward academic dishonesty. For example, Piquero and Tibbetts (1996) found that the effect of self-control on deviance was mediated by attitudinal variables such as perceived pleasure and perceived shame for the act. Bolin and Heatherly (2001) found that attitudes toward deviant behavior were good predictors of actual behavior in two large samples. In addition, Davis et al. (1992) showed that attitudes toward academic dishonesty and perceived opportunity for academic dishonesty both had an impact on cheating among college students.

The current study was based on the premise that the general theory of crime, as proposed by Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990), is an inadequate explanation of cheating among college students unless attitude toward academic dishonesty is added to the model. Haines, Diekhoff, Labeff, and Clark (1986) found preliminary support for this revision to the general theory of crime model. Using stepwise regression, they found that age (a correlate of self-control), attitudes, and perceived opportunity all made significant and independent contributions to the prediction of
academic dishonesty. However, the use of stepwise regression did not allow Haines et al. to test for mediation.

Based on prior research and the preceding discussion, it was hypothesized that the relationship between self-control and academic dishonesty is mediated both by perceived opportunity and attitude toward academic dishonesty. The proposed causal chain that flows from self-control to perceived opportunity to academic dishonesty is consistent with the explanation for deviant acts offered by the general theory of crime. The proposed causal chain that flows from self-control to attitudes toward academic dishonesty to academic dishonesty is the suggested modification to the general theory of crime, especially in regard to academically dishonest behavior. Figure 1 summarizes the proposed relationships among these four variables. A non-directional path between the error terms of perceived opportunity and attitude toward academic dishonesty is included in this model to represent the correlation between these two variables after controlling for the effects of self-control. Because there was no empirical evidence or theoretical rationale that suggested which of these two variables should come first in the causal chain, this relationship was left free to vary.

Method

Participants

Participants were recruited from colleges and universities around the United States through various internet sites and psychology instructors. The initial data set consisted of 853 student responses to an internet survey. The initial data set was reduced by deleting incomplete \( n = 10 \) and duplicate responses \( n = 44 \). A response was considered incomplete if the participant did not respond to 20 percent or more of the items. A response was considered duplicate if two or more responses originated from the same internet protocol address and all items, including the
participants’ birthdays, were identical. The final dataset consisted of 799 responses from college students around the United States. The median age of participants was 20 years; 62.1 percent of the participants reported a birth date that would make them a traditional-age college student (ages 18-22). Nearly 70 percent (n = 554) of the participants were female, and 64 percent (n = 508) were freshmen or sophomores in college.

Measures

*Academic Dishonesty.* The Academic Dishonesty scale consists of 9 behavioral items adapted from McCabe and Trevino (1997). Participants were asked to indicate how often they had engaged in each academically dishonest behavior since beginning their college careers using a five-point Likert scale (1 = Not Even One Time to 5 = Many Times; see Appendix A for a list of items).

*Perceived Opportunity.* The Perceived Opportunity scale consists of 8 items adapted from McCabe and Trevino (1997) that dealt with the participants’ perceptions of the frequency and acceptability of academically dishonest behaviors at their home institution and the likelihood of academic dishonesty being detected. Participants used a five-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Agree to 5 = Strongly Disagree; see Appendix A for a list of items) to rate each item.

*Attitude Toward Academic Dishonesty.* The Attitude Toward Academic Dishonesty scale consists of 4 items adapted from Davis et al. (1992) that dealt with participants’ moral evaluations of cheating. Participants used a five-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Agree to 5 = Strongly Disagree; see Appendix A for a list of items) to rate each item.

*Self-Control.* The Self-Control scale consists of 24 items (for a list of items see Grasmick & Tittle, 1993). The items measure the six facets of self-control first proposed by Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990): Impulsivity, Preference for Physical Activity, Risk Taking, Self-Centered,
Preference for Simple Tasks, and Temper. Participants used a five-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Agree to 5 = Strongly Disagree) to rate each item.

Design and Procedures

Survey Order and Distribution. Items from each scale were combined into a single survey and posted to the internet. Participants’ responses to the survey were automatically appended to a database set up for that purpose. Notices were then sent to several websites that advertise online studies. Additional notices were sent to psychology instructors around the country via e-mail suggesting the survey as an extra credit assignment. Many instructors indicated, via e-mail, that their students would be allowed to complete the survey for extra credit. Participants completed the scales in the following order: Perceived Opportunity, Attitude Toward Academic Dishonesty, Self-Control, and Academic Dishonesty. Composite scores for each scale were computed as a unit-weighted sum of all items. If the participants left any survey responses blank, they were encouraged, but not required, to provide responses to all items. All responses were completely anonymous, but participants had the option of printing a generic receipt after their responses had been logged for the purpose of obtaining course credit.

Estimation Method and Fit Criteria. Hypothesis testing was done using path analysis with the aid of the LISREL software package (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1989). As input for this program, a variance-covariance matrix was computed using listwise deletion of missing data. Measurement error was accounted for in all models by using the standard practice of fixing the error variance of observed variables to [(1-reliability) times the variance] and fixing the path between each latent construct and its observed indicator to the square root of the indicator’s reliability. All parameters were estimated using maximum likelihood estimation.
Assessment of overall model fit was based on both absolute and incremental fit indices. Absolute indices include the $\chi^2$ likelihood ratio test, the standardized RMR, and the RMSEA (Cudeck & Browne, 1983; Mulaik et al., 1989; Steiger, 1988). A good fit of the model was indicated by a non-significant $\chi^2$, a standardized root mean residual (SRMR) of less than .05 and a root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) of less than .05 (Browne, 1982). The Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI; Tucker & Lewis, 1973) was used to compare alternative models, and the Comparative Fit Index (CFI; Bentler, 1990) was used to compare the noncentral $\chi^2$ to the null model. Given the relatively low number of indicators in the models being tested, fairly conservative cutoffs of .95 were used for both indices. In addition to the proposed model, parameter estimates were also computed for several alternative models (Medsker, Williams, & Holohan, 1994).

Results

Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 shows the means, standard deviations, internal consistencies, and inter-correlations for the variables under investigation. Visual inspection of frequency histograms and computation of skew and kurtosis statistics for each variable revealed that academic dishonesty and attitude toward academic dishonesty were both negatively skewed. As a result, both variables were subjected to logarithmic transformation before any analysis in an effort to normalize their distributions. The distributions of self-control and perceived opportunity were both approximately normal.

Model Fit

A summary of fit indices for the saturated model, the proposed model, the next-most-likely alternative model, and the null model is provided in Table 2. The saturated model and null
model are included only as a point of comparison: the saturated model provides the best possible fit to the data and the null model provides the worst possible fit to the data. The proposed model differed from the saturated model by constraining one relationship to zero, the direct path from self-control to academic dishonesty. If there is no direct path between self-control and academic dishonesty, then the relationship between these two variables in the current sample is mediated by perceived opportunity and attitude toward academic dishonesty. The increment in the fit function associated with this change was non-significant, $\Delta \chi^2 (1, N = 661) = 0.041, p = .84$, which provides empirical support for the decision to constrain this path. Self-control did not have a direct effect on academic dishonesty. All of the fit indices for the proposed model also met the a priori standards for good fit; the proposed model provides a very good fit to the actual data. In addition, all structural paths in the proposed model were statistically significant except the path from perceived opportunity to academic dishonesty.

Parameter estimates and fit indices were also calculated for the next-most-likely alternative model. The next-most-likely alternative model differed from the proposed model by constraining one relationship to zero, the direct path from perceived opportunity to academic dishonesty. The increment in the fit function associated with this change was non-significant, $\Delta \chi^2 (1, N = 661) = 3.209, p = .20$, which provides empirical support for the decision to constrain this path. All of the other fit functions also met the a priori standards for good fit; the next-most-likely alternative model provides a very good fit to the actual data. In addition, all structural paths in this model were statistically significant.

Because the proposed model and the next-most-likely alternative model both provide an acceptable fit to the data, selecting the most appropriate model is somewhat more complicated. The choice between models must be based on both empirical and theoretical considerations. On
theoretical grounds, it makes sense for the relationship between perceived opportunity and academic dishonesty to be dependent on each individual’s attitude toward academic dishonesty; noticing an opportunity to cheat is unlikely to lead to the behavior unless an individual also has a favorable attitude toward cheating. Although the difference in empirical fit between the proposed model and the next-most-likely alternative model is relatively small, the greater parsimony, uniformly significant paths, and overall good fit of the next-most-likely alternative model make it preferable to the proposed model. This suggests that the proposed direct relationship between perceived opportunity and academic dishonesty can be removed from the model with little consequence empirically or theoretically (see Figure 2).

Discussion

Interpretation

The proposed relationships depicted in figure 1 were generally confirmed in the current study; there was no direct relationship between self-control and academic dishonesty. However, the proposed model was not selected as the preferred model for the data in the current sample. In particular, the relationship between perceived opportunity and academic dishonesty in the proposed model was not necessary. The next-most-likely-alternative model, a revision of the proposed model shown in figure 2 that deleted this unnecessary path, was selected as the preferred model for the data in the current sample. Overall, the current results suggest that attitude toward academic dishonesty plays a critical role in the explanation of academic dishonesty; nearly 40 percent of the variation in academic dishonesty is explained by its relationship with attitude toward academic dishonesty in the current sample.

Mounting empirical evidence (Arneklev et al., 1993; Piquero & Tibbets, 1996; Vazonyi et al., 2001) and the current results suggest that the general theory of crime is an inadequate
Explanation of deviant acts such as academic dishonesty. However, the current results demonstrate that the theory is viable with the addition of attitudes as an intervening variable. From a logical standpoint, the addition of attitudes to the model makes sense. Having a favorable attitude toward academic dishonesty or any deviant behavior should make it easier to take advantage of opportunities for the behavior (Haines et al., 1986). Having a favorable attitude toward academic dishonesty should also clear the way for individuals with or without self-control to act, some impulsively and others deliberately. Of course, it is also possible that attitudes toward cheating are the result of cheating behavior rather than the cause, or even that attitudes toward cheating and cheating behavior are reciprocally determined.

Implications

These findings have important implications for interventions aimed at reducing academic dishonesty. Self-control is a relatively stable personality trait that is shaped in childhood (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990). If the general theory of crime was accurate and self-control really was the primary cause of academic dishonesty and other deviant acts, then intervention would need to take place well before students enter college. According to the general theory of crime, interventions aimed at increasing self-control would probably not be very effective in reducing academic dishonesty once students reach college age.

Perceived opportunity for academic dishonesty is also difficult to change. Interventions aimed at reducing the perceived opportunity for academic dishonesty might include an increase in surveillance, an increase in sanctions, and disrupting deviant social networks. However, determined cheaters would likely create new opportunities. In addition, reducing the perceived opportunity for academic dishonesty would require eternal vigilance; dishonesty rates would be expected to return to previous levels if the intervention was removed. If the general theory of
crime was accurate and perceived opportunity mediated the relationship between self-control and academic dishonesty, then increasing sanctions and supervision in an effort to deter academic dishonesty would be successful as long as the intervention remained in place.

However, the current results suggest that the general theory of crime is not accurate unless attitudes are added to the model. Because attitudes are less enduring than personality traits like self-control and require less frequent intervention than the eternal vigilance needed to reduce opportunity, interventions aimed at influencing student attitudes toward academic dishonesty would seem to have a higher likelihood of success at a much lower cost. In fact, the recent trend toward the development of honor codes to deter academic dishonesty may be effective, in part, by influencing student attitudes toward academic dishonesty (McCabe & Trevino, 1993). Student attitudes also seem amendable to change through interventions such as education (Ames & Eskridge, 1992). Further, Uhlig and Howes (1967) found that students were less likely to take advantage of opportunities to cheat if they had negative attitudes toward academic dishonesty.

Limitations

Several limitations of the current study are worth noting. First, the use of self-report data, especially for sensitive topics such as academic dishonesty, raises several questions about the accuracy of the data. Also, because participation was anonymous and recruitment efforts were not uniform throughout the country, it seems unlikely that the current sample is representative of the total population of college students in the United States. In addition, most of the students in the current sample were enrolled in a psychology course. It seems likely that students who take psychology courses and participate in extra credit assignments are a selective sample. However, this limitation may be more imagined than real considering that Eskridge and Ames (1993) showed similar results for a sample of mixed academic majors. A closely related problem lies in
the analysis decisions to use composite measures, to transform skewed variables, and to compute
the variance-covariance matrix using listwise deletion of missing data. It is possible that
repeating the analyses using other analysis strategies may slightly alter some path estimates in
the final model. To guard against this possibility, the analyses were repeated using a variety of
different analysis strategies. Because there were no appreciable differences in the results, this
limitation is probably not a serious threat to the validity of these findings. Finally, many
potentially confounding variables were left unexplored and/or unmeasured by the current design.

Future Directions

Future research should continue to probe the limits of the general theory of crime and the
explanation of deviant acts such as academic dishonesty. One need in this area is for
methodologies that allow more direct measure of deviant behavior. Although the current study
made it possible for students to give anonymous reports of cheating, the data still suffers from
the limitations of all self-reported data. In addition, the current study should be expanded to
include noted demographic predictors of academic dishonesty. It would be interesting to see if
demographic predictors of academic dishonesty such as gender and age predict incremental
variance in academic dishonesty after controlling for attitudes. It may also be important to
determine if these relationships are similar for other populations such as high school students and
students at universities in other countries.
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### Table 1

**Descriptive Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Academic Dishonesty</td>
<td>.897</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.351</td>
<td>.506</td>
<td>.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Attitude Toward Academic Dishonesty</td>
<td>.753</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-Control</td>
<td>.834</td>
<td>11.179</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 661. All correlations are significant at p < .01. *a* Cronbach's alpha calculated on the present sample.
Table 2

Fit Indices for Nested Sequence of Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>χ²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>NNFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saturated Model</td>
<td>All predictors have direct and indirect paths to academic dishonesty. Best possible fit.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Mediated Model</td>
<td>No direct path from self-control to academic dishonesty</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next-Most-Likely Alternative Model</td>
<td>No direct path from perceived opportunity to academic dishonesty</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.994</td>
<td>.998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null Model</td>
<td>No relationships between any of the latent variables. Worst possible fit.</td>
<td>571.20**</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p<.05, **p<.01.  N = 661.
Figure 1. Proposed Model of Relationships Among Variables
Figure 2. Parameter Estimates for the Next-Most-Likely Alternative Model

Note. N=661. The standardized solution is shown here. Values on each directional path are standardized beta weights. *p<.05, **p<.01. Chi-Square = 3.25, df = 2, p = 0.197, RMSEA = 0.031.
Appendix A

Items on Each Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Opportunity (adapted from McCabe &amp; Trevino, 1997)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plagiarism and cheating on tests occur frequently at this school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have personally observed another student cheating on a test many times at this school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My closest friend would strongly disapprove if he/she found out I had cheated in a course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A typical student at this school would strongly disapprove if he/she found out I had cheated in a Course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A typical student at this school would report someone who had cheated on a test.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The penalties for academic dishonesty at this school are severe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The faculty understand the policies on academic dishonesty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The faculty support the policies on academic dishonesty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Toward Academic Dishonesty (adapted from Davis et al., 1992)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is ‘wrong’ to cheat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students should go ahead and cheat if they know they can get away with it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students should try to cheat even if their chances of getting away with it are very slim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would let another student cheat off my test if he/she asked.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Dishonesty (adapted from McCabe &amp; Trevino, 1997)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copied material and turned it in as your own work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used unfair methods to learn what was on a test before it was given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copied a few sentences of material from a published source without giving the author credit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped someone else to cheat on a test.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborated on an assignment when the instructor asked for individual work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copied from another student during a test.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turned in work done by someone else.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received substantial help on an individual assignment without the instructor’s permission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheated on a test in any way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used a textbook or notes on a test without the instructor’s permission.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>