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Abstract

Considerable survey research on the topic of academic dishonesty, using widely differing parameters and measurements, have been conducted since the 1960s. Gender differences and committing an act of academic dishonesty for someone other than oneself (altruistic cheating) have been among the more frequently studied variables, although conclusions about both remain inconclusive.

The purpose of this study was to explore underlying variables that might play an active role in how men and women handle requests from others for assistance in committing academic dishonesty. None of these variables had been previously considered. Four conditions were manipulated: relationship with the solicitor ("close friend" or "classmate"), active or passive compliance (doing the work for the solicitor or allowing the solicitor to copy previously completed work); seriousness of offense (small assignment or a term paper); and the solicitor's reason for needing assistance (tending to a sick mother or suffering from a hangover). A brief vignette was created to reflect the 16 possible combinations the four conditions. Undergraduate students (162 men and 201 women) responded to open-ended questions asking if they would comply with the request to assist another in an act of academic dishonesty and to describe the bases of their decisions. Responses were content analyzed, sorted into response categories, and tabulated.

The results suggest a number of potentially fruitful directions that future research might take to better understand gender differences in altruistic cheating. Although men and women responded differently in some regards, both men and women would be more likely to help someone who is a close friend rather than someone described simply as a classmate. Both men and women would be more likely to help someone who aroused sympathy (caring for a sick mother) than one who brought suffering him or herself (hangover). Both men and women preferred to share previously completed work rather than create a new assignment for someone else. Both men and women were more likely to agree to help with a smaller assignment rather than a larger assignment. Findings also suggested that women were more likely than men to cheat because of the expectation of a return favor. Immorality of cheating was not a large deterrent for men or women. Other trends are presented.
A Qualitative, Exploratory Study of Altruistic Academic Dishonesty

Academic dishonesty is a common and perplexing problem for institutions of higher education worldwide. Studies undertaken recently have attempted to pinpoint the causes and situational determinants of cheating so as to reduce it in the future. Academic dishonesty has taken place in one form or another for as long as students have been evaluated. Reports of academic dishonesty have been published for over 60 years (Davis, Grover, Becker, McGregor 1992). Estimates of the percentage of college students who cheat vary dramatically from study to study. Despite the fact that cheating is a major concern for instructors and university administrators, Spiller and Crown (1995) in their analysis of behavioral measures of cheating since 1967, suggested that cheating is not on the rise in America. The misconception that cheating rates are increasing can be attributed to studies being compared that measure different cheating behaviors with different methodologies. Indeed a large problem with studies on academic dishonesty is the use of differing measures to assess cheating behavior.

This discrepancy makes comparison of studies and estimates of cheating incidents very difficult. Measures range from self-reporting of feelings about cheating, to recording personal instances of cheating (Davis and Grover 1992), to actually catching a student in the act of cheating (Spiller and Crown 1995). Another problem arises because different studies use different descriptions of cheating. To some sharing answers on assignments is cheating, while to others plagiarism is cheating. The results of such disparate measures are reports of between 23% to 88% of students in the population cheating (Davis and Grover 1992). Consequently it is hard to find reliable trends in academic dishonesty. Because studies do not measure the same behaviors in the same manner, it is difficult to estimate the amount of cheating, let alone speculate about causes and correlates. Until
standardized measures are used it will be virtually impossible to piece together an accurate, concise picture of cheating in American universities and colleges.

Many factors have been proposed to influence cheating behavior. Moffatt (1990) proposed that involvement in a social sorority or fraternity and choice of academic major have some bearing on a person's likelihood of cheating. Some theories hinge less on personal factors and more on contextual factors. The circumstances of the class work, such as the use of multiple choice tests and crowded exam rooms, may also contribute to cheating (Genereux and Mc Loed, 1995).

One characteristic that has been researched repeatedly is gender. Most studies have resulted in contradictory or inconclusive findings about whether gender plays a part in cheating behavior and frequency. For example a cross-national study done by Evans, Craig, and Mietzel (1990) showed gender effects in cheating to be non-significant regardless of nationality or achievement level. The most common results that involve gender in the study of academic dishonesty show men cheat slightly more frequently than women (i.e. Genereux and Mc Loed 1995).

When significant differences have been found (and even when there are none) many researchers have proposed theories concerning why men and women might cheat at different rates and under different circumstances. DePalma, Madey, and Bornschein (1994) hypothesized that women's impulsiveness and men's need for social recognition may encourage them to cheat under different circumstances. They found that women who had strong ability to persist rarely cheated while the ability to persist had little effect on men's cheating. Barnett and Dalton (1981) theorized that the reason why women seem to cheat less may be that they lie more on self-report questionnaires than do men. Some researchers speculate about familial causes for gender differences in academic dishonesty. Kelly and Worrell (1978) found that women who cheated were likely to have had parents who "were not seen as potent, positive reinforcing agents" (p.187). They
were unable to find clear parental correlates for cheating behavior in men. Some clues about academic dishonesty come from students' disclosures. Women and men give different reasons often for taking part in cheating behavior. Smith, Ryan, and Diggins (1972) reported that women attribute large work load, insufficient time to study, and competition among students as the strongest external sources of pressure to cheat while men attribute graduate school requirements, competition among students for grades, and large work load as their top pressures. Although this study is older, it offers some ideas for thought, suggesting that women feel that they are on solid academic and professional ground but that they do not necessarily have as great a drive for competition as do men.

One of the aspects of the gender in academic dishonesty debate is the motivation behind acts of academic dishonesty. Genereux and McLoed (1995) found that students admit to helping others with their cheating more often than they report helping themselves. They found no gender differences in the frequencies of self-reports. In another study of altruistically motivated cheating, Newstead, Franklyn-Stokes, and Armstead (1996) found no difference between male subjects' and female subjects' reports of cheating to help others. In research done by Schab (1969) however, there was a gender difference in altruistic cheating reported. The results showed that women would let other students copy from their papers more frequently than would men.

Why might men and women respond differently in instances of altruistic cheating? Feshbach (1982) stated that the factors that mediate empathy in men are different from those that mediate empathy in women. Feshbach related that empathy in girls comes from maternal tolerance and permissiveness and is lessened by maternal conflict, rejection, punitiveness and excessive control. In contrast, men's empathy is weakly associated with the nature of their social relationships. The sources of men's empathy cannot be directly traced. It seems to come more from gains in cognitive competency. Nurturance has long been relegated to women in our society as an "innate" trait. Being female reportedly
brings women's "maternal instincts" to help and care for those who are not necessarily linked to these women by blood. It seems logical that women may take something from their relationships with their mothers that men do not, given society's stereotypes of appropriate male and female roles.

With these views in mind, the present research is designed to explore the underlying nature of altruistic cheating using open-ended questions, thus allowing the participants to say, in their own words, what they would do and why. Previous studies of gender differences in altruistic cheating require participants to select predetermined response categories. The present study will manipulate some of the circumstances of cheating to assess how they affect participants' decisions to cheat. The factors manipulated are the condition of need of the person soliciting help, the amount of activity the participant is asked to do, and the importance of the classwork involved. These elements have not been highlighted often in previous research.

Because of the qualitative design of the study, data trends are being sought. The data will add personal perspectives to the body of empirical knowledge about cheating. The participants' own words may reveal a great deal about their feelings about altruistic academic dishonesty.
METHOD

Participants

Participants were 363 undergraduate students (162 men and 201 women) enrolled in Psychology 100 courses at Ball State University. Participation in the study partially fulfilled subjects' course requirements.

Materials

Participants were given a booklet consisting of a page of instructions, one of 16 different vignettes with one open-ended question, and a request for basic demographic information.

Participants were instructed to imagine that the events described in their vignette were really happening to them. All vignettes featured a hypothetical solicitor, "Lee," requesting unauthorized assistance with class work from the participant. The name Lee was chosen to leave the gender of the solicitor ambiguous. The vignettes varied four factors: the severity of the cheating offense (involving an assignment v. a term paper); relationship of Lee to the participant (close friend v. classmate); condition of Lee's need (Lee has a hangover v. Lee's mother is ill); and participant's role in cheating act (let Lee copy v. complete Lee's work for him/her). Each participant received one of sixteen vignettes varying these conditions.

Example of vignette: Lee is your close friend whose mother is very seriously ill. An assignment is due today. Lee comes to you and asks, "Would you let me copy one of your old term papers?"

After reading the short vignette, participants were asked to explain how they would respond to Lee and why they would respond that way (see Appendix A for all vignette descriptions). A minimum of ten male participants and ten female participants were assigned to each condition.
Procedure

The instructions were briefly explained, and the participants were told that the study concerned how people respond when asked for a favor, as not to bias the respondents. Participants were informed that their responses were anonymous and that they could leave at any time without prejudice from the experimenter.

Analysis

Vignettes were content analyzed for the following themes: whether the participants would assist in Lee's cheating, why or why not, and other types of assistance besides cheating that might be offered. See Appendix B for the complete list of content categories.

RESULTS

Willingness of Participants to Cheat across all Conditions

Content analysis of the data yielded six categories to determine the willingness of participants to help Lee. The first category included those who replied they would definitely agree to cheat for Lee. Of the female participants, 14.1% fit into this group as did 21.4% of the male participants across all other conditions. The next category entailed those who would comply with Lee's request but with certain reservations. It encompassed 29.7% of women's responses and 31.7% of men's responses across conditions. Results indicated that 2.0% of females' and .7% of males' responses across categories were ambivalent in their willingness to help Lee. Another response category specified that Lee's request was refused, but Lee would be offered other ethical forms of assistance. Examples given ranged from help with the assignment to sitting with the solicitor's ill mother. This group included 30.2% of female respondents and 20.7% of male respondents across all conditions. Over a fifth of women (23.1%) and men (22.7%) across all conditions said they would not offer Lee any assistance. Content could not be
judged clearly for 1.0% of female participants' responses and 2.8% of male participants' responses.

**Effect of Solicitor Relationship to Participant**

In comparing the frequencies of positive responses and negative responses to the vignettes, using the term "close friend" as opposed to "classmate," the importance of Lee's relationship with the participant was explored. Of women who were given a "close friend" vignette 15.3% responded they would comply for sure to Lee's request, while 13.2% of women with the "classmate" vignette answered the same. Results indicated that 24.7% of women refused to help Lee at all in the "close friend" vignette and 21.9% of women refused to help Lee at all in the "classmate" vignette (see Appendix C for frequencies of answers).

Making the same comparison with male participants, 25.0% of men with the "close friend" version of the survey as well as 25.0% of men with the "classmate" version would comply for sure with Lee's request. When presented with the "close friend" vignette 16.2% of men refused to help Lee at all. The "classmate" condition yielded 25.0% of men refusing to help Lee at all.

**Effect of Solicitor's Condition of Need (Ill Mother v. Hangover)**

Content analysis of the data showed differing levels of participants' willingness to help Lee depending on why Lee needed help. When Lee's mother was said to be ill 17.8% of women would agree to help Lee. When Lee was said to be hungover 10.0% of women would agree to help. In the calculations of refusal, 5.9% of women would decline to help when Lee's mother was sick, while 40.0% of women refused to help when Lee was portrayed as being hungover.

The data showed that 37.5% of men said they would help Lee when it was stated that Lee's mother was ill. 11.8% answered they would help Lee when it was stated that Lee was hungover. Less than one-tenth (7.5%) of male respondents refused to help when
Lee's mother was ill and 35.5% of male respondents would refuse to help when Lee was hungover.

**Effect of Seriousness of Offense (Writing a Term Paper v. Doing a Smaller Assignment)**

Of female participants who were asked to help Lee with a term paper, 12.2% agreed to help. When women were approached to help Lee with the smaller assignment, 18.5% reported they would help. Female participants in 26.5% of cases refused when asked to help Lee with a term paper, while 19.4% of female participants refused when asked to help Lee with the assignment.

When asked to help Lee with a term paper, 16.7% of men agreed to do so. When men were asked to help Lee with the smaller assignment 34.2% agreed to do so. Of the men asked to help Lee with a term paper 24.4% refused to take part, while 17.7% of men asked to help with a smaller assignment refused Lee help.

**Effect of Activity of Participant in Cheating Act (Creating New Work v. Copying Already-Completed Work)**

When women were asked to passively cheat by letting Lee copy already completed work, 20.6% agreed to let Lee compared to 6.5% of women who agreed to help when asked to create Lee's work "from scratch." When women were asked to let Lee copy, 14.7% refused. When women were asked to actually do Lee's work 29.0% refused.

Men were more apt to agree to passively help Lee: 35.1% of men who were asked to let Lee copy their school work would allow it. When men were asked to actively do Lee's work, 19.5% agreed to. Only 4.1% of men would refuse to let Lee copy, while 27.3% of men asked to do Lee's work refused to.

**Reasons Why Respondents Would Help**

Analysis of the participants' responses yielded a variety of reasons for agreeing to help Lee cheat. The most common reason to help given by women respondents was friendship. Responses showed 34.8% of the women who gave reasons for complying
relating that they would do so because Lee is their "friend" or "close friend." These women were not as eager to help someone described as a classmate. The next most common response from women was that they felt sympathy for Lee. When asked why they would help Lee 17.4% of females commenting said they felt sorry for Lee. Another reason for helping Lee, given by 13.1% of women who responded why they would help, was the expectation of a return favor or money. These women would help Lee for personal gain, not just for Lee's sake. For 8.7% of women who explained why they would help Lee, helping another person in need was their motivation. Several other reasons were cited in smaller frequencies.

The most common reason men helped Lee, given by 35.7% of men who commented, was also friendship. The second most popular response of men was that Lee "needed help." Data showed that 17.1% of men who commented helped Lee because he was a person who needed assistance. Another common reason for responding men to help Lee, encompassing 11.4% of men, was that Lee seemed to be a "sympathetic character." That Lee "would do it for me" was noted by 8.6% of men citing a reason for helping Lee to cheat. As with women's responses, other reasons were cited in low frequencies for helping Lee.

**Reasons Why Respondents Would not Help**

When women commented on why they would not help Lee, 27.9% cited that Lee "needed to learn about responsibility." Another popular answer among women (26.1%) was that they "did not feel sorry for Lee." The feeling that Lee does not evoke pity is followed in frequency by 18.0% of women citing the immorality of cheating as a reason not to help Lee. An additional 12.6% of women were too concerned about being themselves caught cheating to help Lee.

Of men who gave reasoning for not helping Lee, 36.9% found that Lee did not deserve sympathy. Also 23.1% of responding men thought Lee needed to learn
responsibility. Men's responses indicated that 21.5% of them would not help Lee because they feared getting in trouble. Only 9.2% of men respondents would not help Lee because they felt cheating was immoral.

**Reservations about Helping Cited**

The most common reservation about helping cited by 44.3% of female participants is concern that Lee's asking for unauthorized help will become a habit. They only wanted to help Lee this one time. Another popular reservation cited by 24.6% of the women was that Lee must be their friend, or more specifically their good friend. Many women made it plain that friendship meant a great deal to them and that helping a friend was a necessary part of friendship. One female participant wrote, "A friendship is dependent on counting on one another in a time of need, and if I could help Lee with something as trivial as one assignment, then I would." Male participants felt similarly. Of men commenting, 41.7% specified that Lee must be their friend or good friend if they were to help. Additionally 30.6% of men commenting wanted to make sure Lee would not make this a habit.

**Other Assistance Offered to Lee**

Many respondents who did not want to help Lee cheat offered Lee other kinds of help that did not involve committing an ethical violation. Of women who offered alternative help, 61.0% said they would help Lee with the assignment. Such help ranged from assistance with research to typing the assignment for the solicitor. Another 22.0% of female participants reported they would still like to help Lee by offering him/her advice. Men responding had similar feelings, with 57.1% of male respondents offering help with the classwork and 31.4% offering advice.
DISCUSSION

Kevin Davis (1992) in his defense of cheating says, "Negotiation is the natural order for problem solving in the world" (p. 73). It appears that many college students feel the same, or at least rationalize their cheating that way. This exploratory study was intended to consider several facets of academic dishonesty that have not received attention. The design allowed participants to formulate personal responses to the question, rather than responding to a list of predetermined choices for them to consider and select the one that came closest to their point of view.

One trend in this study suggested a small difference in academic dishonesty between genders in that men said they would cheat more often for a friend. This could be explained by Kelly and Worell's (1978) findings that male cheaters rely heavily on external sources of approval. The men in this study may feel more pressure to do what others ask of them than do women. Kelly and Worell also suggest that female cheaters are socially alienated. Women who cheat may not do so for socially important reasons. A large difference between men and women surfaced when posed with the circumstance of Lee's mother being ill. Men said they would help by cheating with a frequency of 37.5% while only 17.8% of women responded the same. This suggested that women may not deal with sympathy in the same manner as men when presented with a moral dilemma.

Another gender difference in responses came with the expectation of a return favor or money for cheating. The third most common reason for a woman to help (13.0%) was the hope of receiving something in return. This was not one of the biggest draws for men in cheating. Such a trend undercuts the theories that women are more altruistic than men.

Even though the survey question did not ask about any other sort of help for Lee, many respondents mentioned different ethical ways they would help. That so many participants offered unprompted help revealed the altruistic tendencies of both men and women. Data showed that 20.7% of male participants declined to help Lee cheat but
offered ethical help, while 30.2% of women did the same. This suggests that women's altruism may manifest itself through nurturance somewhat more so than for men. Ward and Beck (1989) attest to the idea that women are socialized to follow rules, more so than are men. Women may feel like they want to help cheaters, but take the classroom rules more seriously than their male counterparts do. Offering to help the cheater in ways that are more ethical shows a strong sense of altruism.

Participants were most likely to help a close friend whose mother is ill by letting him/her copy an assignment and least likely to help a classmate with a hangover by writing a term paper for him/her. The most sympathy-inducing circumstances with the least importance and effort involved in the helping action was more readily accepted by participants. Men responded more often than women on the whole (e.g., 37.5% to 17.8%) that they would help Lee cheat in this high-sympathy condition. Regarding earlier theories that altruism would be more readily evoked in women to encourage them to cheat, this study suggested possibly that men would be more easily moved to help than women.

Some participants cited a lack of time as reason to not help Lee (4.6% of men and 9.0% of women). The constraints of jobs and extracurricular activities that students undertake today may offer more answers about cheating, though time did not seem to be a large factor. Also worth noting was the absence of some types of responses. Only a handful of respondents agreed to help just because it was easy to comply, or for fear that the solicitor would be mad at or reject them.

The results of this study suggested that many students do not see altruistic cheating as a breach in their morals. When only 18.0% of women and 9.2% of men cite immorality of cheating being a deterrent, it seems that students might regard helping others as a moral endeavor and cheating as a helping response. Future studies might compare participants' views about the immorality of helping oneself by cheating with their
views about the immorality of helping others to cheat.

One shortcoming in this study is that many participants did not offer reasons as to why they would or would not help Lee cheat. The instructions should be altered in future studies to more strongly encourage the participants to elaborate on their basic answers. Another possible shortcoming of this study is that the content analysis of this study was done by the author. This may have been a source of unintentional bias.

This exploratory project encourages further research into the effects of altruism and gender on academic dishonesty, and more qualitative studies on the subject in general. There is a wealth of information in this approach that cannot be tapped with questionnaires. The use of vignettes brought about candid, personal replies that offered insight into the participants' thinking. Through this study, many interesting trends have surfaced that can be further developed with future investigations. Among those is the idea that women are often times no more likely to cheat altruistically than are men. Especially interesting is the trend that men will more likely help when the solicitor is sympathetic than will women. Future studies should ask why men might be more apt to help in a highly sympathetic case. Another trend worth studying is the relationship between friendship and cheating. Many participants cited friendship as the only reason that would justify cheating for another person. This qualitative study raises many heretofore unasked questions about altruistic cheating and offers new avenues of more systematic study for the future.
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Appendix A
Variations of Vignette Given to Participants

1. Lee is your close friend whose mother is very seriously ill. An assignment is due today. Lee comes to you and asks, "Would you let me copy one of your old term papers?"

2. Lee is your close friend who stayed out very late last night and now has a bad hangover. An assignment is due today. Lee comes to you and asks, "Would you do my homework assignment for me?"

3. Lee is your close friend who stayed out very late last night and now has a bad hangover. An assignment is due today. Lee comes to you and asks, "Would you let me copy one of your old term papers?"

4. Lee is your close friend whose mother is very seriously ill. An assignment is due today. Lee comes to you and asks, "Can I copy your homework assignment?"

5. Lee is your close friend whose mother is very seriously ill. An assignment is due today. Lee comes to you and asks, "Would you do my homework assignment for me?"

6. Lee is your close friend who stayed out very late last night and now has a bad hangover. An assignment is due today. Lee comes to you and asks, "Would you write the two page report for me?"

7. Lee is your close friend whose mother is very seriously ill. An assignment is due today. Lee comes to you and asks, "Would you write the two page report for me?"

8. Lee is your close friend who stayed out very late last night and now has a bad hangover. An assignment is due today. Lee comes to you and asks, "Can I copy your homework assignment?"

9. Lee is a classmate whose mother is very seriously ill. An assignment is due today. Lee comes to you and asks, "Would you let me copy one of your old term papers?"

10. Lee is a classmate who stayed out very late last night and now has a bad hangover. An assignment is due today. Lee comes to you and asks, "Would you do my homework assignment for me?"

11. Lee is a classmate who stayed out very late last night and now has a bad hangover. An assignment is due today. Lee comes to you and asks, "Would you let me copy one of your old term papers?"

12. Lee is a classmate whose mother is very seriously ill. An assignment is due today. Lee comes to you and asks, "Can I copy your homework assignment?"

13. Lee is a classmate whose mother is very seriously ill. An assignment is due today. Lee comes to you and asks, "Would you do my homework assignment for me?"

14. Lee is a classmate who stayed out very late last night and now has a bad hangover. An assignment is due today. Lee comes to you and asks, "Would you write the two page report for me?"

15. Lee is a classmate whose mother is very seriously ill. An assignment is due today. Lee comes to you and asks, "Would you write the two page report for me?"

16. Lee is a classmate who stayed out very late last night and now has a bad hangover. An assignment is due today. Lee comes to you and asks, "Can I copy your homework assignment?"
Appendix B
Content Analysis Categories

Subjects' Summary Responses
1. Yes, will comply for sure (clear agreement)
2. Will comply, but with reservations/riders
3. Ambivalent (yes and no—not a clear commitment)
4. No, will not comply but will offer other (ethical) assistance
5. No, will not comply (clear rejection of request)
6. Cannot tell for sure

Reasons Subjects Will Comply
1. friendship
2. loyalty
3. "no big deal" (general answer indicating easy compliance without other, more specific justification)
4. person needs my help
5. for money or return of favor
6. easy to comply
7. not an important act (e.g., only a minor form of cheating)
8. to maintain friendship/to make friends
9. homework is irrelevant/stupid/busywork
10. anti-system ("screw the professor/university" type responses)
11. I am a nice person/helping others is good (moral-like stance)
12. he/she would do it for me
13. I know what it is like to need help
14. everyone deserves a break/needs help/makes mistakes
15. I've been in that situation
16. Lee's mom is sick
17. Lee is a sympathetic character
18. sharing knowledge

Reasons Subjects Will Not Comply
1. student's request is immoral/cheating/not ethical/not fair
2. students should do own work
3. I do not want to share my work (worked hard, etc.)
4. not my problem
5. student will not learn if I do it
6. I'm too busy/no time
7. I could get in trouble
8. students will not learn material otherwise
9. other solutions available (e.g., ask prof for an extension)
10. student needs to learn to take responsibility
11. cheating makes things worse/this will not help student
Appendix B, cont.

12. could become a habit
13. student not a sympathetic character
14. don't enjoy doing homework
15. he wouldn't do it for me
16. don't want to feel guilty
17. don't want to feel bad if Lee gets a bad grade

It Depends (ambivalent/"riders" attached to compliance)
1. if I have the time (not too busy)
2. if I am in the mood
3. if I like the person/person is friend/person is a good friend
4. if I am given enough notice
5. if it would be easy for me to do/if I know about the subject
6. if I got paid
7. if the student has a legitimate reason (e.g., deserves my help/mother sick)
8. if the assignment is a small one/not worth much credit
9. if the favor will be returned in the future/expectation of reciprocity
10. if I don't like the professor/class
11. if it doesn't become a habit
12. if she/he changes it a little
13. if it is not used in the same course/with the same professor
14. if the solicitor is responsible/not lazy in class
15. if the professor will not give Lee an extension
16. if she/he really needed help or had no other choices
17. if it isn't an English course
18. if Lee is close with his mother
19. if time allotted for assignment was not more than a couple of weeks
20. if she/he has it started

Other Types of Assistance Offered (instead of or besides compliance)
1. advice (e.g., ask professor for an extension)
2. assistance with assignment but NOT to actually do it
3. verbal sympathy and support
4. will do something supportive (e.g., get a meal, take the assignment to the prof, etc.)
Appendix C
Figures of Compliance

Condition 1: Friend/ill mother/smaller assignment/copy
1. Yes, will comply for sure (clear agreement) M=2/10 F=0/12
2. Will comply, but with reservations/riders M=2/10 F=6/12
3. Ambivalent (yes and no--not a clear commitment) M=0/10 F=0/12
4. No, will not comply but will offer other (ethical) assistance M=4/10 F=5/12
5. No, will not comply (clear rejection of request) M=2/10 F=1/12
6. Cannot tell for sure M=0/10 F=0/12

Condition 2: Friend/hangover/smaller assignment/complete for solicitor
1. Yes, will comply for sure (clear agreement) M=2/10 F=0/12
2. Will comply, but with reservations/riders M=1/10 F=3/12
3. Ambivalent (yes and no--not a clear commitment) M=0/10 F=0/12
4. No, will not comply but will offer other (ethical) assistance M=2/10 F=3/12
5. No, will not comply (clear rejection of request) M=5/10 F=6/12
6. Cannot tell for sure M=0/10 F=0/12

Condition 3: Friend/hangover/term paper/copy
1. Yes, will comply for sure (clear agreement) M=2/10 F=5/13
2. Will comply, but with reservations/riders M=3/10 F=5/13
3. Ambivalent (yes and no--not a clear commitment) M=0/10 F=0/13
4. No, will not comply but will offer other (ethical) assistance M=2/10 F=1/13
5. No, will not comply (clear rejection of request) M=2/10 F=2/13
6. Cannot tell for sure M=1/10 F=0/13

Condition 4: Friend/ill mother/smaller assignment/copy
1. Yes, will comply for sure (clear agreement) M=8/11 F=3/11
2. Will comply, but with reservations/riders M=2/11 F=5/11
3. Ambivalent (yes and no--not a clear commitment) M=0/11 F=0/11
4. No, will not comply but will offer other (ethical) assistance M=1/11 F=3/11
5. No, will not comply (clear rejection of request) M=0/11 F=0/11
6. Cannot tell for sure M=0/11 F=0/11

Condition 5: Friend/ill mother/smaller assignment/complete for solicitor
1. Yes, will comply for sure (clear agreement) M=4/10 F=2/12
2. Will comply, but with reservations/riders M=4/10 F=4/12
3. Ambivalent (yes and no--not a clear commitment) M=0/10 F=0/12
4. No, will not comply but will offer other (ethical) assistance M=1/10 F=5/12
5. No, will not comply (clear rejection of request) M=0/10 F=1/12
6. Cannot tell for sure M=1/10 F=0/12

Condition 6: Friend/hangover/term paper/complete for solicitor
1. Yes, will comply for sure (clear agreement) M=1/10 F=0/10
Appendix C, cont.

2. Will comply, but with reservations/riders M=2/10 F=2/10
3. Ambivalent (yes and no--not a clear commitment) M=1/10 F=0/10
4. No, will not comply but will offer other (ethical) assistance M=2/10 F=1/10
5. No, will not comply (clear rejection of request) M=3/10 F=7/10
6. Cannot tell for sure M=1/10 F=0/10

Condition 7: Friend/ill mother/term paper/complete for solicitor
1. Yes, will comply for sure (clear agreement) M=4/10 F=3/12
2. Will comply, but with reservations/riders M=1/10 F=1/12
3. Ambivalent (yes and no--not a clear commitment) M=1/10 F=1/12
4. No, will not comply but will offer other (ethical) assistance M=4/10 F=6/12
5. No, will not comply (clear rejection of request) M=0/10 F=1/12
6. Cannot tell for sure M=0/10 F=0/12

Condition 8: Friend/hangover/smaller assignment/copy
1. Yes, will comply for sure (clear agreement) M=2/10 F=3/14
2. Will comply, but with reservations/riders M=7/10 F=4/14
3. Ambivalent (yes and no--not a clear commitment) M=0/10 F=0/14
4. No, will not comply but will offer other (ethical) assistance M=3/10 F=7/13
5. No, will not comply (clear rejection of request) M=0/10 F=0/13
6. Cannot tell for sure M=1/10 F=1/14

Condition 9: Classmate/ill mother/term paper/copy
1. Yes, will comply for sure (clear agreement) M=2/10 F=3/13
2. Will comply, but with reservations/riders M=4/10 F=3/13
3. Ambivalent (yes and no--not a clear commitment) M=0/10 F=0/13
4. No, will not comply but will offer other (ethical) assistance M=3/10 F=7/13
5. No, will not comply (clear rejection of request) M=0/10 F=0/13
6. Cannot tell for sure M=1/10 F=0/13

Condition 10: Classmate/hangover/smaller assignment/complete for solicitor
1. Yes, will comply for sure (clear agreement) M=0/10 F=0/14
2. Will comply, but with reservations/riders M=3/10 F=1/14
3. Ambivalent (yes and no--not a clear commitment) M=0/10 F=3/14
4. No, will not comply but will offer other (ethical) assistance M=1/10 F=4/14
5. No, will not comply (clear rejection of request) M=6/10 F=6/14
6. Cannot tell for sure M=0/10 F=0/14

Condition 11: Classmate/hangover/term paper/copy
1. Yes, will comply for sure (clear agreement) M=0/10 F=0/14
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Response 1</th>
<th>Response 2</th>
<th>Response 3</th>
<th>Response 4</th>
<th>Response 5</th>
<th>Response 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(clear agreement)</td>
<td>will comply, but with reservations/riders</td>
<td>ambiguous (yes and no–not a clear commitment)</td>
<td>will not comply but will offer other (ethical) assistance</td>
<td>will not comply (clear rejection of request)</td>
<td>cannot tell for sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M=6/10</td>
<td>M=3/10</td>
<td>M=0/10</td>
<td>M=2/10</td>
<td>M=5/10</td>
<td>M=0/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F=5/15</td>
<td>F=4/14</td>
<td>F=1/14</td>
<td>F=3/14</td>
<td>F=5/14</td>
<td>F=1/14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Condition 12: Classmate/ill mother/smaller assignment/copy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response 1</th>
<th>Response 2</th>
<th>Response 3</th>
<th>Response 4</th>
<th>Response 5</th>
<th>Response 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(clear agreement)</td>
<td>will comply, but with reservations/riders</td>
<td>will not comply but will offer other (ethical) assistance</td>
<td>clear rejection of request</td>
<td>cannot tell for sure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M=6/10</td>
<td>M=3/10</td>
<td>M=2/10</td>
<td>M=5/10</td>
<td>M=0/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F=5/15</td>
<td>F=4/14</td>
<td>F=3/14</td>
<td>F=5/14</td>
<td>F=1/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Condition 13: Classmate/ill mother/smaller assignment/complete for solicitor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response 1</th>
<th>Response 2</th>
<th>Response 3</th>
<th>Response 4</th>
<th>Response 5</th>
<th>Response 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(clear agreement)</td>
<td>will comply, but with reservations/riders</td>
<td>will not comply but will offer other (ethical) assistance</td>
<td>clear rejection of request</td>
<td>cannot tell for sure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M=3/10</td>
<td>M=1/10</td>
<td>M=0/10</td>
<td>M=1/10</td>
<td>M=0/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F=1/11</td>
<td>F=2/11</td>
<td>F=0/11</td>
<td>F=1/11</td>
<td>F=0/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Condition 14: Classmate/hangover/term paper/complete for solicitor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response 1</th>
<th>Response 2</th>
<th>Response 3</th>
<th>Response 4</th>
<th>Response 5</th>
<th>Response 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(clear agreement)</td>
<td>will comply, but with reservations/riders</td>
<td>will not comply but will offer other (ethical) assistance</td>
<td>clear rejection of request</td>
<td>cannot tell for sure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M=0/10</td>
<td>M=4/10</td>
<td>M=2/10</td>
<td>M=4/10</td>
<td>M=0/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F=0/13</td>
<td>F=2/13</td>
<td>F=0/13</td>
<td>F=7/13</td>
<td>F=0/13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Condition 15: Classmate/ill mother/term paper/complete for solicitor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response 1</th>
<th>Response 2</th>
<th>Response 3</th>
<th>Response 4</th>
<th>Response 5</th>
<th>Response 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(clear agreement)</td>
<td>will comply, but with reservations/riders</td>
<td>will not comply but will offer other (ethical) assistance</td>
<td>clear rejection of request</td>
<td>cannot tell for sure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M=1/10</td>
<td>M=2/10</td>
<td>M=4/10</td>
<td>M=3/10</td>
<td>M=0/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F=1/13</td>
<td>F=3/13</td>
<td>F=6/13</td>
<td>F=3/13</td>
<td>F=0/13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Condition 16: Classmate/hangover/smaller assignment/copy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response 1</th>
<th>Response 2</th>
<th>Response 3</th>
<th>Response 4</th>
<th>Response 5</th>
<th>Response 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(clear agreement)</td>
<td>will comply, but with reservations/riders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M=2/11</td>
<td>M=5/11</td>
<td>F=2/11</td>
<td>F=5/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3. Ambivalent (yes and no--not a clear commitment)  M=0/11  F=0/11
4. No, will not comply but will offer other ethical assistance  M=0/11  F=0/11
5. No, will not comply (clear rejection of request)  M=4/11  F=4/11
6. Cannot tell for sure  M=0/11  F=0/11