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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.
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*
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)

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 pollen to snakes wearing a sleeve of colors to masquerade as poisonous, even though they are not so. 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

---

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

2. The 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.
“moral sense” (Wilson, 1993) or highly evolved “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.

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: 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).

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.

The Amelioration of Cognitive Dissonance: Two Good Theories

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).

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).

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?

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.

Attribution Theory: Judgments of Responsibility and Moral Disengagement

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

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.

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.

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

From a cognitive dissonance perspective, all these studies seem to point to the same underlying phenomenon: dissonance reduction via a change in cognitions related to cheating—if everyone else is doing it, and don’t care if I do, 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 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 cheating is okay, even though the majority of believe it 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.

**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 (however small or infrequently). Doing so gives rise 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 theories (or sets of theories) related to causal attributions and social norms that offer powerful explanatory frameworks for understanding how cognitive dissonance in the face of academic dishonesty might be ameliorated.

In the remainder of the article, I discuss the implications of these theories for promoting academic 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 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 provide the foundation for developing—what Walton (2014) called “wise interventions.”

**Wise Interventions**

Wise interventions “are wise to specific underlying psychological processes that contribute to social problems or prevent people from flourishing” (Walton, 2014, p. 73). Attribution and social norms theories offer insights into the psychological processes underlying the reduction or avoidance of cognitive dissonance in the domain of academic dishonesty. These processes, particularly moral disengagement and group identification, have been shown (time and again) to be strong predictors of cheating behavior; a social problem of epidemic proportions. Knowledge and understanding of these processes allows for the possibility of wise intervention. Here I discuss two such possibilities, recognizing that many more exists.

**Promoting judgments of responsibility.** If 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 compelling 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 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
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.

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). 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 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 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).

In their Achieving with Integrity seminar, Stephens and Wangaard (in press) seek to promote students’ judgments of responsibility by engaging them in a three-step values identification and prioritization activity. Specifically, students, 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—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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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
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; 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 (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.

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.

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. 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).

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.

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 a 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.
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**Additional Resources**

The three resources listed below offer possibilities for “wise interventions” aimed promoting academic integrity.

1. **Academic Integrity: Values, Skills, Action**
   https://www.futurelearn.com/courses/academic-integrity
   This 4-week long MOOC is offered several 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 university 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 teachers interested integrating ethics into classroom discussions and published toolkit for creating a schoolwide culture of academic integrity.

3. **The International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI)**
   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 information related to the ICAI’s Fundamental Values Project and Assessment Guide.