

The effects of task completed more than once in regards to students cheating and ...

[Profession](#), [Student](#)



Psyc307 - Cognitive Psychology

Abstract2

1. 4. Introduction4

1. 5. Method5

1. 5. 1. Design6

1. 5. 3. Apparatus7

1. 5. 4. Procedure7

1. 6. Results8

1. 7. Discussion10

Limitations of Research11

Directions for future research11

References: 11

Abstract

The following study intended to understand if individuals were more expected to cheat when told in advance that there would only be one task and that there would be no way of getting caught. The enticement to cheat was the more inquiries responded accurately the more odds you would have of being able to win something such as a mini iPad. In this experiment, there were exactly one hundred Psychology University students that were randomly carefully chosen to participate in three dissimilar types of cheating tasks - permitted to cheat (with any type of information), permitted to cheat (with information) and not permitted to cheat (control group).

Lab Report Assessment on Cheating and Dishonesty

1. 4. Introduction

Recent studies have been showing that academic cheating is a form of behavior that is highly noticeable to educators nevertheless is challenging for experimentalists. Educators have instant concerns in regards to cheating for the reason that its occurrence appears to distort the assessment of learning (Rettinger, 2009). What's more, cheating appears to be something that students will do even if they know in advance what the situation will be. Some cases of cheating still exist even with the multiple exposures to the cheating. (Becker, 2009). One problem with all of these studies is that, with the exclusion of the original work by Becker is trying to figure out was will lower cheating (Jenkel, 2012) and what kind of methods can be used in decreasing this dishonesty. In addition, other research points out that lower cheating is impossible because some people cheat because it is in their genes (Day, 2011).

One theory that has been used is called the genes theory. However, the key issue with the good genes theory is that no one has ever been able to actually nail down precisely what genes causes a person to cheat (as talked about in Mazar & Ariely, 2006). In a recent study, there has been some demonstration that mentioned that even when the probability of getting caught is zero, partakers still decide to cheat " a little bit" (Schuhmann, 2013). The gene theory explores the fact that a person has an altered chromosome in their brain that causes them to cheat no matter what. Even with multiple exposures to cheating task. This gene is suppose to be more dominant in men that it is in women because research shows that men will cheat more often than women. The present investigation is similar to other

research that has been done because it sets out find out rather or not multiple experiences to the cheating task will guide to lesser levels of cheating, especially when students are told way ahead of time that they will be revealed to the task many times before the task actually starts.

. Cheating is something that is almost universally condemned nevertheless is extensively engaged on a constant basis (Zito, 2010). Cheating appears to be on the rise especially if people are put in a desperate situations. Research shows that in desperate situations have required desperate measure for people regardless of their moral or the consequences. On the flip side, some studies have shown that knowing the consequences ahead of time for some does cause them not to cheat even with the exposure (Mazar N. &, 2006). More recently, Mazar, Amir and Ariely (2008) demonstrated that even when the likelihood of getting caught, participants still take the risk. With that said, it is hypothesized in the study that people are more likely to be dishonest when told there is only one task, with the incentive of winning an iPad mini and that there was no way of getting caught. It is also hypothesized that dishonesty would decrease with the knowledge that there is more than one task and that there would be no effect with the control group.

1. 5. Method

While teaching an English course at a private university, it was suggested that the choice to cheat is motivated by an evaluation of the difference between the possible profits of cheating and their associated losses. One of the authors provided the students with a take home problem as a segment of a mid-term exam. This University does have an honor code which orders that students abstain from cheating and that they reveal occurrences of

cheating which they perceive. However, when the professor gave out the assignment, students were then told openly to not work with other students, even though much of their previous assignments had been done in teams. Furthermore, in class the students were told that they should not even go to the computer or the Web.

1. 5. 1. Design

This study will utilize an experimental manipulation in order to measure cheating attitudes when while participants are told in advance that they will be exposed to the task multiple times before the task begins. The researcher chose methodology that had previously been introduced by (Woodbine, 2013). Utilizing classroom "essays" that presented four conditions: mastery culture/poor pedagogy mastery culture/good pedagogy; mastery culture/poor pedagogy; performance culture/poor pedagogy performance culture/good pedagogy;. The independent variable are the essays. The dependent variable is "levels of cheating and dishonesty".

1. 5. 2. Participants

The participants were 64 undergraduate students in an English course at a university. Around two-thirds of the students were in the college of liberal arts, and nineteen were in the college of medicine. Age ranged very little as the undergraduate student population is almost entirely traditional. For the reason of incomplete responses by some students, the amount of subjects whose responses are analyzed below was brought down to 55. Participants took part in the study unwittingly and as a result remained totally naive about the purpose and aims of the study.

1. 5. 3. Apparatus

After getting the approval from our university's Institutional Review Board, which says that that study participants have given their informed consent, graduate and undergraduate students were then recruited from regular school classrooms. They then went on to finish up two internet surveys that will take place over the next two weeks (to lessen common process variance). Their confidentiality was guaranteed by asking them to make a personal, numerical code in order to utilize on both of the questionnaires. Personality measures were used on the first survey (utilizing Oliver P. John's 44-item Big Five Inventory) (Woodbine, 2013); the additional survey at random showed one of four essays telling classroom culture (mastery vs. performance) and pedagogy (good vs. poor).

1. 5. 4. Procedure

Dependent measure was used in this experimentation. During the second survey it would also involve the dependent variables (Day, 2011):

- Explanation of cheating (. " I realize why a student may cheat in Dr. Howard's class).
- Dishonesty of cheating; higher scores display cheating is less moral (e. g. " It is not right to cheat on tests in Dr. Howard's' class").
- Probability of cheating " With a scale of 1-7, how expected are students in Dr. Howard's class to cheat on a test?"; " Supposing there are 20 students in Dr. Howards' class, what amount of students do you think will still go ahead and just to cheat on the test?"
- Putting the blame on the teacher or the student was calculated by two items each:
 - Blaming the student: " If a student cheated on Dr. Howard's test, would you

put the blame on her or him”; “ If a student was to cheated in Dr. Howard’s class, would it be the fault of the student?”

- Putting the blaming on the teacher: “ If a student made the choice to cheat on a test in Dr. Howards’ class, would you put the blame Dr. Howard?” and “ If a student in Dr. Howard’ class decided to cheat on a test, would it be the fault of Dr. Howard’?

1. 6. Results

As predicted, the researcher discovered main effects for classroom context variables of mastery versus performance culture and good versus poor pedagogy on cheating approaches when told in advance that they will be exposed to the task multiple times before the task begins. Mirroring preceding analytical actions (Rettinger, 2009)the Hypotheses 2a and 2bwere both tested with multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA). However the two context variables created what was known as a 2 × 2 design: mastery culture/good pedagogy (N = 43); mastery culture/poor education (N = 45); performance culture/good pedagogy (N = 46); performance culture/poor education (N = 48).

1. 7. Discussion

The results of our hypothesis confirmed our predictions that people who were not told about the amount of trials reported significantly more correctly solved problems as those who were told about the 5 trials and the control group. Students greater in carefulness are less likely to validate cheating, more likely to see it as dishonest, and less probable to consider it will happen, than are those who are lesser in carefulness. They are also more

probable to blame students, instead of the teacher, when it comes to cheating.

The researcher's findings also display that the males vs. females ratio context does seem to predict the cheating attitudes among the sexes. Male students in specific when told in ahead of time that they will be wide-open to the task multiple times before the task initiates in classrooms with mastery cultures, where learning is the lead objective, are less likely to justify cheating or see it as more probable, than those that were in performance cultures where the grade is every bit vital. However, females in specific when are told in ahead of time that they will be wide-open to the task multiple times before the task initiates in classrooms with good instead of poor pedagogy are less probable to justify their cheating, less likely to believe it is possible, and more likely to look at it as being immoral; the females allocate more blame for cheating to the student. With that said, these findings are similar to those discovered in previous studies with male vs. females.

When examining whether these personality traits cooperate with classroom context, some conclusions are steady with the researcher's predictions. Careful students appear to be the ones that are showing less favorable attitudes toward when it comes to cheating: it appears that they are less likely to put the blame on the teacher, even when the pedagogy is considered to be poor. Students in specific when told in ahead of time that they will be wide-open to the task multiple times before the task instructs higher in openness to experience are less probable to see cheating as justified, irrespective of the classroom culture.

Limitations of Research

One limitation of our study is that our dependent variables are attitudes that are in regards about cheating, instead of cheating behavior itself. Even though research designs studying actual cheating may deliver more direct evidence in regards to behavior, they are more harder. On the other hand, past theory and research support that attitudes are projecting of behavior (Day, 2011) and that attitudes about dishonesty or moral behavior are connected with actual cheating (Sierra, 2006).

Directions for future research

As talked about above, increasing the range of personality and other individual change measures would progress our understanding of the person and the context in forecasting cheating. Other personality concepts, for instance locus of control and self efficacy, could display sturdier results when in communication with context variables. Further research would need to examine other context variables that may could forecast cheating. For instance, business students' characters could reflect the school's disciplinary strengths (Jenkel, 2012); if this is factual, programs highlighting moral behavior and attitudes could permit business schools to entice and/or progress personality traits related with honesty.

References:

- Becker, D. R. (2009). The ethic of care and student cheating. *Journal of American Academy of Business, Cambridge*, 14(2), 204-209.
- Day, N. E. (2011). Student or situation? personality and classroom context as predictors of attitudes about business school cheating. *Social Psychology of Education : An International Journal*, 34(6), 261-282.

- Jenkel, I. &. (2012). Influences on students' decisions to report cheating: A laboratory experiment. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 10(2), 123-136.
- Mazar, N. &. (2006). Dishonesty in Everyday Life and its Policy Implications.”. *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing*, 25(1), 117-126.
- Mazar, N. A. (2008). The dishonesty of honest people: a theory of self-concept maintainance. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 45, 633-644.
- Rettinger, D. A. (2009). Situational and personal causes of student cheating. *Research in Higher Education*, 50(3), 293-313.
- Schuhmann, P. W. (2013). Using the scenario method to analyze cheating behaviors. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 11(1), 213-234.
- Sierra, J. J. (2006). A dual-process model of cheating intentions. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 28(3), 193-204.
- Woodbine, G. F. (2013). Dishonesty in the classroom: The effect of cognitive dissonance and the mitigating influence of religious commitment. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 11(2), 139-155.
- Zito, N. &. (2010). Cheating themselves out of an education: Assignments that promote higher-order thinking and honesty in the middle grades. *Middle School Journal*,, 42(2), 6-16.