

City University of New York (CUNY)

## CUNY Academic Works

---

Student Theses

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

---

Spring 6-1-2023

### Witnessing Academic Dishonesty and Student's Satisfaction with Learning, Motivation for Studying and Evaluation of Faculty

Dawoon Lee

*CUNY John Jay College*, dawoon.lee@jjay.cuny.edu

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

More information about this work at: [https://academicworks.cuny.edu/jj\\_etds/271](https://academicworks.cuny.edu/jj_etds/271)

Discover additional works at: <https://academicworks.cuny.edu>

---

This work is made publicly available by the City University of New York (CUNY).

Contact: [AcademicWorks@cuny.edu](mailto:AcademicWorks@cuny.edu)

Witnessing Academic Dishonesty and Student's Satisfaction with Learning, Motivation for  
Studying and Evaluation of Faculty

A Thesis Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree  
of Master of Arts in Forensic Psychology  
John Jay College of Criminal Justice  
City University of New York

Dawoon Lee

May 2023

Witnessing Academic Dishonesty and Student's Satisfaction with Learning, Motivation for  
Studying and Evaluation of Faculty

Dawoon Lee

Thesis Committee

Thesis Advisor: Professor Keith A. Markus

Second Reader: Professor Peggilee Wupperman

External Reader: Professor Chitra Raghavan

### **Abstract**

Academic dishonesty has been a long-term problem in secondary and higher education. Previous studies reported that an average of two-thirds of students reported that they have engaged in academic dishonesty in high school or college. This study explored witnessing academic dishonesty and its influence on students' experiences in the learning environment. The hypothesis is that witnessing academic dishonesty will negatively impact the student's satisfaction with learning, motivation for studying, and evaluation of faculty. In conducting the study, participants ( $N = 250$ ) completed an online survey assessing their satisfaction with learning, motivation for studying, and evaluation of faculty. Participants also reported their reaction to a hypothetical scenario of witnessing academic dishonesty and answered a question about their actual experience of witnessing academic dishonesty. The results found that 46% of participants witnessed academic dishonesty, and students who witnessed academic dishonesty were less satisfied with learning than participants who did not. Witnessing academic dishonesty had no apparent effect on the motivation for study and evaluation of faculty. Moreover, in the experimental study, the result did not support the hypothesis that witnessing academic dishonesty will negatively impact the student's satisfaction with learning, motivation for studying, and evaluation of faculty. Although preliminary, this study indicates a potential causal connection between witnessing academic dishonesty and dissatisfaction with learning.

## **Academic Dishonesty and Student's Satisfaction with Learning, Motivation for Studying and Evaluation of Faculty**

Academic dishonesty has been a general concern in universities (Hodgkinson et al., 2015). Academic dishonesty has become more sophisticated and undetected with the development of technology (Krou et al. 2021). Pervasive practice of academic dishonesty could jeopardize the education system and produce negative habits among students (Yu et al., 2018). A pervasive culture of academic dishonesty could influence students to have negative attitudes toward the learning process and the general education system. This study aims to show how witnessing academic dishonesty is related to students' evaluations of their satisfaction with learning, motivation for study, and of faculty.

For the present study, academic dishonesty is defined as committing dishonest acts in research, tests, term papers, homework assignments, or other graded assessments by anyone in the academic environment (Whitley & Keith-Spiegel, 2002). Students engaged in academic dishonesty conduct educational performance outside the bounds of ethical standards in order to obtain academic rewards (Muñoz-García & Aviles-Herrera, 2014). Academic dishonesty has been a common issue and persistent in even higher education (Davis et al., 1994). With computer-based classes and Internet-based research, more approaches to academic dishonesty have been available to students, such as paying for essays, using a smartphone or smartwatch in examinations, and hiring professionals to conduct research on the student's behalf (Minarcik & Bridges, 2015). Even though most students know committing academic dishonesty is wrong, two-thirds of students report dishonest acts in high school, college, or both (Davis et al., 1994; CAI 2005). Studies by Austin et al. (2006) and Williams et al. (2014) found that 70% to 80% of participants engaged in academic dishonesty one or more times during their academic careers.

Based on these studies and other findings, it is clear that many students are willing to commit academic dishonesty for their grades (Austin et al., 2006).

Whitley and Keith-Spiegel (2002) explained that academic dishonesty is a complex concept because there are many ways to cheat or plagiarize. Different definitions of academic dishonesty exist across majors and regions (Marchall & Varnon, 2017). The most common types of academic dishonesty involve two broad categories: Academic dishonesty in examinations and plagiarism (Muñoz-García & Aviles-Herrera, 2014; Krou et al., 2021). Academic dishonesty in examinations consist of students who use unauthorized methods to get credit in examinations, such as getting answers from another student's test paper and using notes without permission (Minarcik & Bridges, 2015). On the other hand, plagiarism is when students take someone else's ideas and words and pass them off as their own work, such as putting information without proper citations and giving incorrect credit (Minarcik & Bridges, 2015). Not only can they take from others' ideas without contribution, but students also can take ideas from their own previously published papers without proper citations, thus committing self-plagiarism (American Psychological Association, 2020).

Most academic dishonesty is undetected (Drake, 1942; Beasley, 2016). Students and faculty have reported different estimated rates of academic dishonesty happening in their classes (Wajda-Johnston et al., 2001). Faculty tend to underestimate the prevalence of academic dishonesty (Wajda-Johnston et al., 2001). Even if academic dishonesty is discovered, faculty are reluctant to report the student or are not knowledgeable of exact school policies (Jendrek, 1989). Faculty tend to deal with academic dishonesty in a one-on-one manner and impose non-serious punishment when they come across a student's dishonest work (Jendrek, 1989; Beasley, 2016). Faculty do not react to the academic dishonesty of students because they do not admit that

academic dishonesty occurred or are afraid of challenging students due to a lack of time for the prevention of academic dishonesty (Beasley, 2016).

### **The Demographic Background of Students who Commit Academic Dishonesty**

What type of student commits academic dishonesty has been research topics of interest since the 1940s (Drake, 1942). Previous studies have tried to describe who was more likely to commit academic dishonesty. Students who committed academic dishonesty showed less intelligence and less interest in being successful, including a higher likelihood of dropping out of school (Drake, 1942). Female students are less likely to report committing academic dishonesty than male students (DeVries & Ajzen, 1971; Yu et al., 2017). Students from high-income families and parents with college degrees are less likely to commit academic dishonesty than students from low-income families and parents without college degrees (Yu et al., 2017). Students who are older and are in postsecondary education are less associated with academic dishonesty (Krou et al., 2021). International students studying in the United States are more likely to be reported for academic dishonesty than domestic students (Beasley, 2016). This is likely because students who are not familiar with the stricter rules of academic dishonesty in Western countries tend to violate academic integrity more often than students from Western countries (Beasley, 2016). However, there is no significant difference in student's races, political views, and religions (DeVries & Ajzen, 1971; Yu et al., 2017).

### **Individual Factors to commit academic dishonesty.**

Personal factors can affect students' probability of academic dishonesty. One's educational purpose can influence choices including career and learning (Bronk, 2013). Students have their own purposes for staying in the educational system, such as to get high-paying jobs or to study for their own educational satisfaction. The self-oriented purpose is to focus on activities

for the self and the pro-social purpose is to engage in activities helping others (Bronk, 2013). In a study to evaluate individual factors that influence a decision of academic dishonesty with college students, Yu et al. (2017) found that students with self-orientated purposes are more likely to cheat than students with pro-social purposes. Students with self-orientated purposes might perceive academic dishonesty as a means to get good grades as highly beneficial to themselves. Whether or not students decide to commit academic dishonesty depends on their cognitive development, which would influence their judgment and how they understand their moral values (Wisesa et al. 2019). The decision to engage in academic dishonesty would be based on whether students' dishonest behaviors can satisfy their needs (Wisesa et al. 2019). Most students do not plan on committing academic dishonesty (Wisesa et al. 2019). Considering the benefits and return of academic dishonesty, such as receiving a good grade, students usually make a decision at the last minute, such as while taking exams (Wisesa et al. 2019). On the other hand, students may try to justify their academic dishonesty to achieve consistent grades or to maintain consistent performance in a course (Wisesa et al. 2019). In addition, students characterized their actions as highly unusual and inconsistent after committing academic dishonesty (Forsyth et al., 1985). Reasons for academic dishonesty can include refusing to take responsibility, blaming the assignments or faculty, helping peers, and a misunderstanding of consequences by committing academic dishonesty (Minarcik & Bridges, 2015). A student may consider the purpose, ability to commit, and cost of academic dishonesty (Murdock & Anderman, 2006).

### **Committing Academic dishonesty and Satisfaction with Learning**

Satisfaction with learning may predict academic performance and continuous learning. Students who are highly satisfied with learning have been found to have high rates of graduation and greater respect for academic integrity. Muñoz-García and Aviles-Herrera (2014) conducted a



study to determine how satisfaction with life and learning were related to academic dishonesty. The researchers recruited 268 students and used questionnaires to measure satisfaction with learning tasks. The study found that academic dishonesty was negatively related to satisfaction in life and learning. Therefore, students who cheat on learning tasks ultimately may have a lower level of positive perception of their own life and learning ability, which increases personal dissatisfaction (Muñoz-García & Aviles-Herrera, 2014). However, Austin et al. (2006) found that students who engaged in academic dishonesty still showed high satisfaction levels in their educational experiences. The study suggested that only students who know of unrestricted academic dishonesty but are not involved might feel dissatisfied with the class (Austin et al., 2006). In addition, students who know that their peers did not get any trouble with academic dishonesty might feel distant toward their education (Austin et al., 2006).

### **Committing Academic dishonesty and Motivation to Study**

Motivation is any influence on behavior, goals, and perspectives (Reeve, 2009). Depending on the motivations of studying, students might have more tolerance toward academic dishonesty. Krou et al. (2021) researched the association between achievement motivation and academic dishonesty with a meta-analysis of 79 studies. There are several purposes for obtaining an education, such as mastery of knowledge or an extrinsic goal orientation. Mastery of knowledge is to concentrate on learning subjects and extrinsic goal orientation is to focus on getting higher grades and rewards (Krou et al., 2021). Students who were grade oriented rather than learning-orientated were more likely to commit academic dishonesty (Huss et al. 1993). Krou et al. (2021)'s study found that a lack of motivation or extrinsic goal orientation is positively related to committing academic dishonesty. In addition, they found that students with mastery motivation are less likely to commit dishonesty acts in an academic setting. However, if students with a

learning orientation feel that they cannot control their situations to achieve academic success, they might change their behavior and commit academic dishonesty (Davis et al., 1994).

### **Situational Factors related to Committing Academic Dishonesty.**

Situational factors can influence student's violations of rules. Research has found that peer approval and disapproval is one of the situational factors that influence students' decisions to commit academic dishonesty (McCabe et al., 2006; Murdock & Anderman, 2006; Geddes, 2011; Bäker & Mechtel, 2019). Bäker and Mechtel studied whether peer pressure would influence the decision to cheat in individual and peer settings. The researchers created an experiment in which the participants were given a chance to commit academic dishonesty when they did not gain any benefits from academic dishonesty other than peer approval. The research found that peer settings can cause more serious problems with academic dishonesty (Bäker & Mechtel, 2019). Along with peer approval and disapproval, students also consider other situational factors from the classroom and personal matters, such as relationship with teachers, type of assignment, time management, and personal definitions of academic dishonesty (Quaye, 2010).

Beyond peer pressure/approval, researchers have conducted many studies to attempt to understand what particular circumstances may lead students to commit academic dishonesty (Wisesa et al. 2019; Austin et al., 2006). Identifying what factors and situations convince students to commit academic dishonesty might help to reduce overall instances of dishonesty, as students do not plan before committing academic dishonesty. The classroom environment may affect students' decisions on whether or not they cheat. The students' decisions on violating academic integrity may be based on the prevalence of academic dishonesty in the class, a lack of understanding of academic dishonesty, and insufficiency of academic integrity discussion by

instructors (Broeckelman-Post, 2008).

### **Committing Academic dishonesty and Evaluation of Faculty**

Evaluation of faculty is an essential element for schools and faculty to improve the educational environment in order to assist students with their academic goals. Faculty reaction to academic dishonesty and handling of academic dishonesty is an effective prevention method against academic dishonesty (Broeckelman-Post, 2008). Because the instructor directly interacts with students and administers classes, faculty influences how students perceive the overall education system. Evaluation of faculty and schools could depend on students' experiences with academic integrity. Wenzel and Reinhard (2020) examined whether students' negative evaluations of a learning situation may increase academic dishonesty. The researchers gave 390 participants from an American online sample three learning scenario conditions and asked them to answer their perceptions and evaluations of the learning environment. Wenzel and Reinhard (2020)'s study found that imagined learning scenarios of difficult tests indirectly increased academic dishonesty, rationalization of academic dishonesty, and negative perceptions of the learning environment. In Reisig and Bain (2016)'s study, the researchers found that students who consider school authority as legitimate are less likely to engage in academic dishonesty on an exam. Therefore, students who do not perceive universities as legitimate authorities might commit more academic dishonesty. Similarly, faculty are important figures to create the learning environment and establish legitimate authority in the classroom. Students who have negative views on the learning environment would not be satisfied with their faculty and school.

Broeckelman-Post (2008) researched whether the classroom environment made by faculty would influence student behavior on academic dishonesty. The study found that when instructors discussed copying and pasting sentences from other articles as severe academic

dishonesty, students showed less engagement in plagiarism. In addition, the results showed that when students believed that their peers did cheat, students were more likely to become involved in academic dishonesty. Broeckelman-Post (2008)'s study showed that faculty's safeguards about academic dishonesty and conversations among students about academic integrity might discourage students' engagement in academic dishonesty.

### **Witnessing Academic Dishonesty**

Academic dishonesty, which is a common issue in the education environment, can yield harmful effects on students' academic experience when they witness such a situation. Some research indicates that witnessing academic dishonesty can cause negative feelings. For example, a study measured the cognitive responses of 82 students who witnessed academic dishonesty in the classroom (Firmin et al., 2007), and the results showed that students experienced five stages of cognitive processes to understand what they witnessed: recognizing confusion from not knowing the exact problem of academic dishonesty, reactions of surprise and disbelief about academic dishonesty, rationalization of disbelief about academic dishonesty, a realization of reality, and resolution of reporting or ignoring. As this research showed, students who witness acts of academic dishonesty may feel negative emotions and attempt to rationalize others' dishonest acts even though they are not responsible.

In another study, Firmin et al. (2009) replicated their own experiment to research academic dishonesty in the classroom and studied the emotional reactions of the witnesses. In the experiment, students witnessed one classmate's academic dishonesty on an extra credit test. After the test, students were immediately interviewed. The study found that students who witnessed their classmates' academic dishonesty felt hostility and anger because of a lack of willingness to respond to academic dishonesty, anxiety, fear of the cheater's reaction to the reporter, and

empathy. As this research showed, witnessing academic dishonesty can cause negative feelings even though the students themselves did not commit the act.

In addition, previous research showed that committing academic dishonesty can be negatively related to students' satisfaction with learning and their motivation for studying (Muñoz-García & Aviles-Herrera, 2014; Krou et al., 2021). Moreover, faculty reaction to academic dishonesty, and the education environment can influence students' decisions about committing academic dishonesty (Broeckelman-Post, 2008). Therefore, this research explored how committing academic dishonesty impacts those who witnessed it in their satisfaction with learning, motivation for studying, and evaluation of faculty.

### **Hypotheses**

Unlike previous studies, this research investigates the broader impact of students' reactions to academic dishonesty, including imagining seeing peers committing academic dishonesty and observing academic dishonesty in reality. This study explored the influence of students' experiences with academic dishonesty even if they do not commit academic dishonesty. In addition, the study examined how awareness of academic dishonesty affects a student's satisfaction with learning, motivation for studying, and evaluation of faculty. The first hypothesis predicted that witnessing situations of academic dishonesty would decrease the witness' satisfaction with learning. The second hypothesis considered witnessing situations of academic dishonesty would decrease the witness' motivation for studying. The last hypothesis considered witnessing situations of academic dishonesty would make the witness evaluate their faculty less favorably. Moreover, the study compared students' evaluations from the imagined

academic dishonesty and actual observation of academic dishonesty.

### **Method**

The study addressed the above hypotheses by conducting an online survey. The survey had three sections to ask about how witnessing academic dishonesty impacted participants' satisfaction with learning, motivation for studying, and evaluation of faculty. Section 1 of the survey asked participants to think of the most recent institution they attended, the typical course, and the typical instructor and to answer the questions to evaluate their level of satisfaction of learning, motivation for study, and evaluation of faculty. Section 2 of the study gave participants two different scenarios (one of witnessing academic dishonesty and one without academic dishonesty) randomly. Participants then answered the questions to evaluate their level of satisfaction of learning, motivation for study, and evaluation of faculty after imagining they experience the scenarios. Section 3 of the study asked participants questions about an observation of academic dishonesty in their class and about instrument variables. The demographic questions were at the end of the questionnaire.

### **The Demographics of Participants and Sampling**

The study used Prolific(<https://www.prolific.co/>) to recruit participants. Participants were anonymous and from an online population who voluntarily joined the Prolific program to take surveys. The company sent email invitations to encourage panelists to take a survey. The sample size was 250 participants. The data collection was completed within one day.

Only potential participants who met the criteria were invited to participate. The major criteria were the age of 18-35 and the attendance of any public college or private university in the U.S. A limitation of sampling was that participants need the Internet to take the survey.

Demographic information can be found in Table 2.

### **Study Design**

The study used a passive observation design and a two-group experimental design. In the passive observation design, the participants were asked whether or not they witnessed academic dishonesty when they attended their classes. In the two-group experimental design, the two different scenarios (one is witnessing dishonesty in class and one is a similar class situation but without the academic dishonesty) were given out to make two groups to compare. The study design allowed for between-subject comparisons for the two sets of measures of the dependent variables as well as cross-sectional modeling of the data using instrumental variables.

The instrumental variables can be used to help estimate the causal effect of the causal variable on the outcome (Bollen, 2012). The passive observation study used instrumental variables to estimate causal effects. Bollen (2012) explained that instrumental variables impact independent variables but do not directly impact dependent variables. Instrumental variables cannot be correlated with the causes of the dependent variables even if the causes are omitted from the study. The instrumental variables should affect whether students witness academic dishonesty and should not directly affect students' satisfaction, motivation, and evaluation before witnessing academic dishonesty.

The instrumental variables in the study comprise familiarity with school policy about academic dishonesty, college with honor codes, small campus, business majors, earlier and younger students, and living dormitories. Wisesa et al. (2019)'s study found that students did not plan to commit academic dishonesty and that there are situational factors that affect exposure to academic dishonesty, such as the student's surroundings and classmates. Unclear understanding of academic dishonesty and infrequent exposure of school policy about academic misconduct

would lead to committing more academic dishonesty (Smyth & Davis, 2004, Tippitt et al., 2009, Tatum et al., 2018). Colleges having honor codes and conducting exam pledges could reduce academic dishonesty (Konheim-Kalkstein et al., 2008). Small campuses have more reports about academic dishonesty than larger campuses (Arnold et al., 2007). McCabe et al. (2006) found students with business majors commit more academic dishonesty than students with non-business majors. First year and younger undergraduate students commit more academic dishonesty than older students and students with higher class standings (Wideman, 2008). Lastly, students living outside in dormitories commit less academic dishonesty than students living in dormitories (Kisamore, 2007).

## **Measures**

The witnessing of academic dishonesty is an independent variable. The independent variable was manipulated with a scenario and was measured from the experience of witnessing academic dishonesty in participants' classes. The three dependent variables are satisfaction with learning, motivation for study, and evaluation for faculty. The three dependent variables were measured twice: once from their previous class experience and once after imagining the scenarios. The measurement used in this study is attached in the Appendix.

### ***Measurement of Witnessing of Academic Dishonesty***

Academic dishonesty was measured for both the experimental study and the passive observation study. For the experimental study, there were two scenarios randomly assigned to participants. Scenario A was adapted from the previous research that used the example of academic dishonesty scenarios (Schwartz et al., 2013; Tatum et al., 2018). The academic dishonesty scenario (Scenario A) was: "You are in the classroom with 35 students. You are taking a mathematics midterm exam. The midterm exam is one and a half hours long. You finish



your exam and notice another student scrolling on their phone, occasionally stopping to write something down,” adapted from Schwartz et al. (2013)’s study. Participants can choose to answer the questions, about whether or not they have experienced academic dishonesty. The scenario without academic dishonesty (Scenario B) was the following: “You are in the classroom with 35 students. You are taking a mathematics midterm exam. The midterm exam is one and a half hours long. You can occasionally hear loud construction noises while taking the exam.” For the passive observation study, participants were asked whether they have ever observed any academic dishonesty while attending college. Participants were asked the open-ended question, “At the school, you most recently attended, did you ever witness any type of academic dishonesty?” to check the observation of academic dishonesty. If participants answer “Yes,” participants were given an open-ended question about what type of academic dishonesty they observed. The first and second sections each had the same sets of closed-ended questions. The closed-ended questions were grouped into three categories for dependent variables: satisfaction, motivation, and evaluation.

### ***Measurement of Satisfaction***

The first part of the question gauged the participant’s satisfaction with learning. The questions for satisfaction with learning were adopted from the satisfaction with learning section of a survey from Muñoz-García and Aviles-Herrera (2014). The questions (“I am totally satisfied with what I get from my study and learning time”; “Up to now, I have been able to carry out all the learning tasks given to me more than satisfactorily”; “If I had to study and carry out any assigned learning tasks again, I would do them the same way”; “My use of the time I spend on learning tasks could not be better”; and “In most of my learning tasks, I am almost completely satisfied”) were used in this study (Muñoz-García and Aviles-Herrera, 2014, p.355). The

response options used a 5-point Likert scale of a range of 1 (Very little) to 5 (Very much).

Muñoz-García and Aviles-Herrera (2014) reported a Cronbach's reliability coefficient of .87.

The present study found the value for Cronbach's Alpha for these questions was  $\alpha = .85$ , 95% CI [0.83 – 0.88].

### ***Measurement for Motivation***

The second question set gauged motivation for studying. Questions for motivation for studying were adapted from self-regulation sections of the Motivational Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ; Pintrich et al., 1991). In the manual for MSLQ, there are questions for self-regulation, which represent students' efforts and attention in the face of difficulty. The four questions (“Q1: I often feel so lazy or bored when I study for this class that I quit before I finish what I planned to do”; “Q2: I work hard to do well in this class even if I don't like what we are doing”; “Q3: When coursework is difficult, I give up or only study the easy parts”; and “Q4: Even when course materials are dull and uninteresting, I manage to keep working until I finish”) were used in this study (Pintrich et al., 1991, p.27). The response options ranged from Not at all true of me (1) to Very true of me (7). Q1 and Q3 have reversed coded questions. For Q1 and Q3, the answer scores were reserved before analysis. Pintrich et al., (1991) stated an internal reliability coefficient of .69 for these questions. The present study found the value for Cronbach's Alpha for these questions was  $\alpha = .80$ , 95% CI[0.76 – 0.84].

### ***Measurement for Evaluation of Faculty***

The third question set was for the evaluation of faculty. The researchers adopted questions in the overall evaluation section from the Student Evaluation of Faculty Instrument that is used at John Jay College of Criminal Justice. The Student Evaluation of Faculty Instrument is composed of direct instructional activities, course design and course mechanics,

student relations and student satisfaction with the course, overall evaluation, and demographics. The researchers used the section that measures overall evaluation. The three questions were used: “Overall, the instructor is an effective instructor”; “I would take another class taught by this instructor”; and “I would recommend this instructor to other students” (College Committee on Student Evaluation of the Faculty, 2021, p.315). The response options were 9-point scales from Completely Disagree (1) to Completely Agree (9). The present study found the value for Cronbach’s Alpha for these questions was  $\alpha = .95$ , 95% CI [0.94 – 0.96].

### ***Measurement of Demographics***

The last section of the survey had questions on the race and ethnicity, age, family background, and education level of the participant. Participants were asked which states they have attended college in and how many academic credits they have earned. Additionally, there was a question on whether they have graduated from the institution they attended or not.

### ***Measurement of Instrumental Variables***

Each instrumental variable was measured with a single question. For school size, the question “Was your school big, medium, or small?” gave the option for Big, Medium, Small, or Don’t know. The questions for living in a dormitory, majoring in business, and attending school with an honor code directly asked and requested the respondents to choose “Yes” or “No.” The last questions whether or no knowing the school policy about academic dishonesty requested the participants to choose “Yes,” “No,” and “Don’t know.”

### **Procedure**

Data was collected anonymously from participants in the United States. Participants were invited through Prolific. Participants read and agreed with a consent form before starting the survey. The question asking agreement on the consent form was the only required question in the

survey. When participants answered the required question, they received a reward from Prolific. Participants had the option to withdraw and discontinue their survey at any time. In addition, participants were able to skip any questions that they do not want to answer. The purpose of the study was clearly included at the beginning of the survey. Because the hypothesis might bias participants' answers, the purpose of the study was stated as follows: "The purpose of this study is to gain knowledge about academic dishonesty and how it impacts students."

Participants answered the survey in Qualtrics and submitted the survey online. All participants received the same questions of section 1. In section 2, participants randomly assigned one of two scenarios. Under the scenarios, participants indicated the degree to which they were satisfied with learning, motivated to study, and evaluate faculty and school following scales from the original measurement. All participants were asked the same questions on section 3. For participants who witnessed academic dishonesty, there were questions asking the severity of academic dishonesty of the college that the participant attended, which were "How big a problem was academic dishonesty in the college you most recently attended?" and "At what level in college were you when you witnessed the academic dishonesty." If participants answered "No," participants were not asked these questions. In this section, questions for instrumental variables were asked and participants answered questions about their demographics, followed by questions that ask about where they attended the school and when they graduated from the school.

For missing data, I followed the guidelines by Newman (2014). Newman (2014) recommended reporting all missing data and to use the data with even one response in the analysis. Missing items are presented in table 1, and no outliers were found in the responses.

**Table 1***Missing Items*

| Passive Observation     |       |       |       |       | Total |
|-------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Number of Missing items | 0     | 1     | 7     |       |       |
| Frequency               | 246   | 3     | 1     |       | 250   |
| Probability             | 0.984 | 0.012 | 0.004 |       |       |
| Experimental Study      |       |       |       |       | Total |
| Scenario A              |       |       |       |       | Total |
| Number of Missing items | 0     | 1     |       |       |       |
| Frequency               | 124   | 1     |       |       | 125   |
| Probability             | 0.992 | 0.008 |       |       |       |
| Scenario B              |       |       |       |       | Total |
| Number of Missing items | 0     | 1     | 2     | 12    |       |
| Frequency               | 118   | 5     | 1     | 1     | 125   |
| Probability             | 0.944 | 0.04  | 0.008 | 0.008 |       |

## Results

Data were analyzed using R (R Core Team, 2021). Data was analyzed for sample demographic characteristics, participants' experience with academic dishonesty, the passive observation study and the experimental study.

### Sample

Table 2 presented the participants' demographic characteristics. The 250 participants were between the ages of 20 and 35 years old ( $M = 26.9$ ,  $SD = 5.9$ ). All the participants were U.S. residents. Participants had attended higher educational institutions in the U.S. 70 participants were current students (28%) and 169 participants were not current students (68%). Participants consisted of 121 females (48%), 121 males (48%), and 6 others (6%). Participants consisted of 153 White or Caucasian (61%), 34 Asian or Pacific Islander (14%), 20 Black or African American (8%), 16 Hispanic or Latino (6%), and 24 other and multiracial individuals (9%). Four of the participants had doctorate degrees (2%), 31 had graduate degrees (12%), 150 had undergraduate degrees (60%), 55 had technical/community college degrees (22%), and 10 had others, including secondary education and high school diploma (3%). Regarding economic status

while attending school, 49 participants reported above average (20%). 116 of the participants reported average (46%) and 83 of them reported below average (33%). The schools the participants attended were 44 located in the Midwest (18%), 54 located in the Northeast (33%), 87 located in the South (35%), and 64 located in the West (26%). The participants reported years of graduation from 2008 to expected 2027 as participants were asked to think of the recent school they attended in the survey. The mean of the graduate years was 2018.

**Table2***Demographic Characteristics of Participants*

| Age             | Mean                      | SD                        | Range                | Q1                                | Median              | Q3                             | Missing     |       |
|-----------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|-------------|-------|
|                 | 26.94                     | 5.95                      | 20-35                | 24                                | 27                  | 31                             | 6           |       |
| Sex             | Female                    | Male                      | other                | Prefer not to say                 | Missing             |                                |             | Total |
|                 | 121                       | 121                       | 1                    | 5                                 | 2                   |                                |             | 250   |
|                 | 48%                       | 48%                       | 0.4%                 | 2%                                | 0.8%                |                                |             |       |
| Education       | Doctorate degree          | Graduate degree           | Undergraduate degree | Technical/community college       | Secondary education | High school diploma            | Other       | Total |
|                 | 4                         | 31                        | 150                  | 55                                | 1                   | 8                              | 1           | 250   |
|                 | 2%                        | 12%                       | 60%                  | 22%                               | 0.4%                | 3%                             | 0.4%        |       |
| Economic Status | Above average             | Average                   | Below average        | Missing                           |                     |                                |             | Total |
|                 | 49                        | 116                       | 83                   | 2                                 |                     |                                |             | 250   |
|                 | 20%                       | 46%                       | 33%                  | 0.8%                              |                     |                                |             |       |
| Race            | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black or African American | Hispanic or Latinx   | Native American or Alaskan Native | White or Caucasian  | Race/ethnicity not listed here | Multiracial | Total |
|                 | 34                        | 20                        | 16                   | 3                                 | 153                 | 1                              | 23          | 250   |
|                 | 14%                       | 8%                        | 6%                   | 1%                                | 61%                 | 0.4%                           | 9%          |       |
| Graduate Year   | Min.                      | 1st Qu.                   | Median               | Mean                              | 3rd Qu.             | Max.                           | Missing     |       |
|                 | 2008                      | 2015                      | 2018                 | 2018                              | 2021                | 2027                           | 15          |       |

### Academic Dishonesty

114 of the participants (46%) reported that they had witnessed academic dishonesty while they attended school, and 135 (54%) reported that they had not witnessed it. The academically dishonest acts they witnessed were “Cheating during exams” (65%), “Copying and pasting” (17%), “Cheating on assignments” (13%), and “Written by someone else” (6%). Thirty-one participants who witnessed academic dishonesty were freshmen (27%) when they were witnessing academic dishonesty, 23 were Sophomores (20%), 26 were juniors (23%), 16 were seniors (14%), 12 were Graduates (11%), and 5 did not remember (4%) when they witnessed academic dishonesty. Participants completed 7 scales from Not at all (1) to A very big problem (7) about how they think of the seriousness of academic dishonesty in their schools. Thirty-four participants (14%) reported 1 (Not at all), 64 participants (26%) reported 2, 64 participants (26%) reported 3, 47 participants (19%) reported 4, 30 participants (12%) reported 5, 5 participants (2%) reported 6, and 4 participants (2%) reported 7 (A Very Big Problem).

### Experimental Study

Hotelling's T-squared was used to test the experimental comparison between different scenarios. Protected *t-tests* were used to probe the differences. Table 3 presented the results of Means and SD for participants who received the academic dishonesty scenario and participant who received the construction scenario.

Participants with construction noise scenarios reported lower mean ratings than participants with the cheating scenario. Hotelling's t-test showed significance  $t^2(3, 245) = 31.59, p < .001$ . Table 3 presents the Mean and SD for each scenario and the result of the t-test for three dependent variables. Therefore, the result rejects the null hypothesis of no difference between the means. The results were in the wrong direction to support the hypothesis as



participants who imagined the situation of hearing construction noise during the exam reported lower satisfaction with learning and rated less favorable to faculty than participants who imagined the situation of witnessing academic dishonesty during the exam.

**Table 3**

*Experimental Study*

|              | Cheating |      | No Cheating |      | t    | df     | p     |
|--------------|----------|------|-------------|------|------|--------|-------|
|              | M        | SD   | M           | SD   |      |        |       |
| Satisfaction | 16.82    | 4.1  | 13.91       | 4.37 | 5.41 | 245.68 | <.001 |
| Motivation   | 20.3     | 5.51 | 19.46       | 5.07 | 1.26 | 245.62 | 0.21  |
| Faculty      | 18.62    | 5.78 | 16.77       | 5.4  | 2.61 | 246.08 | 0.01  |

**Passive Observation Study**

All of the potential instrumental variables showed adequate variance. Table 4 presented the outcome of instrumental variables. Regarding schools: 120 participants attended medium-sized schools (48%), and 173 participants (69%) did not live in dormitories while attending school. In addition, 216 participants (86%) did not major in business, and 195 participants (78%) answered that they know the school policy about academic dishonesty. Finally, 223 participants (89%) attended the schools with honor codes.

**Table 4**

*Instrumental Variables*

| School Size    | Big | Medium | Small   | Don't know | Missing | Total | r    |
|----------------|-----|--------|---------|------------|---------|-------|------|
|                | 68  | 120    | 55      | 5          | 2       | 250   | 0.04 |
|                | 27% | 48%    | 22%     | 2%         | 1%      |       |      |
| Dormitory      | Yes | No     |         |            |         | Total | r    |
|                | 77  | 173    |         |            |         | 250   | 0.23 |
|                | 31% | 69%    |         |            |         |       |      |
| Business Major | Yes | No     | Missing |            |         | Total | r    |
|                | 33  | 216    | 1       |            |         | 250   | 0.24 |
|                | 13% | 86%    |         |            |         |       |      |
| Honor Code     | Yes | No     |         |            |         | Total | r    |

|                           |     |     |       |       |
|---------------------------|-----|-----|-------|-------|
|                           | 223 | 27  | 250   | -0.05 |
|                           | 89% | 11% |       |       |
| Familiar to School Policy | Yes | No  | Total | r     |
|                           | 195 | 55  | 250   | 0.15  |
|                           | 78% | 22% |       |       |

In correlation coefficient analysis between independent variables and instrumental variables, school size ( $r = 0.04$ ) and schools with honors codes ( $r = -0.05$ ) showed a near zero correlation with witnessing academic dishonesty. Living in dormitories ( $r = 0.23$ ), majoring in business ( $r = 0.14$ ), and knowing the school policy about academic dishonesty ( $r = 0.15$ ) showed a sufficient correlation with witnessing academic dishonesty. The researchers conducted the analysis without the instrumental variables with a near zero correlation. The instrumental variables with a near zero correlation were used as covariates in the analysis to include them as explanatory variables that might influence dependent variables (Fan, 2010).

To analyze the passive observation data, instrumental variable regression was used to estimate the casual effect using the *ivreg()* function from the AER package (Kleiner & Zeileis, 2008) in R. The causal effect of witnessing academic dishonesty on the dependent variables was estimated using separate 2-stage least-squares instrumental variable regression for each dependent variable and covariates (Kleiner & Zeileis, 2008). For the first hypothesis, participants were less satisfied with learning when they witnessed academic dishonesty ( $b = 3.68$ ,  $t(248)=2.3$ ,  $p=0.02$ , 95% CI [0.54, 6.83]). The second hypothesis revealed no difference in motivation for studying between participants who witnessed academic dishonesty and participants who did not ( $b = 2.75$ ,  $t(248)=1.43$ ,  $p=0.15$ , 95% CI [-1.04, 6.55]). For the third hypothesis, this dataset revealed no difference in the evaluation of faculty between participants who witnessed academic dishonesty and participants who did not ( $b = -0.3$ ,  $t(248)=-0.14$ ,  $p=0.89$ , 95% CI [-4.4, 3.8]).

Table 5 presented the results of passive observation.

**Table 5**

*Passive Observation*

|                    | Estimate | Std. Error | t value | Pr(> t ) | 95% CI |        |
|--------------------|----------|------------|---------|----------|--------|--------|
|                    |          |            |         |          | 2.50%  | 97.50% |
| Satisfaction       |          |            |         |          |        |        |
| (Intercept)        | 13.73    | 2.80       | 4.91    | 0.00     | 8.22   | 19.24  |
| academicdishonesty | 3.68     | 1.60       | 2.31    | 0.02     | 0.54   | 6.83   |
| small              | -0.94    | 0.34       | -2.77   | 0.01     | -1.62  | -0.27  |
| honor              | -0.55    | 0.85       | -0.65   | 0.52     | -2.23  | 1.13   |
| Motivation         |          |            |         |          |        |        |
| (Intercept)        | 18.81    | 3.33       | 5.66    | 0.00     | 12.26  | 25.37  |
| academicdishonesty | 2.75     | 1.93       | 1.43    | 0.15     | -1.04  | 6.55   |
| small              | -0.70    | 0.40       | -1.75   | 0.08     | -1.50  | 0.09   |
| honor              | -1.04    | 1.00       | -1.03   | 0.30     | -3.01  | 0.94   |
| Faculty            |          |            |         |          |        |        |
| (Intercept)        | 22.55    | 3.61       | 6.25    | 0.00     | 15.44  | 29.66  |
| academicdishonesty | -0.30    | 2.08       | -0.14   | 0.89     | -4.40  | 3.80   |
| small              | -0.06    | 0.44       | -0.14   | 0.89     | -0.93  | 0.81   |
| honor              | -1.56    | 1.10       | -1.42   | 0.16     | -3.72  | 0.60   |

The study had attention-check questions asking participants to mark certain answers.

There are 12 participants who failed to answer attention-check questions more than once, such as skipping or answering the item incorrectly. In case participants who failed the attention check questions reported outlier ratings, the researchers conducted the analysis without them. For the first hypothesis with only participants who did not fail the attention questions, the result still showed significance ( $b = 4.27$ ,  $t(236)=2.4$ ,  $p=0.02$ , 95% CI [0.77, 7.76]) that participants reported less satisfaction when they witnessed academic dishonesty. For the second and third hypotheses with only participants who did not fail the attention checks, the result did not indicate

significance as analyses with all participants did not indicate the statistical significance report.

## **Discussion**

In the passive observation study, the results showed that participants who have witnessed academic dishonesty reported less satisfaction with learning than participants who have not witnessed it. This result aligns with Muñoz-García and Aviles-Herrera (2014)'s study, which showed that students who committed academic dishonesty were less satisfied in their life and learning. Likewise, the present study indicates that witnessing peers' dishonest acts, even if the participants did not commit academic dishonesty, impacted the participants' overall satisfaction with learning. This study's results suggest, then, that students' satisfaction with their studies relies at least partially on the academic honesty of their classmates. Moreover, students might carry out all the learning tasks given to them with less satisfaction if they witness peers committing academic dishonesty. Students might not complete their coursework the same as before witnessing academic dishonesty. Witnessing academic dishonesty can lead students to feel decreased satisfaction in all components of a course, such as attending the class itself, completing the homework, and studying the material outside of the class. However, witnessing academic dishonesty has no apparent effect on the motivation for study and evaluation of faculty.

The students' satisfaction with learning in a college is important for improving academic performance and continuous learning after graduating from school. Satisfaction with learning might make students stay interested in the class and focus on the class. Students with high satisfaction with learning would study more and understand the subjects better, so they might show better academic performance in class. With the feeling of satisfaction, people might keep studying and trying to learn different subjects after graduation. Muñoz-García and Aviles-Herrera (2014) showed that lifetime learning is essential for people to develop a positive

perception of their own life and learning abilities. People who kept learning and finished their degrees even showed that they stay in jobs longer, have better health, and have better relationships in their lives than people who dropped out of school (Heckman et al., 2014).

Witnessing academic dishonesty can cause negative emotions such as anger and hostility in the class (Firmin et al., 2007; Firmin et al., 2009). With experiencing negative emotions, it is hard for students to be satisfied with their learning. Satisfaction with learning among students is a major purpose of the college. Therefore, the college may have to have a feasible and concrete plan and policy to decrease academic dishonesty in the class.

In the passive observation study, the motivation for studying did not show significant results. Krou et al. (2021)'s study showed that students with a lack of motivation are more likely to commit academic dishonesty. This study was the first to examine witnessing academic dishonesty and how it may impact students' motivation for study based on the rationale that students are less likely to study hard if they witnessed academic dishonesty. The possible reason for not showing significant results could be that students might rationalize their peers' actions when they witnessed them (Firmin et al., 2007). With rationalization, students might ignore others committing academic dishonesty. In addition, students might not bother if their performance is not dependent on others' performances. Therefore, when students witnessed academic dishonesty, they might be less willing to respond to academic dishonesty (Firmin et al., 2009). As a result, witnessing academic dishonesty did not affect participants' motivation to study.

In the passive observation study, the evaluation of faculty did not show significant results. Based on Broeckelman-Post (2008)'s study finding that Faculty's reactions to and handling of academic dishonesty are effective in preventing academic dishonesty and Wenzel

and Reinhard (2020)'s study indicating students' negative evaluations of a learning situation could increase academic dishonesty, the present study was the first study to examine whether witnessing academic dishonesty may have an effect on evaluating faculty based on the rationale that faculty might be vital figures to create an education environment. The reason for not showing significant results could be that the survey asked participants to remember a typical instructor when they answered the questions and not the faculty member of the class when they witnessed academic dishonesty. Participants might remember their favorable instructors when they think of the typical instructor. Moreover, faculty might not be the main reason that they decided to commit to witnessing academic dishonesty. The study reported that peer pressure was the reason that students decided to commit academic dishonesty (Bäker & Mechtel, 2019). There might be a weak connection between witnessing academic dishonesty and negative evaluation of faculty because faculty members were not directly involved in academic dishonesty.

### **Academic Dishonesty**

As previous studies showed 70-80% of students might have engaged in academic dishonesty, 46% of participants were witnessing academic dishonesty in college (Austin et al., 2006; Williams et al., 2014). The present study found that academic dishonesty is common even though 78% of participants answered that they know the school policy on academic dishonesty and 89% of participants said that they attended the school with honor codes. The result of the present study might indicate that school policy about academic dishonesty is not effective to prevent the academic dishonesty, and schools with honor codes might need to revise their school policy to prevent students from committing academic dishonesty in order to meet the expectation as schools with honor codes.

While they attended school, almost half of the participants witnessed academic

dishonesty, mainly in the form of cheating during exams, often by using a computer or phone to find the answers online during the exam, cheating via group messaging apps to share the answers, using notes that were not allowed, and having some students take exams for others. Along with Minarcik and Bridges (2015)'s qualitative research indicating that Internet based library research and studying makes it harder to prevent academic dishonesty, the present study found that participants witnessed the most academic dishonesty (34%) as involving using technology that is not permitted during quizzes and tests in in-person and remote classes when they described the witnessed academic dishonesty. One participant answered that, "The online classes we have are very easy to manipulate and cheat on, and a good portion of students take advantage of the school's loose investment in them." It might point out that there is not enough systematic prevention to decrease academic dishonesty while using the Internet. In addition, some participants mentioned that the "T[he t]eacher didn't care and wouldn't report higher up," and that "Students discussed exam answers once the teacher left the room." As Broeckelman-Post (2008)'s study indicated that how faculty members reacted and handled academic dishonesty is important to prevent academic dishonesty, it might indicate that faculty members need to show their interests to prevent academic dishonesty so students might be attentive and cautious about academic dishonesty.

### **Implications for Practice**

Preventing academic dishonesty in higher education is important to cultivate professionals who are aware of ethical problems and knowledgeable on solutions to increase mortality in the field. The study confirmed that academic dishonesty is still prevalent in universities as previous studies found (Austin et al., 2006; Williams et al., 2014). To decrease academic dishonesty, there might need more involvement and efforts from peers. As almost half

of the participants witnessed academic dishonesty, peers can be a good source of preventing academic dishonesty. If the majority of students are opposed to committing academic dishonesty, there might be less academic dishonesty in the class as the peer pressure is the important reason whether or not students commit academic dishonesty (McCabe et al., 2006; Murdock & Anderman, 2006; Geddes, 2011; Bäker & Mechtel, 2019). Peer pressure could be used for other students.

### **Limitations and Future Research**

The experiment's results are not interpretable. The construction noise scenario might not be a comparable interruption without the element of witnessing academic dishonesty. The present study indicated that there were more negative impacts on student's satisfaction with learning, motivation for study, and evaluation of faculty if there is construction noise during the exam. The construction noise during the exam might cause stress on students about their performance on tests. Students might think that faculty should address these issues by changing the classroom or choosing different dates for the exam. Apparently, the construction noise was more salient than witnessing academic dishonesty during the test when participants measured their satisfaction with learning and evaluation of faculty. There was no significant difference in motivation for studying. As a consequence, the hypotheses were not adequately tested by the present study. The comparable scenario must be considered as having a similar impact, and it might be a good idea to run the preliminary test with a small sample before choosing the scenario. The preliminary test can give the idea to figure out the comparative scenario has similar impacts on the population.

The study did not account for the grading system, which might influence students' academic experience. The grading system can be a moderation of the effect of witnessing



academic dishonesty when students assess their satisfaction with learning, motivation of studying, and evaluation for faculty. The reason that witnessing academic dishonesty did not have a negative impact might be because others' academic dishonesty might not impact participants' grades or performance rates. If the grading system is decided by comparing with other students' performance, witnessing academic dishonesty might have a negative impact on students' satisfaction, motivation, and evaluation of faculty. For instance, under a norm-referenced scoring system, others' performance will decide one's result of performance (Cuhadar & Gelbal, 2021). A future study might need to consider the grading system to capture the effect of witnessing academic dishonesty on students' college education experience.

Another limitation of this study might be that this study did not consider students' internal factors. There are internal factors of participants who might have different views on academic dishonesty and are prone to commit academic dishonesty. Internal factors, such as personal morality and self-control, could affect the views on academic dishonesty (Reisig & Bain; 2016). Some participants with low personal morality and self-control could be prone to committing academic dishonesty and would not consider the influence of academic dishonesty. Therefore, witnessing academic dishonesty would not impact their opinions about the satisfaction of learning, motivation for studying, and evaluation of faculty. A suggestion for the future study is to include individual factors to capture how personal views on academic dishonesty might be related to participants' judgments to witness others' academic dishonesty.

The limitation of this study was that the study used non-random sampling by using voluntary samples and selecting participants' criteria of age ranges and education levels. Non-probability samples may not be comparable to probability samples and can have different results that may not be accurate as done by probability sample (Yeager et al., 2011). As a result, the

sample might not represent the population and can have biases to the prevalence of academic dishonesty and attitude toward academic dishonesty. As the participants completed a higher education level, the sample might have more chances to witness academic dishonesty and have more tolerance for it. In addition, even though web-based research allows the researcher to recruit large samples, the sampling process from the Internet might not result in the representativeness of the general population and the external validity of the research (O'Neil, 2002; Miller et al., 2010).

## References

- American Psychological Association. (2020). Publication manual of the American Psychological Association (7th ed.). *American Psychological Association*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0000165-000>
- Arnold, R., Martin, B. N., & Bigby, L. (2007). Is There a Relationship Between Honor Codes and Academic Dishonesty? *Journal of College and Character*, 8(2).  
<https://doi.org/10.2202/1940-1639.1164>
- Austin, Z., Collins, D., Remillard, A., Kelcher, S., & Chui, S. (2006). Influence of attitudes toward curriculum on dishonest academic behavior. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 70(3), 50–50. <https://doi.org/10.5688/aj700350>
- Bäker, A., & Mechtel, M. (2019). The impact of peer presence on cheating. *Economic Inquiry*, 57(2), 792–812. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecin.12760>
- Beasley, E. M. (2016). Comparing the demographics of students reported for academic dishonesty to those of the overall student population. *Ethics & Behavior*, 26(1), 45–62.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10508422.2014.978977>
- Bollen, K. A. (2012). Instrumental variables in sociology and the social sciences. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 38(1), 37–72. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-081309-150141>
- Broeckelman-Post, M. A. (2008). Faculty and student classroom influences on academic dishonesty. *IEEE Transactions on Education*, 51(2), 206–211.  
<https://doi.org/10.1109/TE.2007.910428>
- Center for Academic Integrity (2005). CAI research.  
<http://www.waunakee.k12.wi.us/hs/departments/lmtc/Assignments/McConnellScenarios/>

AcadHonesty\_5Article.pdf.

Bronk, K. C. (2013). Purpose in life: A critical component of optimal youth development

(2014th ed.). *Springer Netherlands*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-7491-9>

College Committee on Student Evaluation of the Faculty. (2021). College council agenda & attachments. *John Jay College of Criminal Justice*.

[https://www.jjay.cuny.edu/sites/default/files/governance/CC\\_Agenda\\_5\\_11\\_2021.pdf](https://www.jjay.cuny.edu/sites/default/files/governance/CC_Agenda_5_11_2021.pdf)

Cuhadar, & Gelbal, S. (2021). An Evaluation of Pass/Fail Decisions through Norm- and Criterion-Referenced Assessments. *International Journal of Assessment Tools in Education*, 8(1), 9–. <https://doi.org/10.21449/ijate.747105>

Davis, S. F., Noble, L. M., Zak, E. N., & Dreyer, K. K. (1994). A comparison of cheating and learning/grade orientation in American and Australian college students. *College Student Journal*, 28(3), 353–356.

DeVries, D. L., & Ajzen, I. (1971). The relationship of attitudes and normative beliefs to cheating in college. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 83(2), 199–207.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1971.9922463>

Drake, C. A. (1941). Why students cheat. *Journal of Higher Education*, 12, 418–420.

Fan, S. (Ed.) (2010). (Vols. 1-0). SAGE Publications, Inc.,

<https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412961288>

Firmin, M. W., Burger, A., & Blosser, M. (2007). Cognitive responses of students who witness classroom cheating. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 34(2), 110–116.

Firmin, M. W., Burger, A., & Blosser, M. (2009). Affective responses of students who witness classroom cheating. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 32(3), 3–15.

Forsyth, D. R., Pope, W. R., & McMillan, J. H. (1985). Students' reactions after cheating: An

- attributional analysis. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 10(1), 72–82.  
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0361-476X\(85\)90007-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0361-476X(85)90007-4)
- Geddes, K. A. (2011). Academic dishonesty among gifted and high-achieving students. *Gifted Child Today Magazine*, 34(2), 50–56. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107621751103400214>
- Heckman J. J., Humphries, J. E., & Kautz, T. (2014). *The Myth of Achievement Tests: The GED and the Role of Character in American Life*, The University of Chicago Press.
- Hodgkinson, Curtis, H., MacAlister, D., & Farrell, G. (2016). Student Academic Dishonesty: The Potential for Situational Prevention. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 27(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10511253.2015.1064982>
- Huss, M. T., Curnyn, J. P., Roberts, S. L., Davis, S. F., Yandell, L., & Giordano, P. (1993). Hard driven but not dishonest: cheating and the type A personality. *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society*, 31(5), 429–430.
- Jendrek, M. P. (1989). Faculty reactions to academic dishonesty. *Journal of College Student Development*, 30(5), 401–406.
- Kisamore, Stone, T. H., & Jawahar, I. M. (2007). Academic Integrity: The Relationship between Individual and Situational Factors on Misconduct Contemplations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 75(4), 381–394. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-006-9260-9>
- Konheim-Kalkstein Y. L., Stellmack, M. A., & Shilkey, M. L. (2008). Comparison of Honor Code and Non-Honor Code Classrooms at a Non-Honor Code University. *Journal of College and Character*, 9(3). <https://doi.org/10.2202/1940-1639.1115>
- Kleiber, C., Zeileis, A. (2008). *Applied Econometrics with R*. Springer-Verlag, New York. ISBN 978-0-387-77316-2, <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=AER>.
- Krou, M. R., Fong, C. J., & Hoff, M. A. (2021). Achievement motivation and academic

- dishonesty: A Meta-Analytic Investigation. *Educational Psychology Review*, 33(2), 427–458. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-020-09557-7>
- McCabe, D. L., Butterfield, K. D., & Treviño, L. K. (2006). Academic dishonesty in graduate business programs: Prevalence, causes, and proposed action. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 5(3), 294–305. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMLE.2006.22697018>
- Miller, J., J., Dunn, M., Fry, C. L., & Degenhardt, L. (2010). Comparing Probability and Non-Probability Sampling Methods in Ecstasy Research: Implications for the Internet as a Research Tool. *Substance Use & Misuse*, 45(3), 437–450. <https://doi.org/10.3109/10826080903452470>
- Minarcik, J., & Bridges, A. J. (2015). Psychology graduate students weigh in: Qualitative analysis of academic dishonesty and suggestion prevention strategies. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 13(2), 197–216. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-015-9230-x>
- Muñoz-García, A., & Aviles-Herrera, M. J. (2014). Effects of academic dishonesty on dimensions of spiritual well-being and satisfaction: a comparative study of secondary school and university students. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 39(3), 349–363. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2013.832729>
- Murdock, T. B., & Anderman, E. M. (2006). Motivational perspectives on student cheating: Toward an integrated model of academic dishonesty. *Educational Psychologist*, 41(3), 129–145. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep4103\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep4103_1)
- Newman, D. A. (2014). Missing data: Five practical guidelines. *Organizational Research Methods*, 17(4), 372–411. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428114548590>
- O’Neil. (2002). Web-based experimental research in psychology and law: Methodological variables that may affect dropout rates, sample characteristics, and verdicts. ProQuest

Dissertations Publishing.

- Pintrich, P. R. (1991). A Manual for the Use of the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ). <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED338122.pdf>
- Quaye, B. R. L. (2010). Understanding contextual influences on undergraduate students' decisions about academic cheating. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*. (3436095).
- R Core Team (2021). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- Reeve, J. (2009). *Understanding motivation and emotion* (5th ed.). Hoboken: Wiley.
- Reisig, M. D., & Bain, S. N. (2016). University legitimacy and student compliance with academic dishonesty codes: A partial test of the process-based model of self-regulation. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 43(1), 83–101.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854815611165>
- Schwartz, B. M., Tatum, H. E., & Hageman, M. C. (2013). College students' perceptions of and responses to cheating at traditional, modified, and non-honor system institutions. *Ethics & Behavior*, 23(6), 463–476. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10508422.2013.814538>
- Smyth, M. L., & Davis, J. R. (2004). Perceptions of Dishonesty among Two-Year College Students: Academic versus Business Situations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 51(1), 63–73.  
<https://doi.org/10.1023/B:BUSI.0000032347.79241.3c>
- Tatum, H. E., Schwartz, B. M., Hageman, M. C., & Koretke, S. L. (2018). College students' perceptions of and responses to academic dishonesty: An investigation of type of honor code, institution size, and student-faculty ratio. *Ethics & Behavior*, 28(4), 302–315.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/10508422.2017.1331132>

- Tippitt M. P., Ard, N., Kline, J. R., Tilghman, J., Chamberlain, B., & Meagher, P. G. (2009). Creating environments that foster academic integrity. *Nursing Education Perspectives*, 30(4), 239–244.
- Wajda-Johnston, V. A., Handal, P. J., Brawer, P. A., & Fabricatore, A. N. (2001). Academic dishonesty at the graduate level. *Ethics & Behavior*, 11(3), 287–305.
- [https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327019EB1103\\_7](https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327019EB1103_7)
- Wenzel, K., & Reinhard, M.-A. (2020). Tests and academic cheating: do learning tasks influence cheating by way of negative evaluations? *Social Psychology of Education*, 23(3), 721–753. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-020-09556-0>
- Whitley, B., & Keith-Spiegel, P. (2002). *Academic dishonesty: An educator's guide*. Lawrence Erlbaum
- Williams, S., M. Tanner, J. Beard, and J. Chacko. (2014). Academic misconduct among business students: A comparison of the U.S. and UAE. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 12(1): 65–73.
- Wideman, M. (2008). Academic dishonesty in postsecondary education: A literature review. *Transformative Dialogues: Teaching & Learning Journal*, 2, 1–12.
- Wisesa, A., Pringgabayu, D., Pritasari, A., Ramdlany, D. M. A., & Hidayanti, N. (2019). Is university students' value orientation toward integrity behind their decision to cheat or not cheat in exams? *Gadjah Mada International Journal of Business*, 21(1), 91–108.
- <https://doi.org/10.22146/gamaijb.25755>
- Yeager D.S., Krosnick, J. A., Chang, L., Javitz, H. S., Levendusky, M. S., Simpser, A., & Wang, R. (2011). Comparing the Accuracy of RDD Telephone Surveys and Internet Surveys Conducted with Probability and Non-Probability Samples. *Public Opinion Quarterly*,



75(4), 709–747. <https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfr020>

Yu, H., Glanzer, P. L., Sriram, R., Johnson, B. R., & Moore, B. (2017). What contributes to college students' cheating? A study of individual factors. *Ethics & Behavior*, 27(5), 401–422. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10508422.2016.1169535>

Yu, G., P. L., Johnson, B. R., Sriram, R., & Moore, B. (2018). Why College Students Cheat: A Conceptual Model of Five Factors. *Review of Higher Education*, 41(4), 549–576. <https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2018.0025>

## Appendix

### Academic Dishonesty Survey

Please think of the most recent college or university from which you graduated. Please answer all questions referring to this institution. The questions below will refer to this college or university as your school.

*Section 1.* The section is based on your experience while attending your school. Check the answers that most accurately represent your experience in your school.

1. I am totally satisfied with what I get from my study and learning time:  
 Very Little                      Little                      Neutral                      Much                      Very  
 Much

                                                                                      

2. Up to now, I have been able to carry out all the learning tasks given to me more than satisfactorily:

Very Little                      Little                      Neutral                      Much                      Very Much

                                                                                      

3. If I had to study and carry out any assigned learning tasks again, I would do them the same way:

Very Little                      Little                      Neutral                      Much                      Very

Much

                                                                                      

4. My use of the time I spend on learning tasks could not be better:

Very Little                      Little                      Neutral                      Much                      Very Much

                                                                                      

5. In most of my learning tasks, I am almost completely satisfied:

Very Little                      Little                      Neutral                      Much                      Very Much

                                                                                      

*For questions 6 and 7, think of a typical course that you took while attending your school*

6. I will often feel so lazy or bored when I study for this class that I quit before I finish what I planned to do:

Not at all true of me    1    2    3    4    5    6    7    Very true of me

7. I will work hard to do well in this class even if I don't like what we are doing:

Not at all true of me    1    2    3    4    5    6    7    Very true of me

8. When coursework is difficult, I will give up or only study the easy parts:

Not at all true of me    1    2    3    4    5    6    7    Very true of me

9. Even when course materials are dull and uninteresting, I will manage to keep working until I finish:

Not at all true of me    1    2    3    4    5    6    7    Very true of me

Think of a specific instructor who you would consider representing the typical instructor during your experience at school. Answer the following questions about that instructor.

10. Overall, the instructor is an effective instructor:

1 Completely Disagree

- 2
- 3 Disagree
- 4
- 5 Neither Agree nor Disagree
- 6
- 7 Agree
- 8
- 9 Completely Agree

11. I can answer this question. (please mark 9)

- 1 Completely Disagree
- 2
- 3 Disagree
- 4
- 5 Neither Agree nor Disagree
- 6
- 7 Agree
- 8
- 9 Completely Agree

12. I would take another class taught by this instructor:

- 1 Completely Disagree
- 2
- 3 Disagree
- 4
- 5 Neither Agree nor Disagree
- 6
- 7 Agree
- 8
- 9 Completely Agree

13. I would recommend this instructor to other students:

- 1 Completely Disagree
- 2
- 3 Disagree
- 4
- 5 Neither Agree nor Disagree
- 6
- 7 Agree
- 8
- 9 Completely Agree

*Section 2.*

Situation A: You are in the classroom with 35 students. You are taking a mathematics midterm exam. The midterm exam is one and a half hours long. You finish your exam and notice another student scrolling on their phone, occasionally stopping to write something down.

Situation B: You are in the classroom with 35 students. You are taking a mathematics midterm exam. The midterm exam is one and a half hours long. You can occasionally hear loud construction noise while taking the exam.

Choose the answer that best represents how you would respond in this situation.

14. I am totally satisfied with what I get from my study and learning time:

|             |        |         |      |      |
|-------------|--------|---------|------|------|
| Very Little | Little | Neutral | Much | Very |
|-------------|--------|---------|------|------|

|                          |                          |                          |                          |  |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> |                          |                          |                          |  |

15. Up to now, I have been able to carry out all the learning tasks given to me more than satisfactorily:

|             |        |         |      |           |
|-------------|--------|---------|------|-----------|
| Very Little | Little | Neutral | Much | Very Much |
|-------------|--------|---------|------|-----------|

|                          |                          |                          |                          |  |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> |                          |                          |                          |  |

16. If I had to study and carry out any assigned learning tasks again, I would do them the same way:

|             |        |         |      |           |
|-------------|--------|---------|------|-----------|
| Very Little | Little | Neutral | Much | Very Much |
|-------------|--------|---------|------|-----------|

|                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

17. My use of the time I spend on learning tasks could not be better:

|             |        |         |      |           |
|-------------|--------|---------|------|-----------|
| Very Little | Little | Neutral | Much | Very Much |
|-------------|--------|---------|------|-----------|

|                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> |                          |                          |                          |                          |

18. I cannot answer this question. (please mark Very Little)

|             |        |         |      |           |
|-------------|--------|---------|------|-----------|
| Very Little | Little | Neutral | Much | Very Much |
|-------------|--------|---------|------|-----------|

|                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> |                          |                          |                          |                          |

19. In most of my learning tasks, I am almost completely satisfied:

|             |        |         |      |           |
|-------------|--------|---------|------|-----------|
| Very Little | Little | Neutral | Much | Very Much |
|-------------|--------|---------|------|-----------|

|                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> |                          |                          |                          |                          |

20. I will often feel so lazy or bored when I study for this class that I quit before I finish what I planned to do:

|                       |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |                 |
|-----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----------------|
| Not at all true of me | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Very true of me |
|-----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----------------|

21. I will work hard to do well in this class even if I don't like what we are doing:

|                       |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |                 |
|-----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----------------|
| Not at all true of me | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Very true of me |
|-----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----------------|

22. When coursework is difficult, I will give up or only study the easy parts:

|                       |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |                 |
|-----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----------------|
| Not at all true of me | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Very true of me |
|-----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----------------|

23. Even when course materials are dull and uninteresting, I will manage to keep working until I finish:

|                       |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |                 |
|-----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----------------|
| Not at all true of me | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Very true of me |
|-----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----------------|

24. Overall, the instructor is an effective instructor:

- 1 Completely Disagree
- 2
- 3 Disagree
- 4
- 5 Neither Agree nor Disagree
- 6
- 7 Agree
- 8
- 9 Completely Agree

25. There is an even number of nails in the White House (please mark 5)

- 1 Completely Disagree
- 2
- 3 Disagree
- 4
- 5 Neither Agree nor Disagree
- 6
- 7 Agree
- 8
- 9 Completely Agree

26. I would take another class taught by this instructor:

- 1 Completely Disagree
- 2
- 3 Disagree
- 4
- 5 Neither Agree nor Disagree
- 6
- 7 Agree
- 8
- 9 Completely Agree

27. I would recommend this instructor to other students:

- 1 Completely Disagree
- 2
- 3 Disagree
- 4
- 5 Neither Agree nor Disagree
- 6
- 7 Agree
- 8
- 9 Completely Agree

*Section 3.* Academic dishonesty is utilizing any unauthorized method to complete a task, such as plagiarism using the Internet, cheating on an exam, and copying others' work.

28. At the school from which you graduated, did you ever witness any type of academic dishonesty? Yes  No

If you said yes, please answer the following three questions:

- a) Can you describe what kind of academic dishonesty you observed? If you witnessed academic dishonesty more than once, can you describe the most memorable instance?
- b) At what level in school were you when you witnessed the academic dishonesty?  
Freshman  Sophomore  Junior  Senior  Graduate  Do not remember

29. How big a problem was academic dishonesty in the school you most from which you most recently graduated?

Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 A very big problem

30. Was your school big, medium, or small?

Big  Medium  Small  Don't know

31. Did you live in a dormitory? Yes  No

32. Did you major in business? Yes  No

33. Did your school have an honor code? Yes  No

34. Did you know what your school policy about academic dishonesty was?

Yes  No  Don't know

#### Demographic Questions

35. How many years old are you?

36. What sex are you?

- Female  
 Male  
 Other (Please specify)  
 Rather not say

37. What is your ethnicity? Mark all that apply

- Asian or Pacific Islander  
 Black or African American  
 Hispanic or Latino  
 Native American or Alaskan Native  
 White or Caucasian  
 Race/ethnicity not listed here-Please specify [                      ]

38. What was your family financial background when you were in school?

- Above average  
 Average  
 Below average

39. Where is the school you attended located? (Please enter a US state, US territory, or country other than the US.)

40. What is the highest degree or level of school you have completed?

- No formal qualifications
- Secondary education (e.g. GED)
- High school diploma
- Technical/community college
- Undergraduate degree (BA/BSc/other)
- Graduate degree (MA/MSc/MPhil/other)
- Doctorate degree (PhD/other)
- Don't know / not applicable
- Other (please specify)

41. What year did you graduate from the school?

