

THE IMPACT OF PERSONALITY TRAITS ON ACADEMIC DISHONESTY AMONG PAKISTAN STUDENTS

Muhammad Shakeel Aslam¹ and Mian
Sajid Nazir²

Key Words: dishonest behavior, personality traits, extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, Pakistan

Abstract

Academic dishonesty has been a matter of great concern in higher education for last few decades. The dishonest behavior of students at graduate and undergraduate level has become a severe issue for education and business sector, especially when the students exercise same dishonest practices at their jobs. The number of private and public sector universities is increasing; therefore, the effects of academic dishonest behavior on potential professionals need to be carefully investigated and appropriate policies must be formulated by academicians in order to resolve this issue. The present research addresses this matter by investigating into the relationship of student's personality traits such as Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism and Openness with the academic dishonest behaviors of students. A well-structured questionnaire was used to collect the data from 932 respondents studying at graduate and undergraduate levels in different Pakistani universities. The study found students' personality traits to have a significant impact on attitudes towards academic dishonesty. The results provide a strong implication for academicians to develop the moralities and ethics in students so that institutions may provide ethically cultivated professionals to the business community.

INTRODUCTION

Academic Dishonesty has been a matter of great concern in higher education during the last few decades. The issue of dishonest behavior of students at graduate and undergraduate level has become very severe, particularly when students continue to exercise the same practices at the workplace. The worst scandals of world top companies of World Com and E-toyes, Enron & Adelphia have forced the researchers to focus their attention on the role of college and universities in ethical training of tomorrow's business leaders. The cheating students have strong tendency to practice same unethical and dishonest behaviors at the workplace which they had exhibited during their education (Grimes, 2004; Rakovski and Levy, 2007; Hardling et al; 2004; Lawson, 2004). The number of private and public sector educational institutions is increasing day by day; therefore, the impact of academic dishonest behavior on the life of potential professionals needs to be carefully analyzed and appropriate policies must be formulated in order to minimize these unethical practices in the business and education sectors.

The present study sheds some light on this issue by investigating the relationship of personality traits with the frequency of students' involvement in dishonest behaviors, severity of and penalty for these behaviors. Researchers in the area of social sciences agree upon the five dimensions of personality e.g. Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism and Openness (John and Srivastava, 1999; Levine and Jackson, 2002). These dimensions are collectively called as

¹ Lecturer at Department of Management Sciences, COMSATS Institute of Information Technology, Lahore, Pakistan.

² Assistant Professor at Department of Management Sciences, COMSATS Institute of Information Technology, Lahore, Pakistan.
sajidnazir2001@yahoo.com

Big Five personality traits (John and Srivastava, 1999).

Extraversion is revealed to be strongly related to the positive emotionality (Barrick and Mount, 1991; John and Srivastava, 1999). Furthermore, it is found to have connection with training expertise and positive work relationship (Barrick and Mount, 1991; Furnham, et al, 2005). Individual high on Agreeableness found to have high ability to get along with the groups and for the creation of good relationships (Organ and Lingl, 1995). In addition, Trevino and Nelson (2004) revealed that individuals high on Agreeableness always pursue the group norms if they found them in the favor of organization. It is noted that the level of Agreeableness does not have significant impact on the level of students' behaviors towards academic dishonesty (Christine and James, 2008). Characteristics of Conscientiousness include thinking well before taking action, proper planning and organizing, abiding by norms, rules and regulations, greater sense of responsibility, prioritizing, high training aptitude and delaying pleasure (Barrick and Mount, 1991). Colbert et al, (2004) found Conscientiousness to have positive relationship with higher productivity and less deviance. Neuroticism, fourth dimensions of personality has been reported to have close association with organizational deviance (Colbert, et al, 2004) and with non-constructive emotionality as well (Barrick and Mount, 1991; John and Srivastava, 1999). The Openness trait has positive relationship with work and independence in job affairs (Furnham et al, 2005) as well as related to the intellectual level, cognitive capability and high training aptitude (Barrick and Mount, 1991).

The research is expected to contribute a better understanding of the ethical decisions of students helping the academicians and business professionals to look into and formulate some policies to refrain from this behavior. The remainder of the paper is organized as follows; the next section

reviews some significant studies, third part develops the methodology followed by results and discussion in the next. Final section concludes the study by suggesting some implications for educators and future avenues for researchers.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Much has been written and researched about the students' ethics in higher education (Rakovski & Levy, 2007). In this regard, some earlier work of William and Bowers in 1960s has provided a strong base, which is further explored by Donald McCabe in 1990s. However, these concepts came from the developed world and researches were also carried out in these countries. In general, research concluded that dishonesty in education is rampant which needs to be carefully analyzed in other countries as well along with its relation with the demographic factors of the students. Literature finds mixed views regarding the increased frequency of cheating in academics (McCabe and Bowers, 1994; McCabe and Drinn, 1999) despite some contrary findings of Brown and Emmett, 2001). The longitudinal analysis of the Bower's research indicates that the frequency of students' involvement in academic dishonesty and cheating is rising. In earlier, Bower (1964) analyzed 5000 students from 99 various college campuses and found that at least half of them were engaged in some form of academic dishonesty. Later on, McCabe and Bowers (1994) conducted the survey students from 9 more campuses to the previous study and concluded that 52% of the sample students reported copying exam sheet or test from another student where in 1964 this ratio was just 26%. McCabe and Trevino (2002) also observed a fourfold increase in the number of students using cheating material in exam (i.e. from 6% to 27%). Academic dishonesty among students has been explored in the western context and this area remained unattended in Pakistan. To address this gap and to provide the new avenue to the researchers in the area of educational research, Nazir and Aslam (2009) conducted

first study on academic dishonesty with respect to the Pakistani culture and concluded considerable results which can be helpful to decrease the level of cheating among the students.

As per the findings of a student self reported survey of Ogilby (1995), the ratios of cheaters on exam has increased from 23% to 84% during a period of 1940-1982 while students cheat more frequently at rural colleges (Robinson et al., 2004) as well as small colleges (Dawkins, 2004). Use of technology has further enhanced the problem of academic dishonesty at university and college levels. Computers and internet have made it very convenient and easier to obtain the information and use it as your own with or without mentioning the source. This has been taken into consideration by Scanlon and Neumann (2002) by conducting a study of undergraduate from nine colleges and universities from USA; the study reported the findings that a substantial number of students use the internet form copy and paste text into their assignments and papers without mentioning the source. The use of technology for cheating has increased much that student even use to break into the computer files of professors and steal exam papers and result sheets (Fishbein, 1993).

Research has found mixed evidence on the gender effect on moral values of students. Although, some earlier studies reported inconclusive findings on gender differences and academic dishonesty (Thoma, 1986); however, recent studies noted a link is prevailing (Shaub, 1989; Sweeney, 1995, Cohen et al, 1998). As per Malone (2006), attitude of male and female students differs on some dishonest acts but for most of the issues of dishonesty, they behave in same way. Cohen et al. (1998) developed a Multidimensional ethics Scores (MES) to evaluate the ethical evaluation and intention aspects of honest behaviors, and found that males and females had significantly different set of judgments on their perception of ethical behavior. Some other

studies reported that male students are more frequently engaged in dishonest acts than females (Bower, 1964; McCabe and Trevino, 1997; Whitley et al, 1999). Moreover, this is also confined by a literature review paper of Crown and Spiller (1998) who reported more involvement of male students in cheating than females. So, we can also expect a significant relation between the gender difference of students and their involvement into academic dishonest acts. The study of Nazir and Aslam (2009) confirms the findings of previous studies that the involvement of male students in cheating behaviors is greater than that of female students.

Different studies have addressed the students' dishonest behaviors on the basis of age as well. It is reported that younger students engaged more oftenly in cheating than their older counterparts (Haines et al., 1986; Graham et al., 1994; Diekhoff et al., 1996). Another point of view came into consideration i.e. in younger age, they have their own code of ethics to behave in society but as they grow up, they show moralities in their behaviors and become more philosophical (Auerbach and Welsh, 1994; Barger et al., 1998). Younger and unmarried students are more tolerant to cheating behavior than older and married students (Whitley et al., 1998). This notion is also supported by Coombe and Newman (1997) that the individuals at younger age, are found to be less ethical than the older ones. According to the findings of Nazir and Aslam (2009), no prominent difference has been in the level of cheating behavior on the basis of age difference.

Regarding the subject majors and program levels of students, researchers are confused. Many studies provided evidence that, at the college and university level, the business students are among the most dishonest ones (Caruana et al., 2000; Clement, 2001; Smyth and Davis, 2004). Business students provided the highest cheating rate 87% while comparing it to the other non-business majors (Caruana et al., 2000).

Harris (1989) reported that, most business students have low ethical values than their peer students in other majors. Recently, Christine and James (2008) analyzed the academic behaviors of students and showed that subject major significantly influences the students' choice for academic dishonesty. Contrary to these studies, Beltramini et al., (1984) provided a very weak precedent that despite the gender effect business students are ethically sounder than the students opting for non-business subjects. The study conducted by Nazir and Aslam (2009) provided similar findings as of Beltramini et al. (1984) that business students are less tolerant for academic dishonesty and they involve less frequently in cheating behaviors as compare to the non-business.

Prevalence of academic integrity and dishonesty has also been studied across the different levels of the students. Zastrow (1970) has concluded that the frequency of cheating in students at the graduate level was at least as extensive as for the undergraduate students. Rakovski and Levy (2007) noted that undergraduate students are involved more often and extensively in dishonest acts than the graduate students; however, Christine & James (2008) reported that there is no significant difference between the attitudes of students towards academic dishonesty at the graduate and undergraduate level. Furthermore, academic performance of students has also been an important predictor which reflects the negative relationship. Smith et al., (2002) summarized the results of various studies and concluded that students with greater academic performance are engaged in cheating less often than the students with lower performance. In the light of previous studies, similar evidence has been found for the level of cheating behaviors on the basis of academic program that undergraduate students are more tolerant for academic dishonesty and their involvement in cheating behaviors is greater than that of graduate students.

Several studies can be found in literature of academic integrity on the degree of dishonesty and suggested penalties for these acts. Rakovski and Levy (2007) summarized these in their paper concluding that exam-related and plagiarism dishonest acts are to be considered more serious dishonest acts; whereas, collaborating on homework and not contributing to group projects are less serious dishonest acts. As per the general expectations, the behaviors students mostly involved in are considered less serious by them (Kidwell et al., 2003; Nuss, 1984). Whitley (1998) and Whitley and Kost (1999) determined that the student consider and most likely act to help someone cheat (which is a passive and less serious act) than to cheat by themselves on the exams (which is reported most severe and active dishonest act). Nazir and Aslam (2010) concluded that the students take academic behaviors as more severe in which they involve more frequently and as less severe in which they involve less frequently.

In addition, researchers also addressed the issue of penalties for these academic dishonest behaviors. According to the Nuss' (1984) survey of faculty members regarding penalties for academic dishonesty, 39% respondents would report the matter to appropriate authorities; 34% would grant a lower grade and 26% would give a warning to student if he/she has found cheating. Moreover, these suggestions of penalties are dependent on the severity of the dishonest acts as well. Whitley and Kost (1999) use a case study method by presenting the students' different cheating scenarios and reported that assisting and helping others to cheat is viewed by students as less serious dishonest act than cheat by itself. Furthermore, they suggested that cheater should be given a failing grade (50%) or failing grade on assignment (25%). Students also suggested that most common punishment for the cheater should be a private reprimand and writing a comprehensive paper on academic honesty. In the study of Nazir and Aslam (2010), it is revealed that the students recommend high

penalties which are being considered as more severe and low punishment for less severe cheating behaviors.

Five personality traits are expected to have direct impact on the level of students' cheating behaviors. As per the available literature, single study conducted by Christine and James (2008) has been found that examined the level of students' academic dishonesty on the basis of big five personality traits. As per the findings of Christine and James (2008), Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness and Neuroticism found to have no impact on the level of cheating tendency among students while Openness found to be moderately impact the level of students' academic dishonesty. Although personality can not only be the single predictors to assess the ethical behaviors, some personality dimensions e.g. Conscientiousness can foresee unethical behaviors (Colbert, et al, 2004; Litzky, et al, 2006; Robinson and Greenberg, 1998). Individual personality and nature mainly considered for examining the individual attitude and behavior (Fang, 2006). Individual having positive emotionality analyze more information and alternatives and which leads them to the quality decision making process (Christine and James, 2008).

From the above discussion, we can infer that the studies to analyze the impact of students' personality traits on their attitudes toward academic dishonesty, severity and penalties are from developed countries. This issue, yet, has not been explored in the context of higher education in developing countries like Pakistan. To fill this gap a structured questionnaire has been administered to assess the five personality traits of students, studying at public and private sector universities of Pakistan, their level of frequency, severity and penalties of academic dishonesty.

METHODOLOGY

The study gathered the data from the respondents on a well-structured and self-administered questionnaire. The questionnaire was divided into two parts. First part was focusing on the personality traits of the students. The five personality traits such as Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism and Openness have been measured by using the 10 items scale developed by Rammstedt and John (2007) on five point Likert scale i.e. 1 for disagree strongly and 5 for agree strongly. Second part consists of most commonly researched thirteen unethical academic acts the students may involve in. The frequency, severity and penalty of academic dishonest behaviors have been measured by second part of the questionnaire taken from the literature (Cohen et al., 1998; Davis and Welton, 1991; Rakovski and Levy, 2007). The responses for frequency of students' involvement in cheating behaviors were arranged on a five point Likert Scale in always to never (i.e. 1 stands for always and 5 for never involved); for severity of these behaviors in most severe to least severe (1 for most severe, 2 for more severe, 3 for moderate severe, 4 for less severe and 5 for least severe); and for penalty of these behaviors on 1 to 5 (i.e. 1 for no penalty, 2 for reduce grade by 1 level, 3 for reduce grade by more than 1 level, 4 F grade in course or assignment/project and 5 for F grade in overall course). The data was collected on the questionnaire discussed above from the graduate and undergraduate students studying at the various universities of Pakistan. The questionnaires were distributed in the classes and students took approximately 15 minutes to complete each questionnaire.

For the sake of generalization and fruitfulness of the study, students were selected from the senior most classes of the professional fields only like the business, engineering, public administration and commerce. There were 1000 questionnaire distributed among the respondents out of which 932 were found complete and useful questionnaire returned having 93.2%

effective response rate. The internal consistency of the Scale and data collected was tested using Cronbach's alpha which produced a co-efficient of 0.68. The research has proved that the value of this alpha is greater than 0.5 and is acceptable in social sciences (Nunnally, 1978). Descriptive statistics and different measurements of association have been used to investigate the relationship of students' demographics and their academic dishonest behaviors using SPSS 16.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

INSERT TABLE-1 HERE

The cross tabulation were shown in Table 1 in CGPA, Academic Program, Age Group and Major were compared with Gender of the respondents. The sample was collected from different universities which are representative of population. Out of 932 respondents 622 (67%) are male and 310 (33%) are female. In terms of academic performance, a vast majority of male students secured a CGPA ranging from 2.50 to 3.50 while out of 310 female respondents 240 (77%) were found to have secured CGPA of 3.00 to 4.00 which reflects that female students are more hard working and earn good grade than their male counterparts. Number of respondents studying in undergraduate classes is more than that of graduate classes. A heavy majority of respondents were found in age group of 21 to 25 while no student was found above thirty years of age. There is slight variation in sampling across business and non-business majors with former having small majority both in male and female respondents.

INSERT TABLE-2 HERE

Table 2 shows the cross tabulations for personality traits and demographics. Approximately 90% students falling in different groups classified on the basis of Gender, CGPA, Academic Program, Age Group and Academic Major are found to be high on Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness and Openness. In case of

Neuroticism 66% students found to be on higher side while 34% students are on Low in Neuroticism.

INSERT TABLE-3 HERE

Table 3 reports the results of correlations analysis has been used to investigate the relationship of personality traits with frequency of students' frequency of involvement in academic dishonesty. Mean and standard deviation columns show that overall students have been found high in all personality traits. Correlation found mix result for the relationship of all personality traits with frequency of academic dishonesty. Only Extraversion dimension has positive and significant relationship with the frequency of academic dishonesty; negative and insignificant relationship has been found for the relationship of Agreeableness and Neuroticism with frequency of cheating behavior and negative and highly significant (p values are less than 0.01) relationship has been seen for the relationship of Conscientiousness and Openness with the frequency of dishonest behaviors. As far as the relationship of personality traits with severity of academic dishonesty, viewed by students, has been concerned, Table shows that negative and insignificant (0.715) relationship has been revealed for the relationship of Extraversion and severity of dishonesty while positive and insignificant (p values are greater than 0.05). Suggested level of penalty for the dishonest acts has been noted insignificant (p values are greater than 0.05) relationship with all personality types. It is noted that penalty for dishonest behaviors have positive relationship with Extraversion, Agreeableness & Conscientiousness with penalty and negatively related to Neuroticism and Openness. Overall the result of this study validate the findings of Christine and James, (2008)

INSERT TABLE-4 HERE

Table 4 shows the results of 2-Independent sample has been used for the comparison between mean score of respondents found

to be high and low on personality traits. 2-independent test has been used here as the samples are found to be non-normal. In case of frequency of students' involvement on the basis high and low on personality traits, no significant differences have been found for Agreeableness, Neuroticism and Openness as the p values are less than 0.01 while significant differences have been found between the mean score of high and low on Extraversion and Conscientiousness. When we measure the differences between means of responses found to be high and low on personality traits towards the viewed severity of and personality for academic dishonesty, behaviors of both high and low level groups of all personality traits are found to be equal as the p values for the comparisons between all groups are greater than 0.05. Overall it has been concluded that students behave in the same way towards either they have high on a particular personality traits or low.

CONCLUSION

The issue of academic dishonesty has remained a matter of great concern during past few decades. The situation and scandals of popular companies make it more sensitive due to the students' practices of dishonesty at the workplace. The present research has tried to investigate some of the aspects of this issue and explored the impact of students' demographic factors on their inventions and perception of academic dishonesty. A self-administered questionnaire was distributed to the senior students of different business and non-business programs at higher level of study. The students were supposed to respond whether they engaged in any dishonest act always or never, whether they take academic dishonesty more seriously or not and what level of penalty they recommend for dishonest behaviors.

The results of different correlation analysis have concluded that students having high Conscientiousness and Openness found to be involved in cheating behaviors less

frequently. As the level of Extraversion in one's personality gets high, his/her cheating level will be expected to be increased. Students having high Conscientiousness and Openness take academic dishonesty more seriously as compare to the student found to be high on Extraversion and Neuroticism. Agreeableness is found to be silent in this regard. Students having high on Neuroticism and Openness suggest low level penalty for academic dishonesty while students found to be high on Extraversion, Conscientiousness and Agreeableness recommend high level penalty for these behaviors. Overall students recommend low penalties for academic dishonest behaviors. Findings of the study conducted by Christine and James (1999) found no significant relationship between personality traits and cheating behaviors of the students but this study reported some significant connections between personality traits and frequency of cheating among students. In addition, no significant differences have been found between the attitudes of students towards academic dishonesty on the basis of high and low level of personality traits.

The results also put emphasis on the need to have a careful insight by the academicians and policy makers on the ethical and moral values of students at the undergraduate level at a university. This also puts stress on the requirement to impact the course of Ethics in the undergraduate curriculum, especially for non-business students. Finally, the students also left some un-attended areas of this field to be addressed in future. These may include looking this issue in the other regions of Pakistan by increasing the sample and taking into consideration more universities. Different programs, subject major and other academic characteristics can be helpful to further explore the demographical impact on the students' attitude towards academic dishonesty. Different personality traits of students and personality types (A/B) along with locus of control are also some issues of academic

dishonesty to be discussed in future researches.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors wish to thank Sh. Muhammad Adnan for his appreciable support in this research. We also like to pay our gratitude to Ms. Farhan Ahmad for his help in data analysis as well as Mr. Iftikhar Ahmed, Ms. Iffat Khalid, Mr. Mussarat Nawaz, Mrs. Samia Tariq, Ms. Irum Nawaz, Ms. Irum Ashraf, Mr. Farhan Ahmad for their help in data collection. We would also thank Mr. Samar Kamal Fazli for reviewing the paper.

References

- Aurebach, J. A. & Welsh, J. S. (1994). Aging and Competing: Rebuilding the U.S. Workforce. *National Council on the Aging-National Planning Association Symposium*, Washington D.C., ISBN: 0890681287.
- Barger, R. N., Kubitschek, W. N. & Barger, J. C. (1998). Do Philosophical Tendencies Correlate with Personality Types? *Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA*, April 13-17.
- Barrick M. R. & Mount, M. K. (1991). The Big Five Personality Dimensions and Job Performance: A Meta-Analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 1-26.
- Beltramini, R. F., Peterson, R. A. & Kozmetsky, G. (1984). Concerns of College Students regarding Business Ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 3, 195-200.
- Bower, W. J. (1964). Students Dishonesty and its Control in College. *Working Paper Series, Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia, NY*.
- Caruana, A., Ramaseshan, B. & Ewing, M. T. (2000). The Effect of Anomie on Academic Dishonesty among University Students. *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 14, 23-29.
- Christine, Z. J. & James, C. A. (2008). Personality Traits and Academic Attributes as Determinants of Academic Dishonesty in Accounting and Non-Accounting College Majors. *In the Proceeding of 15th Annual Meeting of American Society of Business and Behavioral Sciences (ASBBS) held on 23-24 February, 2008 at Las Vegas, USA*, 15, 604-616.
- Clement, M. J. (2001). Academic Dishonesty: To be or not to be? *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 12, 253-270.
- Cohen J. G., Laurie & David, J. S. (1998). The Effect of Gender and Academic Discipline Diversity on the Ethical Evaluations, Ethical Intentions and Ethical Orientation of Potential Public Accounting Recruits. *Accounting Horizons*, 12, 250-270.
- Colbert A. E., Mount, M. K., Harter, J.K., Witt, L. A. & Barrick, M. R. (2004). Interactive Effects of Personality and Perceptions of the Work Situation on Workplace Deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 599-609.
- Coombe, K. & Newman, L. (1997). Ethics in early Childhood Field Experiences. *Journal of Australian Research in Early Childhood Education*, 1, 1-9.
- Crown, D. F. & Spiller, M. S. (1998). Learning from the Literature on Collegiate Cheating: A Review of the Empirical Research. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 17, 683-700.
- Davis, J. R. & Welton, R. E. (1991). Professional Ethics: Business Students' Perceptions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 10, 451-463.
- Diekhoff, D. M., LaBeff, E. E., Clark, R. E., Williams, L. E., Francis, B. & Haines, V. J. (1996). College Cheating: Ten Years Later. *Research in Higher Education*, 37, 487-502.
- Furnham, A. (2003). Personality, Individual Differences and Incentive Schemes. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 5, 325-334.
- Furnham, A., Petrides, K. V., Tsaousis, I. Pappas, K. & Garrod, D. (2005). A Cross-Cultural Investigation into the Relationships between Personality Traits and Work Values. *The Journal of Psychology*, 139, 5-32.
- Graham, M. A., Monday, J., O'Brien, K. & Steffen, S. (1994). Cheating at Small

- Colleges: An Examination of Student and Faculty Attitudes and Behaviors. *Journal of College Student Development*, 16, 777-790.
- Grimes, P. W. (2004). Dishonesty in Academics and Business: A Cross-Cultural Evaluation of Student Attitudes. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 49, 273-290.
- Haines, V. J., Diekhoff, G. M., LaBeff, E. E & Clark, R. E. (1986). College Cheating: Immaturity, Lack of Commitment, and the Neutralizing Attitude. *Research in Higher Education*, 25, 257-266.
- Hardling, T. S., Carpenter, D. D., Finellie, C. J. & Passow, H. J. (2004). Does Academic Dishonesty relate to Unethical Behavior in Professional Practice? An Explanatory Study. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 10, 311-326.
- Harris, J. R. (1989). Ethical Values and Decision Processes of Male and Female Business Students. *Journal of Education for Business*, 64, 234-238.
- John, O. P. & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Giv Five Trait Taxonomy: History, Measurement and Theoretical Perspectives. In Pervin L and OP Johns (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and Research* (pp. 102-138), New York: Guilford.
- Lawson, R. A. (2004). Is Classroom Cheating Related to Business Students' Prosperity to Cheat in the Real World? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 49, 189-199.
- Litzky, B. E., Eddleston, K. A. & Kidder, D. L. (2006). The Good, the Bad, and the Misguided: How Managers Inadvertently Encourage Deviant Behaviors. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 20, 91-103.
- Malone, F. L. (2006). The Ethical Attitude of Accounting Students. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, 8, 142-148.
- McCabe, D. L. & Trevino, L. K. (1997). Individual and Contextual Influences on Academic Dishonesty: A Multi-Campus Investigation. *Research in Higher Education*, 38, 379-396.
- Nazir, M. S. & Aslam, M. S. (2009). On the Relationship of Demography and Academic Dishonest Behaviors of Students. In the proceedings of 2nd COMSATS Applied Business Research Conference held at COMSATS Institute of Information Technology, Lahore Pakistan on November 14, 2009.
- Nazir, M. S. & Aslam, M. S. (2010). Academic Dishonesty and Perceptions of Pakistani Students. *International Journal of Education Management*, 24, forthcoming.
- Nunally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric Theory*. NY: McGraw-Hill Publishers.
- Organ, D. W. & Lingl, A. (1995). Personality, Satisfaction, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 135, 339-350.
- Rakovski, C. C. & Elliott, S. L. (2007). Academic Dishonesty: Perception of Business Students. *College Student Journal*, 41, 466-478.
- Rammstedt, B. & John, O. P. (2007). Measuring personality in one minute of less: A 10-item short version of the Big Five Inventory in English and German. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 41, 203-213.
- Robinson, S. L. & Greenburg, J. (1998). Employees Behaving Badly: Dimensions, Determinants, and Dilemmas in the Study of Workplace Deviance. In C. L. Cooper & D. M. Rousseau (Eds.), *Trends in organizational behavior* (pp. 1-30). Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Shaub, M. (1994). An Analysis of the Association of Traditional Demographic Variables with the Moral Reasoning of Auditing Students and Auditors. *Journal of Accounting Education*, 12, 1-26.
- Smith, K. J., Davy, J. A., Rosenberg, D. L. & Haight, G. T. (2002). A Structural Modeling Investigation of the Influence of Demographic and Attitudinal Factors and In-Class Deterrents on Cheating Behaviors among Accounting Majors. *Journal of Accounting Education*, 20, 45-65.
- Smyth, M. L. & Davis, J. R. (2004). Perception of Dishonesty among Two-Years College Students: Academic versus Business Situation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 51, 63-73.

- Sweeney, J. (1995). The Moral Expertise of Auditors: An Explanatory Analysis. *Research on Accounting Ethics*, 1, 213-234.
- Thoma, S. (1986). Estimating Gender Differences in the Comprehension and Preference of Moral Issues. *Development Review*, 6, 165-180.
- Trevino, L. K. & Nelson, K. A. (2004). *Managing Business Ethics: Straight Talk about How to do it Right* (3rd Ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Whitley, B. E. (1998). Factors Associated with Cheating among College Students: A Review. *Research in Higher Education*, 39, 235-274.
- Whitley, B. E., Nelson, A. B. & Jones, C. J. (1999). Gender Differences in Cheating Attitudes and Classroom Cheating Behavior: A Meta Analysis. *Sex Roles*, 41, 657-680.
- Zastrow, C. H. (1970). Cheating among College Graduate Students. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 64, 157-160.

1. Table 1: Demographic Statistics

Panel A: Gender and CGPA						
CGPA	Male		Female		Total	
	N	%age	N	%age	N	%age
Below 2.0	9	1	2	1	11	1
2.0 - 2.5	92	15	8	3	100	11
2.5 - 3.0	206	33	60	19	266	29
3.0 - 3.5	206	33	114	37	320	34
3.5- 4.0	109	18	126	41	235	25
Total	622	100	310	100	932	100
Panel B: Gender and Program						
Program	Male		Female		Total	
	N	%age	N	%age	N	%age
Graduate	107	17	87	28	194	21
Undergraduate	515	83	223	72	738	79
Total	622	100	310	100	932	100
Panel C: Gender and Age Group						
Age Group	Male		Female		Total	
	N	%age	N	%age	N	%age
16-20	81	13	62	20	147	15
21-25	532	85	245	79	777	83
26-30	8	2	3	1	11	2
Above 30	1	0	0	0	1	0
Total	622	100	310	100	932	100
Panel D: Gender and Major						
Major	Male		Female		Total	
	N	%age	N	%age	N	%age
Business	320	51	205	66	525	56
Non-Business	302	49	105	34	407	44
Total	622	100	310	100	932	100

Table 2: Personality Traits and Demographics

Panel A: Personality Traits and Gender										
Gender	Extraversion		Agreeableness		Conscientiousness		Neuroticism		Openness	
	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
Male	556	74	581	49	582	48	422	208	576	54
Female	267	35	281	21	278	24	195	107	279	23

Total	823	109	862	70	860	72	617	315	855	77
Panel B: Personality Traits and CGPA										
CGPA	Extraversion		Agreeableness		Conscientiousness		Neuroticism		Openness	
	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
Below 2.0	11	0	9	2	9	2	6	2	11	0
2.0 - 2.5	90	11	91	10	87	14	69	32	95	6
2.5 - 3.0	237	34	244	27	246	25	188	83	245	26
3.0 - 3.5	288	34	303	19	307	15	207	115	294	28
3.5 - 4.0	197	30	215	12	211	16	147	80	210	17
Total	823	109	862	70	860	72	617	315	855	77
Panel C: Personality Traits and Academic Program										
Program	Extraversion		Agreeableness		Conscientiousness		Neuroticism		Openness	
	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
Graduate	161	24	175	10	170	15	126	59	173	12
Undergraduate	662	85	687	60	690	57	491	256	682	65
Total	823	109	862	70	860	72	617	315	855	77
Panel D: Personality Traits and Age Group										
Age Group	Extraversion		Agreeableness		Conscientiousness		Neuroticism		Openness	
	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
16-20	125	17	131	11	131	11	91	51	127	15
21-25	84	91	718	57	715	60	516	259	714	61
26-30	13	1	13	1	13	1	10	4	13	1
Above 30	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0
Total	823	109	862	70	860	72	617	315	855	77
Panel E: Personality Traits and Major										
Major	Extraversion		Agreeableness		Conscientiousness		Neuroticism		Openness	
	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
Business	461	55	496	20	483	33	329	187	471	45
Non-Business	362	54	366	50	377	39	288	128	384	32
Total	823	109	862	70	860	72	617	315	855	77

Table 3: Correlation for all Personality Traits, Frequency, Severity and Penalty

Sr. No	Item	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	Extraversion	3.35	0.90	-							
2	Agreeableness	3.50	0.82	-.045	-						
3	Conscientiousness	3.40	0.80	.140**	.141**	-					
4	Neuroticism	2.72	0.92	-.244**	-.024	-.124**	-				
5	Openness	3.15	0.70	.013	-.030	.062	.052	-			
6	Frequency	2.41	0.67	.071*	-.053	-.169**	-.027	-.087**	-		
7	Severity	3.23	0.78	-.012	.000	.001	-.028	.028	-.018	-	
8	Penalty	2.30	0.80	.008	.007	.055	-.047	-.056	-.142**	-.169**	-

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 4: Measurement of equality of means Scores of Respondents high and Low on Personality Traits

Personality Traits	Frequency				Severity				Penalty			
	High	Low	Z-value	P-Value	High	Low	Z-value	P-Value	High	Low	Z-value	P-Value
Extraversion	2.43	2.25	-2.600	0.009	3.23	3.22	-0.37	0.708	2.31	2.19	-1.07	0.285
Agreeableness	2.40	2.56	-0.983	0.326	3.23	3.22	-0.16	0.870	2.29	2.39	-0.45	0.650
Conscientiousness	2.39	2.61	-2.790	0.003	3.22	3.30	-0.08	0.936	2.30	2.26	-0.45	0.651
Neuroticism	2.38	2.46	-0.161	0.872	3.22	3.24	-0.84	0.399	2.29	2.30	-0.02	0.983
Openness	2.40	2.50	-1.793	0.073	3.23	3.22	-0.62	0.533	2.28	2.44	-1.74	0.081