

Smith, S.M., Steele, K.M., Greene, P., Stanny, C.J., Klein, E., Finley, D., Baxter, C., Bristow, A., Edwards, J., Herzog, C., Ross, L., Santoro, P., Smith, G., Forsyth, D.R., Rubin, Z. (2001). The Forum. *Ethics & Behavior*, 11(3): 349-363 (July 2001). Published by Taylor & Francis (ISSN: 1050-8422).

The Forum

Stephen M. Smith, Kenneth M. Steele, Paul Greene, Claudia J. Stanny, Erica Klein, Diane Finley, Chrismarie Baxter, Ann Bristow, Jason Edwards, Cindy Herzog, Lee Ross, Pat Santoro, Gabie Smith, Donelson R. Forsyth, Zick Rubin

Case Vignette: The Class That (Probably) Cheated: Professor Dill's Dilemma. After an exam in a class of 160 students, 7 students independently approached Professor Dill to inform him that "massive cheating" had occurred in the back of the room. Reports of the number of involved students ranged from 8 to 15. None of the students, however, was willing to name names. Professor Dill asked his teaching assistant, who was walking the aisles during the exam, if she saw anything. She replied that some students seemed uncomfortable and moved around in their seats, but she did not observe any cheating.

Professor Dill concluded that seven separate reports constituted a strong evidence that cheating had occurred. However, with no direct evidence and the unwillingness of the witnesses to provide further information, he was at a loss as to how to deal with the matter. He comes to you for advice. How would you advise Professor Dill? (Respondents were to assume that no honor code was in effect that required students to report observed cheating.)

The issue editors solicited brief responses to the Professor Dill case from TIPS, an online discussion group composed primarily of college-level psychology instructors. The responses we present here were selected for their clarity and representativeness of the many views and opinions that were submitted.

The first essay response reflects the view that available evidence was insufficient to take any action. In addition, without confirmation that cheating actually occurred, honest students could be unfairly disadvantaged.

Response 1 Stephen M. Smith Department of Psychology North Georgia College & State University

Professor Dill would be wise to simply let the matter drop. Without any concrete evidence there really is no case against anyone. Throwing out the exam would unfairly punish the honest students who did well. An investigation would almost surely set off protests from the innocent students who are interrogated as well as a few of the guilty ones who figure that objections would make them appear innocent. Even if someone were to "name names," I cannot imagine a hearing committee siding with the professor without any evidence of cheating on the exams themselves, especially if there was student representation on the committee.

Other responses reflect almost the opposite view from the first. That is, honest students expect and welcome the matter to be dealt with in a forthright way.

Response 2 Kenneth M. Steele Department of Psychology Appalachian State University

In my experience, students taking an exam are focused on the exam itself and are relatively inattentive to the actions of other students. Therefore the cheating activity in this case was, in most probability, flagrant enough to disturb several students.

These students are expecting Professor Dill to take strong and public action. One must realize that the situational pressures on students are against reporting such incidents. Most schools impose harsh penalties as a consequence of an official conviction of cheating. Students are inclined to excuse the questionable incidents involving their peers given the magnitude of the consequences. Additionally, even clear instances of cheating may be explained as due to extraordinary circumstances. Finally, there is pressure against standing out from their peers or harming a fellow student. Therefore, the cheating incident must have been egregious to cause several students to report the incident.

Here is one possible response to this case. Immediately announce that attendance is required at the next class. At that next class, administer the same test (or an easily scored portion) a second time. Explain to the students that charges of academic dishonesty have been made and how performance on this second test can be interpreted. One would expect most test scores to decline somewhat. However students who achieved high test scores by cheating should show a strong decline relative to other students. Calculate the average amount of decline and look for those test scores that stand out because of the magnitude of decrease. Contact those students and ask them to explain the precipitous change in their test scores. This action informs miscreants that there is a means by which they can be identified, informs the class that you take possible instances of cheating very seriously, and informs those students who made the report that you support their actions.

Response 3 Paul Greene Psychology Department Iona College

Professor Dill spoke to seven students who independently reported massive cheating and apparently was convinced that cheating occurred. Such a conclusion is rightfully based on the considered opinion of the teacher in charge. Although the total number of students reported to

have been cheating is a small percentage of the class, the number is probably sufficient to skew the distribution of scores, potentially injuring the academic records of many students. Credible reports by seven students, even if they are uncorroborated by the teaching assistant or mistaken, compromise the integrity of the class and do so in a manner that may have destructive educational consequences beyond the exam and class.

The presence of "massive" cheating is in part a function of the procedures used in the teacher's evaluative process. Although the professor apparently used common and standard procedures to protect against academic dishonesty, the administration of the exam may not have insured a fair and objective test. The professor is responsible for the methods that prevent cheating and its corrosive consequences. Giving another test and taking additional measures to guard against cheating can restore fairness and integrity.

The students who did not cheat and prepared for the exam in a timely manner are penalized by having to prepare for the exam a second time. Those students who cheated or were unprepared have a second opportunity to study and hide their poor initial performance. Still, on balance, administering another test and throwing out the results of the first at least creates an evaluation that more accurately reflects the original purpose of the exam.

Another popular response was to attempt to substantiate cheating through the use of an item analysis, and, in the process, possibly identifying those who were involved. Programs can now be purchased that will do such analyses in a matter of seconds. The identification of seating patterns and a minimum number of test items are required in order to perform these analyses.

Response 4 Claudia J. Stanny Department of Psychology, University of West Florida, Pensacola

Professor Dill might be able to determine whether cheating occurred based on the pattern of wrong answers among exams of students suspected of cheating based on "suspicious" or "nervous" behavior observed by the teaching assistant during the exam. There is only one way to get an answer right on a multiple-choice test, but there are several ways of getting answers wrong. Two students almost never get the same questions wrong and, when they do, they often select different wrong answers. Past experience with this approach suggests that it is best suited for exonerating students suspected of cheating. The students are found to have missed different questions or selected different wrong answers when they missed the same question.

If students had exams that matched on both which questions were missed and which wrong options were selected, I would call the students in to talk to them about the coincidence and ask them to retake the exam in separate locations. I am not comfortable about a more severe punishment unless I have a witness who will identify the culprits in addition to the circumstantial evidence of excessive similarities on the exams.

It should be noted that such an analysis can only indicate a likelihood of duplicate wrong answers and should not be used as the sole basis for disciplining students for cheating. Even when the probability that cheating among two or more persons is high, such programs cannot tell us who was dishonest and who might have been the unwary source of answers.

A popular suggestion was to, at the very least, use the incident as a learning experience for both the students and Professor Dill. Furthermore, Professor Dill may now realize that instituting preventive measures would be worth while to pursue in the future.

Response 5 Erica Klein Department of Psychology University of Houston

Professor Dill needs to speak to the class as soon as possible about the cheating. He should discuss the following: his awareness that cheating occurred (without giving away how he knows); his great disappointment that students would behave this way (lay it on here, discuss expectations, honesty, integrity, learning, academic policies, and possible penalties); the need for students to avoid even the appearance of impropriety, pointing out he cannot read their minds, but he can note that they appeared to be cheating and present behaviors that might make him suspect cheating; and, finally, the procedures he will use to ensure that this does not occur at the next test.

Professor Dill should also devote a discussion session to what is known about cheating, what is known about why students cheat, and the relation between cheating as a student and the potential for continuing dishonest behavior in future endeavors.

Response 6 Diane Finley Department of Psychology, Community College of Baltimore County

If this were my class, I would come away with a learning experience for future semesters. Because the students are unwilling to name the alleged cheaters, there is no way to identify whom to question about potential academic misconduct. I assume that in a class of that size, the exam is multiple choice. Picking names of suspected cheaters at random leaves Professor Dill open to all sorts of problems and hassles, including potential legal action. Thus, I would use this experience as a guide on what not to do in the future. I would change the way I give exams to avoid future dilemmas.

Response 7 Chrismarie Baxter, Ann Bristow, Jason Edwards, Cindy Herzog, Lee Ross, Pat Santoro, and Gabie Smith Psychology Department, Frostburg State University

We considered several alternative responses. These included ignoring the cheating (because Professor Dill had no proof) and dropping the grade for that exam, giving all students the option of retaking an alternative exam (because scores on the exam were clearly not valid in all cases). However, we decided that the best response would involve two steps.

In the initial step, a "teaching moment" would be created. Professor Dill would inform the class that cheating had been reported and stress two points. First, cheating is totally unacceptable. Second, those who observe cheating have an ethical responsibility to report it. Professor Dill would call for the witnesses to talk to him privately and identify cheaters by name.

Next, Professor Dill would ask those who had been cheating to talk to him privately and own up to their cheating. If they did so, they would have the option to retake an alternative form of the exam although they would receive a grade penalty. However, if cheaters failed to identify themselves and were later named by witnesses, the maximum penalties would be imposed and the appropriate campus administrators (e.g., judicial board) would be informed.

Suggestions for Minimalizing the Dilemma

Most college-level instructors have likely faced a situation similar to Professor Dill's, and the reader may have noticed the strong resemblance between this vignette and the case study in this issue (Throckmorton-Belzer, Keith-Spiegel, & Wrangham, 2001/this issue). Because detection is often difficult, instructors cannot be looking everywhere at once, and students are unlikely to report their peers, preventive techniques are highly recommended. The issue editors and our respondents offer several suggestions to implement, when feasible:

1. Let students know via the syllabus and announcements at the beginning of the course and before every exam that academic honesty is an important to you and that cheating will not be tolerated.
2. Be explicit about what materials students ay and may not be used during exams, and reinforce this policy with oral instructions just before the exam.
3. Create several versions of the exams. Versions could differ simply by a random ordering of response alternatives. Inform students that multiple forms will be used. Make it difficult for students to easily distinguish between different forms.
4. Make a seating chart. Mark individuals on the seating chart if suspicious behavior occurred. This can provide the basis for checking for similar response patterns on exams.
5. Space students with an empty seat in between or by increasing the space between rows.
6. Require that all books and materials be left in front (or back) of room during tests.
7. Require students who wear baseball caps to turn the brim to the rear.
8. Provide all paper, exam booklets, and the like, to the students at the start of the exam. If students bring their own exam booklets, collect them, stamp them with a code, and redistribute them randomly. Or have students bring an exam book the session before the exam, review and mark them, and distribute them randomly on exam day.
9. Allow pencils only in the exam room. (Many commercial information-storage products look like pens.)
10. Attach blank pages to the test when scratch paper is needed.
11. Ban all electronic devices from examination, except those absolutely required for completion of the exams.
12. Actively proctor exams. Add proctors on test days. Train assistants to recognize behaviors to watch for and give them permission to move students to different seats during the test if suspicions are aroused.
13. Do not allow students to share pencils, and erasers, once the exam has started, or require students to use pencils and so forth, supplied by the instructor.
14. Require students to keep their answers covered.
15. Require students to turn in exams or leave test materials with a proctor if they must leave the room. (Discourage leaving the room at all.)
16. Point out that these procedures will not penalize honest students in any way.

A sentence from the Erica Klein's response makes a fitting conclusion: If students know that cheating is being taken seriously and efforts are being made to prevent cheating, potential cheaters may become more reluctant to take chances while honest students may feel more confident that their hard work will be rewarded.

REFERENCE

Throckmorton-Belzer, L., Keith-Spiegel, P., & Wrangham, J. (2001/this issue). Student response to a collective penalty for reported cheating: A case study. *Ethics & Behavior*, 11, 343-348.

Conducting Research on Academic Dishonesty

Research on academic dishonesty provides an important source of information on its causes and creates a basis for developing interventions to promote academic integrity, prevent academic dishonesty, and rehabilitate offending students. However, research on academic dishonesty can itself raise ethical issues, as illustrated in the following vignettes. These cases are based on research designs that have been used in published studies.

Discussants: The discussants for these cases are Donelson R. Forsyth and Zick Rubin. Donelson Forsyth received his PhD in Social Psychology from the University of Florida in 1978 and is currently Professor of Psychology and Sociology at Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond. Zick Rubin received his PhD in Social Psychology from the University of Michigan in 1969 and his JD from Harvard Law School in 1988. He is currently Of Counsel at the law firm of Hill and Barlow in Boston.

Research Vignette 1: To study the effect that anticipated reward might have on cheating, Professor Anne Nova conducted an experiment in which college students were promised either a large reward, a moderate reward, a small reward, or no reward to solve 20 difficult anagrams. Extensive pretesting showed that 90% of students could solve no more than three of the anagrams and that the operational definitions of the reward levels were valid. To give each experimental participant an opportunity to cheat, the research assistant conducting the experimental sessions supposedly remembered something that she had left in another room and went to get it, telling the research participant that she would be back in 10 min. As she left the room, she "accidentally" left a clearly marked answer key for the anagrams exposed to the participant's view. When the research assistant returned 10 min later, she told the participant that time was up and collected the participant's answer sheet. She then thoroughly debriefed the participant. Dr. Nova computed each participant's cheating score as the number of anagrams correctly solved minus 3.

Research Vignette 2: Professor N. D. Field was also interested in the possible effects of anticipated reward on cheating, but wanted to study those effects in a natural setting. To do so, he used two of the multiple-choice tests he administered to his class, one worth 10% of the final grade and the other worth 25% of the final grade. Each test had the same number of items. Two class sessions after the administration of each test, Dr. Field told his students that he had not had the time to score the tests, but that he wanted them to know the results. Therefore, he told them, he would give each student his or her answer sheet, read off the correct answers, and

have students score their own exams. He did not tell the students that he had copied the answer sheets. As he read off the answers, Dr. Field focused on the papers on his lectern and did not look at the class. Dr. Field computed each student's cheating score as the difference between the student's score on the copied answer sheet and the score the student reported after self-scoring the test. Dr. Field used the scores reported by the students in computing course grades and took no action against students whose self-reported scores differed from their original scores.

Breaking Standards of Morality When Studying Morality Donelson R. Forsyth

Why do people sometimes do things that violate widely held moral principles? Why do they deliberately underpay their taxes? Break vows of fidelity in the marital relationships? Tell lies to loved ones? Cheat on tests? Researchers who wish to answer these questions often face a pernicious moral dilemma, for in their quest to study morality, they may themselves act in morally dubious ways. In the two vignettes, for example, investigators wanted to understand why students cheat, but in doing so, they themselves misled research participants.

To study morality by conducting studies that violate basic moral principles is certainly ironic, but is it unethical? Even if studies of morality escape the special scrutiny that their subject matter suggests, they should at least comply with the professional standards that apply to all research studies involving human participants. Although ethical judgments are a personal matter and reflect each individual's moral beliefs and values, through discourse and debate the field has reached consensus on the value of a risk-benefit approach as a means of organizing the myriad factors that must be considered when evaluating a study's moral feasibility. Both studies can potentially yield insights into the causes of a poorly understood social behavior, but both may also lead to psychological harm, invasion of privacy, manipulation, and legal retaliation. To evaluate these two studies one must weight risks against benefit, as one would in evaluating any project. If this review identifies a substantial potential for risk, then the procedures ultimately chosen by the investigator must be demonstrably superior to alternative, and less risky, research strategies.

Consider the two studies' possible benefits. If dozens of prior studies have already offered convincing evidence of the tendency for people to cheat more when the benefits of successful cheating are greater, then the need for this work is questionable. Moreover, even though the specific finding may be a novel one, its scientific value depends on its conceptual implications. If the results of the study resoundingly disconfirm some prior theory of moral behavior while adding support to an alternative and widely disputed view, then the work's scientific impact is greater than if the study is disconnected from any conceptual framework. The integrity of the study's methods, too, directly determine its scientific value and, indirectly, its ethical value. A badly done study, by wasting participants' time and holding up progress in science, becomes morally suspect by creating only costs with no benefit. Finally, some people may also feel that studies that yield useful information, such as suggestions for creating learning situations that do not pressure students into cheating, are more valuable than studies that have few practical implications.

Both studies also create the potential for risk, for they involve deception, invasion of privacy, and the withholding of consent. Society, in general, condemns deceptive practices, and researchers are not exempted from this norm. The researchers in both studies do not just

withhold information from participants, but mislead participants about the nature and purpose of the situation. Both studies, the field study in particular, also fail to provide participants the opportunity to give their consent to participate. In the laboratory study, the consent form could describe the nature of the situation and warn participants that they may experience anxiety and tension as a result of participation. In the field study, no consent form was apparently used, and so participants were not warned of the potential for duress and given the opportunity to decline participation. In neither study, however, were participants fully informed prior to giving their consent. The entire point behind informed consent is that researchers give participants the opportunity to decide for themselves if they will participate after they are fully informed regarding the benefits to be gained and the possible costs sustained. When studies involve deception, consent is not informed.

Both studies also subjected participants to stress. The layperson, hearing of the methods used in the studies, may respond that in both the participants are not subjected to pressures any different from that experienced in many everyday situations. Moreover, the participants themselves could freely choose to act in accordance with the dictates of morality, or they could instead decide to cheat in order to earn a better score or test grade. Psychologists recognize, however, that such situations are coercive ones, and some participants may have experienced anxiety and self-condemnation after cheating. The magnitude of these negative consequences will vary, in part, on the nature of the debriefing used in the research. Although debriefing is mentioned only in the laboratory study, one would assume that both studies provided participants with additional information about the nature of the study and its implications at the conclusion of the experimental session. A careful debriefing, in which participants rights are fully restored and any possible upset replaced with positive feelings toward themselves and the researcher, can go a long way in tipping the risk-benefit calculation back in favor of the project.

The researcher in the field study, by using the researcher's own students as research participants, confronts an additional set of moral complexities. That researcher can claim a personal right to take actions that will help the students learn about psychology's theories, findings, and methods. However, the researcher who studies his or her own students is caught in a conflict of dual roles. The researcher may be a scientist seeking truth, but as a teacher has a special obligation to protect the students. When an instructor acts in ways that violates the trust of students, the instructor can potentially undermine the relationship that makes learning possible.

Given that the studies both create the potential for harm to participants, both researchers should have considered less risky methodologies before settling on the methods they eventually used. They could, for example, have made use of role-play methods in which participants were asked to imagine themselves in a testing situation, correlational methods in which participants reports of past cheating actions were related to the importance of the test, or qualitative approaches involving a small number of willing participants who provide detailed personal information about past instances of cheating. The researchers may, however, have been justified in rejecting these alternatives because they may not yield valid results for this particular hypothesis. The role-play responses of participants may tell us little about how people actually act when tempted to cheat, the self-reports may cast them in a too favorable a light, and journals in the field may not publish evidence generated using qualitative methods.

These concerns for benefits, risks, and alternative methods apply to all studies involving human participants, but it may be that the studies that described two vignettes, because they investigate a moral behavior, are held to more stringent ethical standards than most. When

investigators want to study helping behavior, they may create a false emergency and see if people react. Those who study aggression may give participants the opportunity to retaliate against another person. However, when studying moral behavior, investigators must perform the untoward actions that they themselves are studying. Such work may earn a swift moral condemnation because the investigator's violation of societal standards of morality is particularly flagrant. The work itself is based on people's condemnation of certain types of behavior, yet the investigators carry out those very same actions in their work. Their work creates the impression that they have put themselves above, or at least outside, the regulatory social system that they are studying. This extra ethical objection, however, overlooks the intentions of the researcher. The investigators are not seeking personal gain, but are impelled by a motivation that society applauds: the quest to extend understanding. If anything, they deserve special approbation, for they must violate principles that they may personally believe in order to reach scientifically commendable goals.

In closing, this analysis assumes that researchers have a shared set of values concerning research and ethics, and this assumption may not be tenable. As studies of individual differences in ethical philosophy indicate, people differ widely in terms of their reliance on moral principles and the weight they assign to human consequences when making moral choices. Some investigators may insist that their actions be consistent with fundamental moral principles that are exceptionless, and so they would not themselves carry out research that violates those principles and they would condemn others that do so as well. Still other investigators may base their choices of research on self-interest alone, and so would not carry out studies that place them at risk professionally, financially, socially, and legally. However, others may be so dedicated to the analysis of social processes that they feel justified in stepping outside the bounds of moral propriety to extend that knowledge.

Dishonest Studies of Dishonesty: Are They Ethical? Are They Legal? Zick Rubin

If we are to combat academic dishonesty effectively, we must try to understand it. By exploring the effects of an anticipated reward on cheating, the studies described in these vignettes address one piece of the puzzle of academic dishonesty, and so there are good reasons to conduct studies of this sort. Yet, I fear that the researchers often fail to recognize the central irony inherent in studies like these--that in their effort to study academic dishonesty, the researchers are engaging in academic dishonesty themselves. Indeed, although the researchers don't like to think about it, they may even be acting unlawfully.

The research in the first vignette is pervaded by lies. As part of her experimental manipulation, Professor Nova makes promises to her student research participants that she has no intention of keeping--the promised rewards never arrive. She sets up a problem-solving session under false pretenses, telling the students that she is studying anagram solving when she really is studying something quite different. She asks her research assistant to do her best to deceive--to tell students she had "left something" in another room (when she had not), to "accidentally" (but actually very intentionally) leave behind an answer key.

These deceptions may seem innocuous. Indeed, in the larger scheme of things, they are relatively innocuous, because Professor Nova and her assistant know that at the end of the session they will explain to the participants just what they had done and why. Such full explanation undoubtedly takes much of the sting out of the deceptions and distinguishes the

researcher's lies from those of students who cheat. Cheating students do not do so in the knowledge that they will come clean at the end of the day. However, the relative innocuousness of Professor Nova's deceptions should not obscure the facts that they are deceptions and are, by any reasonable meaning of the term, instances of academic dishonesty.

The academic dishonesty in the second vignette is perhaps more subtle. The tests are real tests, and they really are worth 10% and 25% of the final grade. Although Professor Field's lies are less obvious than Professor Nova's, there is academic dishonesty nevertheless: The professor has secretly copied the answer sheets and will score the tests himself. Yet, he implies to the students that he will not be scoring them ("he didn't have time").

Although there may be less overt deception in the second vignette than in the first, the study seems far more objectionable. Whereas in the first vignette the researchers know that they will explain all at the end of the day, Professor Field apparently decided that debriefing would make for a sticky situation. So he forgoes any debriefing, and instead uses the students' self-reported grades--some of which he knows to have been inflated by cheating--to compute their real course grades. One may wonder what the university administration would think if it knew that Professor Field had--in the service of hassle-free research--not only intentionally elicited cheating but also set up a situation in which cheating did pay. One may wonder, too, what the honest students would think if they learned the truth.

In conducting studies like these, the researchers should consider not only whether they are ethical but also whether they are legal. Every state recognizes civil actions for such torts as misrepresentation, fraud, invasion of privacy, and infliction of emotional distress. A student in Professor Nova's study who was led to cheat--entrapped, he might claim, by the carefully planted answer sheet--and shaken by it might well have such a cause of action. Informed consent from adult (i.e., nonminor) students might be a good defense, but it's hard to see how fully informed consent can be given when the study involves deceptions of this sort. In the case of Professor Field's study, it might be the honest student who has the grievance. She might claim with some justification that her contract with the college, as set forth in the student handbook, was breached when the professor awarded course grades that rewarded cheating and, at least in relative terms, penalized honesty.

Students could undoubtedly bring lawsuits in such cases, and under some circumstances might even win them--especially if the aggrieved student had a mother or father who was a lawyer who decided to make something of it. At times, when universities are scared to death of sexual (and racial, ethnic, etc.) harassment lawsuits, perhaps they should be a little more concerned about lawsuits brought by students who are induced to cheat under false pretenses. Indeed, many harassment lawsuits are based on conduct that is more innocuous than inducing impressionable students to behave immorally.

Even psychological researchers who are highly attuned to ethical concerns often seem to be oblivious to such legal considerations. The researchers seem to assume that there is some special sort of academic freedom that allows us to commit as researchers dishonest acts that we could not get away with if we were, say, stockbrokers or real estate agents.

However, such confidence may be misplaced. Recent court cases have emphasized that even members of the press may be held liable for the use of dishonest reporting techniques. For example, in the recent case of *Food Lion, Inc. v. Capital Cities/ABC, Inc.*, investigative reporters who used undercover techniques were found to be liable for certain torts. The First Amendment

gives the press a wide berth, but it does not legitimate fraud. Similarly, there is no "researcher privilege" that legitimates deception--nor am I sure that there should be.

Do we really need to engage in academic dishonesty to study academic dishonesty? Perhaps we do. Although a great deal can undoubtedly be learned by thoroughly honest research methods--such as surveys, observational studies, or entirely honest experiments (see Rubin, 1973)--there may be aspects of academic dishonesty that can most effectively be explored only by dishonest means.

I am not an absolutist about honesty. Honesty is most often the best policy, but it must sometimes give way to other values, such as self-defense, the sparing of others' feelings, and the creation of hope--even false hope--when that is all that is left to a person. Yet, the value of academic integrity is undermined if we too readily grant ourselves a "research exemption." If we are going to lie in the pursuit of truth, we should at least be honest with ourselves about what we are doing. When we conduct studies like these, we are engaging in academic dishonesty. In each case, we should consider very carefully whether the dishonesty is justified.

NOTES

This section of the journal features a fictionalized case vignette that embodies one or more important and complex ethical dilemmas with professional or public policy overtones. Each case is accompanied by two or more independently crafted commentaries of approximately 1,000 words by experts with diverse backgrounds and perspectives. Readers are invited to submit cases and brief follow-up commentaries that raise new and important issues.

Requests for reprints of the Forum section should be sent to the editor, Gerald P. Koocher, Graduate School for Health Studies, Simmons College, 300 The Fenway, Boston, MA 02115.

REFERENCES

Food Lion, Inc. v. Capital Cities/ABC, Inc., 984 F Supp. 923 (D. North Carolina 1997), *aff'd*, 194 F. 3d 505 (4th Cir. 1999).

Rubin, Z. (1973). Designing honest experiments. *American Psychologist*, 28, 445-448.