



Libraries and Learning Services

University of Auckland Research Repository, ResearchSpace

Version

This is the Accepted Manuscript version. This version is defined in the NISO recommended practice RP-8-2008 <http://www.niso.org/publications/rp/>

Suggested Reference

Stephens, J. M. (2017). How to Cheat and Not Feel Guilty: Cognitive Dissonance and its Amelioration in the Domain of Academic Dishonesty. *Theory Into Practice*, 56(2), 111-120. doi: [10.1080/00405841.2017.1283571](https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2017.1283571)

Copyright

Items in ResearchSpace are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved, unless otherwise indicated. Previously published items are made available in accordance with the copyright policy of the publisher.

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published in *Theory Into Practice* on 08 Mar 2017, available online:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00405841.2017.1283571>

For more information, see [General copyright](#), [Publisher copyright](#), [SHERPA/RoMEO](#).

Jason M. Stephens

How to Cheat and Not Feel Guilty: Cognitive Dissonance and its Amelioration in the Domain of Academic Dishonesty

QUERY SHEET

This page lists questions we have about your paper. The numbers displayed at left can be found in the text of the paper for reference. In addition, please review your paper as a whole for correctness.

- Q1:** Au: Please add abstract for this article
Q2: Au: Please add pg # for Moore 1903 quote
Q3: Au: Please add pg # for quotes from Wilson 1903 & Haidt 2013
Q4: Au: Please add pg # for Josephson Inst of Ethics 2012 quote
Q5: Au: McCabe 1992 not in References (check year). If keeping, add first initial
Q6: Au: Bandura 1986 not in References (check year)
Q7: Au: Please add pg # for quote from Shi et al 2011
Q8: Au: Please add pg # for Dee & Jacobs 2010 quote
Q9: Au: Please add pg # for Prentice & Miller 1993 quote
Q10: Au: Please add pg # for Walton 2014 quote
Q11: Au: Were italics in original Walton 2014 p. 73 quote, or added?
Q12: Au: Please add pg # for Ross 1977 quote
Q13: Au: Bertram Gallant & Kalichman 2011 not in References
Q14: Au: Please add pg # for Wangaard & Stephens 2011 quote
Q15: Au: Please add pg # for Dee & Jacobs 2010 quote
Q16: Au: Please add pg # for Ross 1977 quote
Q17: Au: Please delete issue # from any journal in which each issue doesn't start on pg 1
Q18: Au: Bertram Gallant 2011 not cited in text
Q19: Au: Please complete publisher location for Moore 1903: Cambridge England or MA?

The belief that cheating is wrong doesn't prevent its enactment. For example, many students cheat despite believing that is wrong or unjustifiable. The question taken up in this article concerns how the resulting cognitive dissonance is ameliorated; that is, how do students cheat and not feel guilty? This article will describe two "good" theories that offer some insight into the psychological and social processes underlying the reduction of cognitive dissonance. Specifically, attribution theory and social norms theory serve as conceptual lenses for understanding how students manage cognitive dissonance related to academic dishonesty. Finally, in the spirit of Kurt Lewin, these two "good" theories are discussed in terms of the design and development of "wise interventions" aimed at promoting academic integrity and reducing the prevalence of cheating.

- Q20:** Au: Please verify that Prentice & Miller 1993 is on only 1 pg
Q21: Au: Please update Stephens & Wangaard if it's been published
Q22: Au: Please spell out MOOC, as abbreviation isn't used again
Q23: Au: Please provide issue title.

Abstract

The belief that cheating is wrong doesn't prevent its enactment. For example, many students cheat despite believing that is wrong or unjustifiable. The question taken up in this article concerns how the resulting cognitive dissonance is ameliorated; that is, how do students cheat and not feel guilty? This article will describe two "good" theories that offer some insight into the psychological and social processes underlying the reduction of cognitive dissonance. Specifically, attribution theory and social norms theory serve as conceptual lenses for understanding how students manage cognitive dissonance related to academic dishonesty. Finally, in the spirit of Kurt Lewin, these two "good" theories are discussed in terms of the design and development of "wise interventions" aimed at promoting academic integrity and reducing the prevalence of cheating.

TABLE OF CONTENTS LISTING

The table of contents for the journal will list your paper exactly as it appears below:

How to Cheat and Not Feel Guilty: Cognitive Dissonance and its Amelioration in the Domain of Academic Dishonesty
Jason M. Stephens

Jason M. Stephens 

How to Cheat and Not Feel Guilty: Cognitive Dissonance and its Amelioration in the Domain of Academic Dishonesty

There is nothing so practical as a good theory.
(Kurt Lewin, cited in Tolman, 1996, p. 31)

Q1 Cheating behavior and the cognitive dissonance it creates among humans is most certainly as old as the species. Indeed, humans are not the first species to “cheat”—gain an unfair advantage through deception or dishonesty (Egan, Santos, & Bloom, 2007). Such behavior is rife in the natural world—from plants posing as inviting insects to lure in would-be carriers of their pollen¹ to snakes wearing a sleeve of colors to masquerade

as poisonous, even though they are not so.² In fact, humans are not likely the only species to experience cognitive dissonance—discomfort in the face of acting in a way that is discordant with one’s thoughts, beliefs, attitudes, or values (Festinger, 1957). Evidence for such dissonance in nonhuman species dates back to the late 1950s, and suggest that not only primates, humanity’s closest kin, but also rats and birds experience it (Egan et al., 2007).

In light of the foregoing, it seems clear that cheating is natural—woven into the fabric of nature (flora and fauna alike). From a Darwinian perspective, the reason why is straightforward: Cheating evolved as a stratagem, deployed to increase one’s likelihood of survival and/or reproduction success (Trivers, 2011). Being natural, however, does not make cheating ethical. Although some may entertain such a “naturalistic fallacy” (confusing what is with what ought to be; Moore, 1903), cheating behavior—even as it presents an opportunity for competitive advantage—represents a transgression of humanity’s innate

Jason M. Stephens is Senior Lecturer at School of Learning, Development and Professional Practice, Faculty of Education and Social Work, The University of Auckland.

Correspondence should be addressed to Jason M. Stephens, School of Learning, Development and Professional Practice, The University of Auckland, 74 Epsom Avenue, H-508, Epsom 1020, Auckland, New Zealand. E-mail: jm.stephens@auckland.ac.nz

¹Spider orchids, for example, appear spider-like and release a perfume that mimics the pheromones of a fertile female wasp to attract male wasps.

²The Mexican milk snake, for example, mimics (even if imprecisely) the tri-banded coloring pattern of the Texas coral snake; but only the latter is poisonous.

Q3 40 “moral sense” (Wilson, 1993) or highly evolved
45 “intuitive ethics” (Haidt, 2013). Namely, cheating
and other forms of unfairness are at odds with people’s sense of justice, honesty, and truth. Even when doing so might be beneficial to one’s individual interests, people feel it to be wrong; a violation of the social contract that obliges them to consider the welfare of others, and to be fair and caring in interactions with them.

50 It is, of course, the failure to act as one ought, or even think about doing so, that produces cognitive dissonance; an unease that begs to be reduced. In this article, I focus on how cognitive dissonance is ameliorated in the face of cheating, particularly academic dishonesty. The empirical research on such cheating is now extensive, and unambiguous on two points:
55 Most students do it and many despite believing that is wrong to do so (e.g., Anderman, Griesinger, & Westerfield, 1998; Jordan, 2001). Yet, even as they do that which they believe to be wrong, the vast majority of students report being “satisfied with their own ethics and character” and “better than most people they know” (Josephson Institute of Ethics, 2012).

Q4 65 The question taken up here is: How do students cheat and not feel guilty? More precisely, how do students reduce the cognitive dissonance experienced in the face of cheating? Given the limits of time and space, I address this question through the lens of two good theories; that is, in the spirit of Lewin (as quoted previously), I offer up these two theories as examples (if not exemplars) of how good theory can be of practical use. For my purposes here, I explore how these theories might be useful in guiding the development of interventions aimed at promoting academic integrity.
75

**The Amelioration of Cognitive Dissonance:
Two Good Theories**

80 In his theory of cognitive dissonance, Festinger (1962) put forth two basic hypotheses: (a) the psychological discomfort accompanying the presence of dissonance motivates individuals to attempt to reduce it and restore consonance, and (b) in addition to attempting to reduce

existing dissonance, “persons will actively avoid situations and information which would likely increase the dissonance” (p. 3). 85

With the first hypothesis in mind, Festinger offered two suggestions concerning how one might reduce dissonance: (a) *change actions* so they are consonant with cognitions (e.g., stop cheating—if one believes cheating is wrong, and refrains from doing so, then one’s cognition about what one’s does will be consonant with their beliefs about the acceptability of cheating), and (b) *change cognitions* so they are consonant with actions (e.g., stop believing cheating is wrong—if one believes cheating is acceptable, and engages in it, then one’s cognition about what one’s beliefs and behaviors related to cheating will be consonant). 90 95 100

The now extensive body of research on academic dishonesty strongly suggests that relatively few students seek to reduce dissonance generated by cheating via Festinger’s first suggestion (i.e., changing actions). As noted, most students cheat, many despite believing it is wrong (e.g., Anderman et al., 1998; Jordan, 2001), and still feel morally superior to their peers (Josephson Institute of Ethics, 2012). In short, it seems clear that dissonance arising from cheating behavior is managed via Festinger’s second suggestion (i.e., changing cognitions). Or, perhaps, via his second hypothesis (i.e., not the reduction of dissonance, but the avoidance of its activation). But how exactly? 105 110 115

One might choose from numerous theories that could help explain how cognitive dissonance is ameliorated in the domain of academic dishonesty. Here I focus on two of them: (a) attribution theory and the related constructs of responsibility judgments and moral disengagement; and (b) social norms theory and the power of the situation. Each theory highlights a unique dimension or aspect of how students might reduce or avoid dissonance related to cheating behavior. 120 125

**Attribution Theory: Judgments of
Responsibility and Moral Disengagement**

Rooted in the work of Heider (1958) and extended by others (e.g., Kelley, 1973; Weiner,

130 1985), attribution theory is concerned with the ways in which people explain (or attribute) the causes of behavior. At its most basic level, the theory distinguishes between two types of causal attributions: *internal* or dispositional attributions (i.e., personal factors, such as personality, ability, efforts or character) and *external* or situational attributions (i.e., factors beyond the person, such as other actors, cultural norms or even the time of day).

140 For my purposes, it's important to understand Weiner's (1985) extension of attribution theory for thinking about achievement motivation and emotion. Specifically, he suggested a three-dimensional structure of causality by adding *stability* (i.e., the extent to which causes can change over time) and *controllability* (i.e., the degree to which causal forces are within one's capacity to command) to the existing dimension of *locus of control*. Weiner also suggested that these three dimensions were implicated in a variety of emotions, including pride, shame, gratitude, guilt, and hopelessness. For example, a student who believes that intelligence is a fixed entity (stable, uncontrollable, internal) is likely to feel pride and perhaps gratitude if he believes he possesses a lot of it, but shame and perhaps hopelessness if he believes he is not very intelligent.

155 In *Judgments of Responsibility*, Weiner (1995) used this three-dimensional model to theorize on the *responsibility process* and its emotional consequences. Although Weiner focused on graver social and moral problems (e.g., aggression, mental illness, and stigmatization), the process he described—and conceptual distinctions he made between causal attributions, judgments of responsibility, and blame—are also relevant to cheating behavior (see Weiner, 1995, p. 12). For example, although one might acknowledge personal causality in testing on an exam (they admit to doing so), they may deny or externalize responsibility by invoking uncontrollable causes or mitigating circumstances.

170 One of the prime ways to resolve such dissonance (and avoid unpleasant self-recriminations leading to shame or guilt) is through the deployment of *mechanisms of moral disengagement* (Bandura, 1990) or *neutralization techniques*

(Sykes & Matza, 1957). These mechanisms or techniques (e.g., denial, displacement, diffusion) reduce or even negate one's responsibility by attributing one's conduct to others or situational contingencies. With their roots in Freud (Freud & Strachey, 1989), these mental devices can be seen as ego defense mechanisms, deployed to protect one's sense of self as a good and decent person in the face of doing something they know to be wrong. In terms of Weiner's (1995) responsibility process, they allow one to acknowledge personal causality while denying, displacing, or otherwise disengaging personal responsibility: *I cheated, but I'm not responsible*.

Several studies have demonstrated a strong positive association between cheating and neutralization among secondary (e.g., Evans & Craig, 1990) and tertiary students (e.g., Diekhoff et al., 1996; Haines, Diekoff, LaBeff, & Clark, 1986). For example, in his study of undergraduates, McCabe (1992) found denial or displacement of responsibility to be most prevalent mechanisms: 61% of students who reported cheating rationalized their cheating by blaming others and/or some aspect of the situational context. Similarly, in their study of high school students, Evans and Craig found displacement of responsibility to the teacher to be most pronounced among college-bound and high achieving students.

On a more positive note, several recent experimental studies have highlighted important possibilities for reducing moral disengagement and activating a sense of personal responsibility for not cheating. For example, Shu, Gino, and Bazerman (2011) demonstrated that participants who read or signed an honor code were significantly less likely to cheat; nor did they report the increased level of moral disengagement observed among those that cheated. Importantly, Shu et al. measured moral disengagement after the opportunity to cheat was presented, and treated it as a dependent variable, rather than a predictor of cheating (as done in the studies referenced previously). In doing so, they not only offered support to Bandura's (1986) contention that the selective activation and disengagement of self-sanctions can occur throughout the self-regulatory process, they also highlight the

importance of information saliency in the process (participants that were made to read the honor code also cheated less than those that were not made to do so).

In other words, even if Shi et al.'s (2011) experiments speak most directly to Festinger's (1962) first hypothesis concerning the reduction of dissonance or restoration of consonance (via moral disengagement), they also have something to say about his second hypothesis the avoidance of information or situations to might heighten prevent dissonance. Specifically, in randomly assigning half of their participants to read or sign an honor code immediately preceding completion of an assignment on which the opportunity to cheat was afforded, Shi et al. (2011) essentially usurped student "controllability" by making salient information that might otherwise avoid. Information, in this case, that would make denial or displacement of responsibility very difficult, and the prospects of dissonance great.

In a related vein, Dee and Jacobs (2010) demonstrated that requiring university students to complete a brief tutorial on plagiarism at the beginning of the semester significantly reduced their actual plagiarism on a subsequent essay assignment later in the semester. Additional analyses revealed the substantial decrease was a function of greater knowledge (not increased fear of detection and punishment). Dee and Jacobs noted the importance of educative tutorials in combatting the state of "rational ignorance" that helps sustain the current epidemic of plagiarism.

Social Norms and the Power of Situations

The second good theory that helps explain how cognitive dissonance is ameliorated in the domain of academic dishonesty concerns social norms and the power of situations. There is a long history in social psychology on the powerful effect peers can have on one another—from the beliefs they embrace to the behaviors they enact (Asch, 1951; Newcomb, 1943; Sherif, 1936). In this section, I briefly review the empirical research related social norms and academic dishonesty. Before doing so, I discuss some important concepts in the literature on norms.

As defined by Sherif (1936), social norms are "the customs, traditions, standards, rules, values, fashion and all other criteria of conduct which are standardized as a consequence of contact with individuals" (p. 3). As summarized in an excellent review by Lapinski and Rimal (2005), norms are theorized to exist at two levels. At the collective (often unwritten) level, they are the "prevailing codes of conduct that either prescribe or proscribe behaviors that members of a group can enact" (Lapinski & Rimal, 2005, p. 129). The second level—the psychological level concerned with how individuals construe (or misconstrue) those norms—that is often of most interest to social psychologists. It is these *perceived norms* that are often of most consequence in determining behavior, and the ones most often assessed in the research on cheating behavior.

The relations between perceived peer norms and academic dishonesty have been empirically investigated in scores of studies over the past 6 decades (e.g., Bowers, 1964; Jordan, 2001; D. McCabe & Trevino, 1997; Stephens, Young, & Calabrese, 2007). In their oft-cited multicampus investigation of individual and contextual influences related to academic dishonesty, D. McCabe and Trevino (1997) found peer norms to be the strongest predictors of cheating. Specifically, students' perceived peer disapproval of academic dishonesty negatively predicted self-reported cheating, and perceived engagement in cheating behavior was as significant positive predictor of such behavior.

Similarly, Stephens et al. (2007) found both perceived peer acceptability of cheating and peer cheating behavior to be positively correlated with both conventional and digital forms of academic dishonesty: as perceptions of peer acceptability of and engagement in cheating increased, so, too, did self-reported cheating. Those findings were consistent with earlier research by Jordan (2001) that found that, compared to those who did not do so, students who cheated reported higher estimates of the percentage of students who they believe cheated at their school.

More recently, experimental studies (e.g., Fosgaard, Hansen, & Piovesan, 2013; Gino, Ayal, & Ariely, 2009) have offered clearer and

320 stronger insights into the causal relations between
 social norms and academic dishonesty, and the
 variables or factors that might mediate or moder-
 ate those relations. In a pair of experiments, for
 325 example, Gino et al. (2009) demonstrated that
 group membership status significantly affected
 unethical behavior. Specifically, when the con-
 federate who cheated was dressed to be seen as
 an in-group member, other students followed suit
 and cheated more.

330 From a cognitive dissonance perspective, all
 these studies seem to point to the same under-
 lying phenomenon: dissonance reduction via a
 change in cognitions related to cheating—if
 everyone else is doing it, and don't care if I do,
 335 then maybe it isn't so bad and I shouldn't feel so
 bad about myself. Although this line of reasoning
 is not entirely disingenuous, it is undergirded by
 a degree of "pluralistic ignorance" (e.g., Prentice
 & Miller, 1993); that is, incorrectly believing that
 340 the majority of one's peers accept or approve of
 the prevailing norm when the reality is that the
 majority of group members privately reject it
 (e.g., perceiving that everyone else thinks cheat-
 ing is okay, even though the majority of believe it
 345 is wrong). This makes their own engagement in
 cheating less aberrant and unacceptable, in turn
 reducing any self-sanctions that would produce
 dissonance in need of reduction

Q9

350 **Theory in Practice: Implications for Wise
 Intervention**

The central thesis of this article is that cheating,
 although natural and ubiquitous, is not ethical. Yet,
 even though people know it to be wrong, most find
 themselves engaging in some form of dishonesty
 355 (however small or infrequently). Doing so gives
 raise to cognitive dissonance, an uncomfortable
 mental state that people seek to avoid in the first
 instance and readily resolve when in its midst. This
 article has argued that there are at least two good
 360 theories (or sets of theories) related to causal attri-
 butions and social norms that offer powerful expla-
 natory frameworks for understanding how
 cognitive dissonance in the face of academic dis-
 honesty might be ameliorated.

In the remainder of the article, I discuss the
 365 implications of these theories for promoting aca-
 demic integrity. It is clear that these theories help
 explain academic dishonesty, and how so many
 students can cheat and not feel guilty. However,
 if these are truly *good theories* (in Lewin's
 370 terms), then they should also be useful in helping
 address the problem. Evidence of such possibility
 can already be seen in some of the research
 reviewed (e.g., Dee & Jacob, 2010; Shu et al.,
 2011). These experiments are—or at least pro-
 375 vide the foundation for developing—what
 Walton (2014) called "wise interventions."

365

370

375

Q10

Wise Interventions

Wise interventions "are *wise to* specific under-
 lying psychological processes that contribute to
 380 social problems or prevent people from flourish-
 ing" (Walton, 2014, p. 73). Attribution and social
 norms theories offer insights into the psychologi-
 cal processes underlying the reduction or avoid-
 385 ance of cognitive dissonance in the domain of
 academic dishonesty. These processes, particu-
 larly moral disengagement and group identifica-
 tion, have been shown (time and again) to be
 strong predictors of cheating behavior; a social
 problem of epidemic proportions. Knowledge
 390 and understanding of these processes allows for
 the possibility of wise intervention. Here I dis-
 cuss two such possibilities, recognizing that
 many more exists.

380

Q11

385

390

Promoting judgments of responsibility. If
 395 moral disengagement is one of the underlying
 processes at play in socio-moral transgressions,
 then a wise intervention must prevent or temper
 the activation of its mechanisms. The experiment
 by Shu and colleagues (2011) offered a compel-
 400 ling example of how a brief, *in situ* reminder (i.e.,
 the reading or signing of an honor code) can
 greatly reduce moral disengagement and cheating
 behavior. Though the idea may sound quaint to
 some, there seems to be much power in such
 405 reminders; they serve as direct cues, making
 clear and salient that which one might wish to
 remain uncertain or obscure. In short, it becomes
 very difficult to disengage one's sense of

395

400

405

410 personal responsibility for acting in accord with
the values of academic integrity, when one has
just read or signed a declaration affirming such an
obligation.

415 Here again, it's important to recall Festinger's
(1962) second hypothesis of cognitive dissonance
—people don't just attempt to reduce its existence;
they “actively avoid situations and information
which would likely increase” it (p. 3).
420 Very few students actively choose to read their
school or university policies concerning academic
integrity; indeed, many may be subconsciously
avoiding doing so. Meanwhile, all secondary
schools and tertiary institutions have a student
code of conduct or some formal statement that
425 communicates the standards of ethical behavior
students are expected to uphold. What's often
absent is the salience of these statements, and
the obligations they carry with them. Few very
universities (and much fewer still secondary
430 schools) use these statements as a wise
intervention—making them clearly visible
(unavoidable even), and deploying their use in
a strategically timed manner (immediately
preceding the submission or completion of an
assessment).

435 In their *Achieving with Integrity* seminar,
Stephens and Wangaard (in press) seek to promote
students' judgments of responsibility by engaging
then in a three-step values identification and
prioritization activity. Specifically, students,
440 while considering a moral dilemma in which
they are the protagonist, must: (a) decide—
make a responsibility judgment by addressing
questions such as, *Am I responsible? What
should I do in this situation?* (b) confirm—
445 reiterate their decision in the values being
prioritized and those being sacrificed (e.g., in
deciding not to help a friend cheat on test,
one may prioritize fairness over loyalty); and
(c) check—ensure the chosen course of action
450 is free of rationalizations or mechanisms that
have disengaged their sense of responsibility.

In short, educators and institutions need to
create (unavoidable) situations that lead students
to know and understand their obligations related
to academic integrity. They must also provide
455 opportunities that equip students with the
strategies that help them make judgments of
responsibility unstained by moral disengagement.
Failure

to provide such education can leave students in
state of *rational ignorance*—choosing to avoid
460 knowledge, understanding, or ways of thinking
that might heighten dissonance (producing a
cost greater than its benefit). Most students do
not choose on their own accord to learn about
academic integrity or to think deeply about their
465 responsibilities related to it. These need to be
taught, and there are now numerous online
resources that provide the instruction needed
(see Additional Resources).

*Changing social norms and creating a culture
of integrity.* If attribution theory and judgments
of responsibility largely focus on internal
psychological processes, then theories related
to social norms remind us of the importance
of culture and the “power of situations”
(Ross, 1977). Cheating does not occur
475 randomly. Certain conditions affect its
likelihood, such as seeing those around you
cheat and believing that they wouldn't much
disapprove if you did, as well. In such a
culture, cheating becomes commonplace; even
epidemic, as it now is in the United States
and elsewhere (Josephson Institute of
480 Ethics, 2012; Lupton & Chapman, 2002;
Ma, McCabe, & Liu, 2013; D. L. McCabe,
2005; Stephens, Romakin, & Yukhymenko,
2010).

The extent of the problem doesn't lend itself
to quick fixes, but wise intervention is possible
485 and there are several models and resources
available for those interested in changing
social norms and creating a culture of integrity
(International Center for Academic Integrity,
2008). Perhaps the longest-standing approach
to creating of integrity has been 490 the
adoption of institutional honor codes, which
had a renaissance in the United States in the
1990s with significant results (D. McCabe &
Trevino, 1997). More recently, in *Creating
the Ethical Academy*, Bertram Gallant and
Kalichman (2011) offered a 495 systems
approach for cultural change. Like honor
code institutions, this approach includes the
strong presence of “organizational level”
factors such as “clearly articulated norms
and rules, transparent procedures, distributed
power, fair and strong incentive systems,
ethical infrastructures, and strong leadership
within the organization” (p. 39).

Similarly, Wangaard and Stephens (2011) used
systems theory as a basis of their four-component

505 approach to creating a culture of integrity in secondary schools.. For example, the first component of the model, *core values*, offers a clear articulation of the norms and rules that are to serve as the “foundation and guideposts” of all social and academic behavior; Q14
 510 the second component, *committees and commitments*, calls for the creation of an Academic Integrity Committee (AIC) to provide the ethical infrastructures needed. Finally, and importantly, because these AICs are comprised of mostly students
 515 (at least two from each year or grade level), students play a significant role in changing the social norms at their school and helping create a culture of integrity.

In brief, changing social norms related to cheating requires cultural change. Systems theory offers one set of possibilities for undertaking such change toward creation of a culture of integrity. In such cultures, the meaning and importance of academic honesty are widely understood and embraced, and pluralistic ignorance untenable.
 520
 525

Concluding Thoughts

In closing, I return to the beginning. Cheating is natural, and for humans, of nature. Human beings are neither special in their use of deception to gain competitive advantage, nor unique in seeking to ameliorate the dissonance that arises when they engage in such behavior. People’s capacity to both reduce and avoid dissonance helps explain the widespread nature of cheating; allowing even those they believe it is wrong to cheat to do so and not feel guilty. This guilt arises because, just as cheating is natural, so too is one’s moral sense that it is wrong—dishonest, unfair, a betrayal of trust, etc.
 530
 535

With these suppositions in place, I explored two good theories with the aim of better understanding some of the complex psychological and social processes involved in cognitive dissonance, particularly in the domain of academic dishonesty. Specifically, attribution and social norms theory were singled out (among many candidates) as such theories; theories, that is, that provide insights into practice or wise intervention (Walton, 2014) that targets those processes. Two broad types of such intervention were offered up as examples.
 540
 545

The first, rooted in attribution theory, suggested ways to increase students’ personal responsibility judgments (or greater internal locus of control) and decrease the activation of disengagement mechanisms. Namely, using findings from two experimental studies (Dee & Jacob, 2010; Shu et al., 2011), it was suggested that teachers and institutions more broadly need to help strengthen students’ responsibility judgments through greater information saliency related to the honor code or fundamental values of academic integrity they are obliged to respect. Doing so undermines attempts (even if subconscious) to avoid such information and remain in a state of “rational ignorance” (Dee & Jacob, 2010). Q15

The second suggestion for wise intervention, emanating from social norms theory, focused on the importance of culture and the “power of situations” (Ross, 1977) in the perpetration of cheating. In particular, students’ beliefs that their peers are cheating, and wouldn’t disapprove if they did so, normalizes the behavior. This makes their own engagement in cheating less aberrant and unacceptable, in turn reducing any self-sanctions that would produce dissonance in need of reduction. As it stands, students’ perceptions of cheating behavior are high and disapproval low (D. L. McCabe & Trevino, 1997; Stephens et al., 2007), and it was suggested that educators and institutions need to take a more proactive role in these changing these perceived behavioral and attitudinal norms using models and approaches based in systems theory. Q16
 565
 570
 575

In sum, although cheating may be natural—and presently the norm—it is neither ethical nor inevitable. Wise intervention is possible, and numerous resources now available to those who create culture of integrity where students’ sense of personal responsibility for academic integrity is strong and peer cheating behavior is seen as rare and wrong. All that remains is for institutions and individuals alike to avail themselves of such resources and use them wisely.
 580
 585
 590

ORCID

Jason M. Stephens  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2404-6321>

References

- 595 Anderman, E. M., Griesinger, T., & Westerfield, G. (1998). Motivation and cheating during early adolescence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 90(1), 84–93.
- Q17
600 Asch, S. E. (1951). Effects of group pressure upon the modification and distortion of judgments. In H. Guetzkow (Ed.), *Groups, leadership and men; research in human relations* (pp. 177–190). Oxford, England: Carnegie Press.
- 605 Bandura, A. (1990). Selective activation and disengagement of moral control. *Journal of Social Issues*, 46(1), 27–46.
- Bertram Gallant, T. (2011). *Creating the ethical academy: A systems approach to understanding misconduct and empowering change in higher education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- 610
Q18
Bowers, W. J. (1964). *Student dishonesty and its control in college*. Retrieved from New York:
- 615 Dee, T. S., & Jacob, B. A. (2010). *Rational ignorance in education: A field experiment in student plagiarism* (Working Paper 15672). National Bureau of Economic Research. <http://www.nber.org/papers/w15672> Retrieved from <http://www.nber.org/papers/w15672>
- 620 Diekhoff, G. M., LaBeff, E. E., Clark, R. E., Williams, L. E., Francis, B., & Haines, V. J. (1996). College cheating: Ten years later. *Research in Higher Education*, 37(4), 487–502.
- 625 Egan, L. C., Santos, L. R., & Bloom, P. (2007). The origins of cognitive dissonance evidence from children and monkeys. *Psychological Science*, 18(11), 978–983.
- 630 Evans, E. D., & Craig, D. (1990). Adolescent cognitions for academic cheating as a function of grade level and achievement status. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 5(3), 325–345.
- Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press..
- 635 Festinger, L. (1962). *A theory of cognitive dissonance* (Vol. 2), Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- 640 Fosgaard, T. R., Hansen, L. G., & Piovesan, M. (2013). Separating will from grace: An experiment on conformity and awareness in cheating. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 93(0), 279–284. doi:10.1016/j.jebo.2013.03.027
- Freud, S., & Strachey, J. (1989). *New introductory lectures on psycho-analysis*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company.
- 645 Gino, F., Ayal, S., & Ariely, D. (2009). Contagion and differentiation in unethical behavior: The effect of one bad apple on the barrel. *Psychological Science*, 20(3), 393–398. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02306.x
- Haidt, J. (2013). Moral psychology for the twenty-first century. *Journal of Moral Education*, 42(3), 281–297. doi:10.1080/03057240.2013.817327 650
- Haines, V. J., Dieckoff, G. M., LaBeff, E. E., & Clark, R. E. (1986). College cheating: Immaturity, lack of commitment, and the neutralizing attitude. *Research in Higher Education*, 25(4), 342–354.
- 655 Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of interpersonal relations*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- International Center for Academic Integrity. (2008). *The fundamental values of academic integrity*. Retrieved from <http://www.academicintegrity.org/icai/resources-2.php> 660
- Jordan, A. E. (2001). College student cheating: The role of motivation, perceived norms, attitudes, and knowledge of institutional policy. *Ethics & Behavior*, 11(3), 233–247.
- 665 Josephson Institute of Ethics. (2012). *2012 Report card on the ethics of American youth*. Retrieved from <https://charactercounts.org/national-report-card/2012-report-card/>
- 670 Kelley, H. H. (1973). The processes of causal attribution. *American Psychologist*, 28(2), 107–128. doi:10.1037/h0034225
- Lapinski, M. K., & Rimal, R. N. (2005). An explication of social norms. *Communication Theory*, 15(2), 127–147. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2885.2005.tb00329.x
- 675 Lupton, R. A., & Chapman, K. J. (2002). Russian and American college students' attitudes, perceptions and tendencies towards cheating. *Educational Research*, 33(1), 17–27.
- 680 Ma, Y., McCabe, D., & Liu, R. (2013). Students' academic cheating in Chinese universities: prevalence, influencing factors, and proposed action. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 11(3), 169–184. doi:10.1007/s10805-013-9186-7
- 685 McCabe, D., & Trevino, L. K. (1997). Individual and contextual influences on academic dishonesty: A multicampus investigation. *Research in Higher Education*, 38(3), 379–396.
- 690 McCabe, D. L. (2005). Cheating among college and university students: A North American perspective. *International Journal of Educational Integrity*, 1, 1–11.
- 695 McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (1997). Individual and contextual influences on academic dishonesty: A multicampus investigation. *Research in Higher Education*, 38(3), 379–396.
- Moore, G. E. (1903). *Principia ethica*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Q19

- 700 Newcomb, T. M. (1943). *Personality and social change; attitude formation in a student community*. Ft. Worth, TX: Dryden.
- 705 Prentice, D. A., & Miller, D. T. (1993). Pluralistic ignorance and alcohol use on campus: some consequences of misperceiving the social norm. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64(2), 243.
- Q20** 705 Ross, L. (1977). The intuitive psychologist and his shortcomings: Distortions in the attribution process. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (pp. 173–220). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- 710 Sherif, M. (1936). *The psychology of social norms*. Oxford, England: Harper.
- 715 Shu, L. L., Gino, F., & Bazerman, M. H. (2011). Dishonest deed, clear conscience: When cheating leads to moral disengagement and motivated forgetting. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 73(3), 330–349.
- 720 Stephens, J. M., Romakin, V., & Yukhymenko, M. (2010). Academic motivation and misconduct in two cultures: A comparative analysis of U.S. and Ukrainian undergraduates. *International Journal of Educational Integrity*, 6(1), 47–60.
- 725 Stephens, J. M., & Wangaard, D. B. (in press). The Achieving with Integrity seminar: An integrative approach to promoting moral development in secondary school classrooms. *International Journal of Educational Integrity*, xx(y), xx–yy. doi:10.1007/s40979-016-0010-1
- Q21** Stephens, J. M., Young, M. F., & Calabrese, T. (2007). Does moral judgment go offline when students are online? A comparative analysis of undergraduates' beliefs and behaviors related to conventional and digital cheating. *Ethics & Behavior*, 17(3), 233–254. doi:10.1080/10508420701519197
- 730 Sykes, G. M., & Matza, D. (1957). Techniques of neutralization: A theory of delinquency. *American Sociological Review*, 22, 664–670.
- 735 Tolman, C. W. (1996). *Problems of theoretical psychology*. North York, Canada: Captus.
- 740 Trivers, R. (2011). *The folly of fools: The logic of deceit and self-deception in human life*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- 745 Walton, G. M. (2014). The new science of wise psychological interventions. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 23(1), 73–82. doi:10.1177/0963721413512856
- Wangaard, D. B., & Stephens, J. M. (2011). *Creating a culture of academic integrity: A tool kit for secondary schools*. Minneapolis, MN: Search Institute.
- 750 Weiner, B. (1985). An attributional theory of achievement motivation and emotion. *Psychological Review*, 92(4), 548–573. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.92.4.548
- 755 Weiner, B. (1995). *Judgments of responsibility: A foundation for a theory of social conduct*. New York, NY: Guilford.
- Wilson, J. Q. (1993). *The moral sense*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Additional Resources

760 The three resources listed below offer possibi-
765 lities for “wise interventions” aimed promoting
academic integrity.

1. **Academic Integrity: Values, Skills, Action**
<https://www.futurelearn.com/courses/academic-integrity>

770 This 4-week long MOOC is offered several
775 times a year. Each week offers learners a
series of videos, articles, and activities
designed to develop the knowledge and
skills needed to be a successful and ethical
learner. Though designed primarily for uni-
versity students; it is equally valuable to
secondary students as well.

2. **The School for Ethical Education (SEE)**
<http://ethicsed.org/academic-integrity>

SEE’s *Integrity Works!* Project is aimed at
promoting academic integrity in secondary
schools. Its many resources include an
online professional development for tea-
chers interested integrating ethics into
classroom discussions and published
toolkit for creating a schoolwide culture
of academic integrity.

780

3. **The International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI)**

785

<http://www.academicintegrity.org>

The ICAI “works to identify, promote, and
affirm the values of academic integrity
among students, faculty, teachers, and
administrators.” Membership is needed to
access all of their resources. Nonmembers,
however can view and download informa-
tion related to the ICAI’s Fundamental
Values Project and Assessment Guide.

790

TIP

PROOF