

DIMENSIONAL ANALYSIS OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY WITH RESPECT TO GENDER AND STREAM AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

¹Mr.Rajib Chakraborty, ²Ms. Charanjit Kaur

¹Assistant Professor, Department of Education, Lovely Professional University, Phagwara, India

²Research Student, Department of Education, Lovely Professional University, Phagwara, India

Abstract

The present study tries to investigate the role of gender on the construct Academic Dishonesty and its Dimensions among first year college students of Kapurthala district. The study consists sample of 187 students of Science, Commerce and Arts stream . The tool used in this study is Academic dishonesty Scale developed by Rawwas and Isakson (2000) for data collection. The Cronbach's alpha reliability of the scale is .70. The tool has construct validity. The result indicate that there is no significant difference between the means of Academic dishonesty construct and its dimensions with respect to Gender and stream was found. The construct predicted the dimensions well. There is significant relationship among all dimensions expect the dimension Fabricating Information with Ignoring Prevalent Practices. This means that both boys and girls are equally engage in cheating and indulge in academic dishonesty. Moreover, Study discuss the strategies like quizzes, curricular and co-curricular activities, projects for students for abolishing the academic dishonesty

Keyword:-Academic Dishonesty, Gender difference, Dimensions of Academic Dishonest

INTRODUCTION

When students don't want to prepare for doing work and feel stress for performing the work because lack of knowledge, low motivation and have less competition and only depend independently with the help of peers, internet resources, crib notes, other writing words and then students don't want to express their own word or work in any situation then we can say they perform the term dishonesty. In order to understand the term dishonesty our internal and external factor are responsible for engaging in dishonesty.

According to Symaco & Marceb(2003) , “ academic dishonesty is defined as destruction of rules and regulations in most tertiary education institutions”

According to (Staats, et al, 2009), “when students show unexpected behavior, that affects to the students's development characteristics and personality traits”

(Storch and Storch, 2002) refers as “Academic dishonesty has been defined as the act of giving or receiving unauthorized help for performing academic task or getting benefit for copied effort.”

William L. Kibler state that academic dishonesty as “academic dishonesty as forms of cheating and plagiarism that involve students giving or receiving unauthorized assistance in an academic exercise or receiving credit for work that is not their own.”

According to (Tadesse and Getachew, 2010), “academic dishonesty refers to the long-lasting in many occurrences and its impediment for growth is largely alarming.”

(Naghdipour and Emeagwali, 2013) undetermine “the excellence of education as well as undetermining the vision of grooming honest, accountable and trustworthy professionals in the future.” Many researchers found that “students, who engaged in academic dishonesty, were more probable to engage in workplace dishonesty.”

(Ellahi et al., 2013) said that, “Academic dishonesty is a continuous process .To remove the academic dishonesty, some institution and organization make some policies for removing the dishonesty. e.g quizzes, exams, individual assignments, plagiarism.

Eriksson and McGee (2015), “Academic dishonesty as a major or widespread problem for tertiary level education or higher education in universities found that when students perform unsociable attitude then the behaviors of academic dishonesty rises mostly when students don't observe the behavior of academic dishonesty”

“Academic dishonesty happens when the attitude of student is change if the chance or opportunity given to the students for engage in dishonesty”(Rawwas and Isakson(2000))

There are four Factors of academic dishonesty

Receiving and Abetting Academic Dishonesty: the first dimension initiated by student by unethically engage in institution.

Obtaining an Unfair Advantage : the second dimension arises when students take benefits of a unexpected situation and become the part of dishonesty.

Fabricating Information: this dimension takes place when students are not prepare well for doing any kind of task but become actively part of dishonesty but not clearly involved in it like making numerous justifications or excuses for not doing work or any kind of academic task.

Ignoring Prevalent Practices: when students visit frequently in teacher’s office seeking help for final exam.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

McCabe et al. (2006) established that students from commerce stream is cheated more than science stream students and also conducted that commerce students is more inclination towards dishonesty during exams as compared to science students and found that there are 24 business students who are more admitted to such behavior.

Shaw (2008) recognized that morality primarily occur in childhood from their own personal senses, later on it changes into ethical manners. Every learner learns to find the morality during own by realizing their own ideas, thoughts, perceptions and change the perception of dishonesty according to their traditions. There are 20 percent tertiary level students who are copied their work from internet resources.

Brown, Weibleand Olmosk (2010) found that at the tertiary level, only 49 percent students were engage in cheating, but in today’s era the percentage of student’s cheating are increases up to 100 percent and also noticed that as compared to other courses business students are also involve in cheating process.

Jones (2011) found that why students from commerce stream are more connected in dishonesty .the three reason behind for dishonesty is (i) grades (ii) lack of time to complete the task (iii) anxiety for appearing in theory test and procrastination. The sample size for research is 144 and found that there are 60% of the Commerce students and 64% of arts students become the part for making dishonesty.

(Bedford et al., 2011) conducted that some factors are depending on academic dishonesty and such as gender, low Grades, egotism, less opportunity for getting the job ,increasing competition in any field related to job and other factors such as learning environment, peer pressure and found some reasons behind why students are more likely towards dishonesty that is academic standards is not soo good, class size is very large, less number of getting the jobs.

(Pottle, 2012) found that many learners who take the admission in degree college and show signs of unenthusiastic or unexpected behavior of dishonesty, not capable to enter a good job market. for getting professional job, learners are to become honest and have moral values.

Munoz-Garcia and Aviles-Herrera (2014) recognized that there are four factors of academic dishonesty and found that students cheat with the help of crib notes, write the notes on the hand, when teacher gives individual task to the students with the help of collaboration students are more admitted to copy paste and submit the task or homework

Eriksson and McGee (2015) conducted that in 99 American colleges and Universities there are 5000 students who are more interested towards academic dishonest acts and found that why students cheat. There are many reason like poor academic performance, tough competition, lack of interest in subjects, basics are very poor, lack of knowledge. So, when students are lack of preparation in any task, assignment, homework, and exam then students find the material or resources for cheating.

Kevin L. Wright (2018) found that how academic dishonesty are varied at different universities and colleges and compare and contrast how such policy violations are addressed by campus administrators. And also gives the recommendations for academic dishonesty like encourage moral development and policymakers will need to check the reason of consistent tests and the plan of current grading systems.

BODY OF ARTICLE

Statement of the problem

Dimensional Analysis of Academic Dishonesty with respect to gender and stream among college students.

Reserch objective

- To study the difference between boys and girls with respect to the construct academic Dishonesty in undergraduate students
- To study the difference between boys and girls with respect to dimension receiving and abetting in undergraduate students
- To study the difference between boys and girls with respect to dimension obtaining an unfair advantage in undergraduate students
- To study the difference between boys and girls with respect to the dimension fabricating information in undergraduate students
- To study the difference between boys and girls with respect to dimension ignoring prevalent practices in undergraduate students
- To study the difference between students from science commerce and arts streams with respect to the construct academic dishonesty at undergraduate level
- To study the difference between students from science commerce and arts streams with respect to the dimension receiving and abetting academic dishonesty at undergraduate level
- To study the difference between students from science commerce and arts streams with respect to the dimension obtaining an unfair advantage at undergraduate level
- To study the difference between students from science commerce and arts streams with respect to the dimension fabricating information at undergraduate level
- To study the difference between students from science commerce and arts streams with respect to the dimension ignoring prevalent practice in undergraduate level

Research hypotheses

- H₀: There is no significant difference between boys and girls with respect to the construct Academic dishonesty in undergraduate level.
- H₀: There is no significant difference between boys and girls with respect to dimension receiving and abetting in undergraduate level.
- H₀ :There is no significant difference between boys and girls with respect to dimension obtaining an unfair advantage in undergraduate level.
- H₀: There is no significant difference between boys and girls with respect to dimension fabricating information in undergraduate level.

- H0: There is no significant difference between boys and girls with respect to dimension ignoring prevalent practices in undergraduate level.
- H0: There is no significant difference between students from science commerce and arts streams with respect to the construct academic dishonesty at undergraduate level.
- H0: There is no significant difference between students from science commerce and arts streams with respect to receiving and abetting academic dishonesty at undergraduate level
- H0: There is no significant difference between students from science commerce and arts streams with respect to obtaining an unfair advantage at undergraduate level
- H0: There is no significant difference between students from science commerce and arts streams with respect to fabricating information at undergraduate level at undergraduate level
- H0: There is no significant difference between students from science commerce and arts streams with respect to ignoring prevalent practices at undergraduate level

Population for the study

The population of the research is the students, of B.Sc., B.Com. B.A. (First year) of college of district Kapurthala, Punjab.

Sample for the study

In the recent study, total 187 students from government and private colleges students of Science, Commerce and Arts stream of district Kapurthala, Punjab, selected randomly. There were 110 girls students and 77 boys students.

Tools used in study

The Academic Dishonesty Scale (ADS) is used by researcher to measure the various forms of collegiate cheating which was developed by Rawwas and Isakson (2000). It has total 20 items with four dimensions, all 20 statements are positive. It is a questionnaire with five-point likert scale means each statement has five responses i.e strongly disagree, disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Agree, Strongly agree. It has content validity.

Sr. No.	Dimensions	Total no. of items	Reliability (Cronbach's alpha)
1.	Dimension 1	6	.77
2.	Dimension 2	7	.72
3.	Dimension 3	4	.70
4.	Dimension 4	3	.71

2.7 Scoring procedure:

Sr. No.	Type of items	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Total score	Range of the score
I	Positive	1	2	3	4	5	100	20-100

SAMPLING

In the present study, the technique is used for data collection is simple random sampling. by using this technique researcher is to collect data from 187 students from different streams of government and private college from B.Sc., B.Com., B.A. of district Kapurthala, Punjab.

RESULTS

After the data collection, data analysis is done using SPSS software. The interpretation of the result and data analysis is given below:

Analysis of descriptive statistics

The mean, standard deviation (S.D.), standard error, of the variables Academic dishonesty among college students has been given below:

Descriptive Statistics

Table 2: Measures of Central Tendency, Dispersion and Standard Error

S.No.	Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
1	Academic Dishonesty	2.5257	.57315	.04191
2	Academic Dishonesty in Boys	2.5831	.64142	.07310
3	Academic Dishonesty in Girls	2.4855	.51937	.04952
4	Dimension 1	2.2060	.69866	.05109
5	Dimension 1 in Boys	2.2960	.74421	.08481
6	Dimension 1 in Girls	2.1431	.66111	.06303
7	Dimension 2	2.4891	.65974	.04824
8	Dimension 2 in Boys	2.4900	.72444	.08256
9	Dimension 2 in Girls	2.4885	.61384	.05853
10	Dimension 3	2.6580	1.62144	.11857
11	Dimension 3 in Boys	2.6169	.90556	.10320
12	Dimension 3 in Girls	2.6868	1.97801	.18860
13	Dimension 4	3.2111	.91483	.06690
14	Dimension 4 in Boys	3.3068	.87819	.10008
15	Dimension 4 in Girls	3.1442	.93777	.08941

Table 1 Measures of Central Tendency, Dispersion and Standard Error

Interpretation: The academic dishonesty construct is found to be more in boys as compared to girls. The mean score of boys (2.5831) is more than mean score of girls(2.4855).according to t-test,p-value=.245 which is greater than .05 that is non-significant. Hence Null hypothesis is *accepted*.

The dimension receiving and abetting is found to be more in boys as compared to girls. The mean score of boys (2.2960) is more than mean score of girls(2.1431).according to t-test,p-value= .837 which is greater than .05 that is non-significant. Hence Null hypothesis is *accepted*.

The dimension obtaining an unfair advantage is found to be more in boys as compared to girls. The mean score of boys (2.4900) is more than mean score of girls(2.4885).according to t-test,p-value=.338 which is greater than .05 that is non-significant. Hence Null hypothesis is *accepted*.

The dimension fabricating information is found to be more in girls as compared to boys. The mean score of girls (2.6868) is more than mean score of boys(2.6169).according to t-test,p-value=.806 which is greater than .05 that is non-significant. Hence Null hypothesis is *accepted*.

The dimension ignoring prevalent practices is found to be more in boys as compared to girls. The mean score of boys (3.3068) is more than mean score of girls(3.1442).according to t-test,p-value=.136 which is greater than .05 that is non-significant. Hence Null hypothesis is *accepted*.

Measures of Relationship– Pearson’s Correlation

	Dim 1	Dim 2	Dim 3	Dim 4	AD
Dim 1	1				
Dim 2		1			
Dim 3			1		
Dim 4				1	
AD					1

** - Results significant at $\alpha=0.01$, * - Results significant at $\alpha=0.05$

Table 3 Measures of Relationships– Pearson’s Correlation

Interpretation:

The relationship between Receiving and Abetting Academic Dishonesty with Obtaining an unfair Advantage is moderate (.656) in strength and highly significant at $\alpha =0.01$). Hence the result is significant and the null hypothesis is *rejected*.

The relationship between Receiving and Abetting Academic Dishonesty with Fabricating Information is moderate(.324) in strength and highly significant at $\alpha =0.01$). Hence the result is significant and the null hypothesis is *rejected*.

The relationship between Receiving and Abetting Academic Dishonesty with Ignoring Prevalent Practices is weak(.284) in strength and highly significant at $\alpha =0.01$). Hence the result is significant and the null hypothesis is *rejected*.

The relationship between Receiving and Abetting Academic Dishonesty with academic dishonesty is strong(.862) in strength and highly significant at $\alpha =0.01$). Hence the result is significant and the null hypothesis is *rejected*.

The relationship between Obtaining an unfair Advantage with Fabricating Information is moderate(.273) in weak and highly significant at $\alpha =0.01$). Hence the result is significant and the null hypothesis is *rejected*.

The relationship between Obtaining an unfair Advantage with Ignoring Prevalent Practices is weak(.234) in strength and highly significant at $\alpha = 0.01$). Hence the result is significant and the null hypothesis is *rejected*.

The relationship between Obtaining an unfair Advantage with Academic dishonesty is strong(.830) in strength and highly significant at $\alpha = 0.01$). Hence the result is significant and the null hypothesis is *rejected*.

The relationship between Fabricating Information with Ignoring Prevalent Practices is weak, equal to 0.143 in strength but non significant at $\alpha = 0.05$ level. Hence the result is non significant and the null hypothesis is *accepted*.

The relationship between Fabricating Information with Academic dishonesty is moderate(.390) in strength and highly significant at $\alpha = 0.01$). Hence the result is significant and the null hypothesis is *rejected*.

The relationship between Ignoring Prevalent Practices with Academic dishonesty moderate(.518) in strength and highly significant at $\alpha = 0.01$). Hence the result is significant and the null hypothesis is *rejected*.

DISCUSSION

- In discussion, we discuss that gender has no role in academic dishonesty. there is no difference between boys and girls for engage in academic dishonesty
- The major findings of the study is the academic dishonesty construct and its four dimensions have no significant difference in their means with respect to gender and stream in first year undergraduate college students.
- Among the minor findings of the study, the researcher found that the gender is not related neither to the construct academic dishonesty nor its four dimensions there is no significant difference in their means with respect to gender in first year undergraduate college students.
- This means that the academic dishonesty construct and its dimensions dimension fabricating information is found to be more in girls as compared to boys and rest all three dimensions is found to be more in boys as compared to girls.
- There is significant difference from different stream of students from B.Sc., B.Com., B.A. in dimension Fabricating Information but rest of all three dimensions have no significant difference from different streams of students from B.Sc., B.Com., B.A.
- All dimensions of construct Academic dishonesty predicts academic dishonesty significantly for a unit change in receiving and abetting academic dishonesty, there is 74.3% change in academic dishonesty for a unit change in obtaining an unfair advantage, there is 68.8 % change in academic dishonesty for a unit change in fabricating information, there is 15.2% change in academic dishonesty for a unit change in ignoring prevalent practices, there is 26.9% change in academic dishonesty.

CONCLUSION

There is no significant difference between boys and girls on academic dishonesty at undergraduate level in science, commerce and arts stream. So educational experts, curriculum makers, teachers and school management should make such strategies, curriculum, co-curricular and curricular activities, quizzes, projects for students so that academic dishonesty is removed.

REFERENCES

1. rties of an instrument to measure family disease management.
2. International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology, 15(3), 253-264.
3. Mahne, K., & Huxhold, O. (2014). Grandparenthood and subjective well-being:
4. Moderating effects of educational level. Journals of Gerontology Series B:
5. Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences, 70(5), 782-792.

6. McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (1993). Academic dishonesty: Honor codes and other contextual influences. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 64(5), 522-538.
7. McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (1997). Individual and contextual influences on
8. academic dishonesty: A Multicampus Investigation. *Research in Higher Education*,
9. 38(3), 379-396.
10. McCabe, D. L., Trevino, L. K., & Butterfield, K. D. (2001). Dishonesty in academic
11. environments: The influence of peer reporting requirements. *The Journal of Higher*
12. *Education*, 72(1), 29-45.
13. McCabe, D. L., Butterfield, K. D., & Trevino, L. K. (Adesile, I., Nordin, M. S., Kazmi. Y., & Hussien, S. (2016). Validating Academic
14. Integrity Survey (AIS): An Application of Exploratory and Confirmatory Factor
15. Analytic Procedures. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 14(2), 149-167.
16. Adnanes, M. (2007). Social transitions and anomie among post-communist Bulgarian
17. youth. *Young*, 15(1), 49-6970 Development and Validation of Academic Dishonesty Scale. *International Journal of Instruction*, April 2018 Vol.11, No.2
18. Akbulut, Y., Sendag, S., Birinci, G., Kilicer, K., Sahin, M. C., & Odabası, H. F. (2008). Exploring the types and reasons of Internet-triggered academic dishonesty among Turkish undergraduate students: Development of Internet-Triggered Academic
19. Dishonesty Scale (ITADS). *Computers & Education*, 51(1), 463-473.
20. Ashworth, P., Bannister, P. and Thorne, P. with student on the Qualitative Research Methods Course Unit (1997) "Guilty in whose eyes? University students' perceptions of cheating and plagiarism in academic work and assessment", *Studies in Higher Education* 22(2), 187–203.
21. Norton, L.S., Tilley, A.J., Newstead, S.E. and Franklyn-Stokes, A.(2001) "The pressures of assessment in undergraduate courses and their effect on student behaviours", *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education* 26(3), 269–284.
22. Allen, J., Fuller, D., & Lockett, M. (1998). Academic integrity: Behaviors, rates, and
23. attitudes of business students toward cheating. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 20(1),
24. 41-52.
25. Alleyne, P., & Phillips, K. (2011). Exploring academic dishonesty among university
26. students in Barbados: an extension to the theory of planned behaviour. *Journal of*
27. *Academic Ethics*, 9(4), 323.
28. Bedford, D. W., Gregg, R. J. & Clinton M. S. (2011). Preventing Online Cheating with Technology: A Pilot Study of Remote Proctor and an Update of Its Use. *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice*, 11(2), 41–59.
29. Bolin, A. U. (2004). Self-control, perceived opportunity, and attitudes as predictors of
30. academic dishonesty. *The Journal of Psychology*, 138(2), 101-114.
31. Brown, B. S. (1995). The academic ethics of graduate business students: A survey.
32. *Journal of education for Business*, 70(3), 151-157.
33. Brown, B. S. (1996). A comparison of the academic ethics of graduate business,
34. education, and engineering students. *College Student Journal*, 30, 294-301.
35. Brown, B. S. (2000). The academic ethics of graduate business students: 1993 to 1998.
36. *Journal of Applied Business Research (JABR)*, 16(4), 105-112
37. Brown, B. S., Weible, R. J. & Olmosk, K. E. (2010). Business school deans on student academic dishonesty: A survey. *College Student Journal*. 44, 299-309.
38. Burton, J. H., Talpade, S., Haynes, J. (2011). Religiosity and test-taking ethics among Business School Students. *Journal of Academic and Business Ethics*. 4, 1-8.
39. Bushweller, K. (1999). Generation of cheaters. *American School Board Journal*, 186(4),24-32.
40. Byrne, B. M. (1994). Structural equation modelling with EQS and EQS/windows: Basic concepts, applications, and programming. California: Sage Publishing.
41. Chapman, K. J., Davis, R., Toy, D., & Wright, L. (2004). Academic integrity in the
42. business school environment: I'll get by with a little help from my friends. *Journal of*
43. *Marketing Education*, 26(3), 236-249.
44. Chukwuemeka, U., Gbenga, F., Sunday, N., & Ndidiamaka, E. (2013). Academic
45. dishonesty among Nigeria pharmacy students: A comparison with United Kingdom.
46. *African Journal Pharmacy and Pharmacology*, 7(27), 1934-1941.

47. DeVellis, R. F. (2016). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (Vol. 26). Sage
48. Publications
49. Ellahi, A., Mushtaq, R., & Bashir Khan, M. (2013). Multi campus investigation of
50. academic dishonesty in higher education of Pakistan. *International Journal of*
51. *Educational Management*, 27(6), 647-666.
52. Eminoglu, E., & Nartgun, Z. (2009). A scale development study to measure academic
- dishonesty tendency of university students. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 6(1), 215-240.
53. Bashir & Bala 71 *International Journal of Instruction*, April 2018 Vol.11, No.2
54. Eriksson, L. & McGee, T. R. (2015). Academic dishonesty amongst Australian criminal justice
- and policing university students: individual and contextual factors.
55. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 11(5). doi: 10.1007/s40979-015-
56. Ferrari, J. R. (2005). Impostor tendencies and academic dishonesty: Do they cheat their way to
- success? *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, 33(1), 11-18.
57. Floyd, F. J. & Widaman, K. F. (1995). *Factor Analysis in the Development and*
58. *Refinement of Clinical Assessment Instruments*. *Psychological Assessment*, 7(3), 286-
59. 299.
60. Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with
61. unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of marketing research*, 39-50.
62. Gehring, D., & Pavel a, G. (1994). *Issues and perspectives on academic integrity* (2nd
- ed.). Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.
63. Gay, J. L., Evenson, K. R., & Smith, J. (2010). Developing measures on the perceptions
64. of the built environment for physical activity: a confirmatory analysis. *International*
65. *Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 7(1), 72.
66. George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and*
- reference. 11.0 update (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
67. Gliem, J. A., & Gliem, R. R. (2003). Calculating, interpreting, and reporting Cronbach's alpha
- reliability coefficient for Likert-type scales. In 2003 Midwest Research to Practice Conference
- in Adult, Continuing and Community Education. Columbus, OH
68. Graham, M.A., Monday, J., O'Brien, K., & Steffen, S. (1994). Cheating at small college: An
- examination of student and faculty attitudes and behaviors. *Journal of College Student*
- development, 35, 225-260
69. Grimes, P. W., & Rezek, J. P. (2005). The determinants of cheating by high school
70. economics students: a comparative study of academic dishonesty in the transitional
71. economies. *International Review of Economics Education*, 4(2), 23-45.
72. J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis* (7th ed.).
- Upper Saddle River: Pearson Education International.
73. Kelley, K., & Bonner, K. (2005). Digital text. Distance education and academic dishonesty:
- Faculty and administrator perception and responses. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning*
- Network, 9, 43-52.
74. Kevin L. Wright (2018). *Academic Dishonesty: Recommendations for the*
75. *Future of Higher Education* 39(8), 49-54.
76. Harding, T. S., Carpenter, D. D., Finelli, C. J., & Passow, H. J. (2004). Does academic
- dishonesty relate to unethical behavior in professional practice? An exploratory study. *Science*
- and engineering ethics, 10(2), 311-324.
77. Hayashi, K., Kamata, A. (2005). A note on the estimator of the alpha coefficient for
78. standardized variables under normality. *Psychometrika*, 70(3), 579-586.
79. Hensley, L.C., Kirkpatrick, K.M. & Burgoon, J.M. (2013). Relation of gender, course
80. enrollment, and grades to distinct forms of academic dishonesty. *Teaching in Higher*
81. *Education*, 18(8), 895-907.
82. Higbee, J.L. & Thomas, P.V. (2002). Student and faculty perceptions of behaviors that
- constitute cheating. *NASPA Journal*: 40(1), 39-52.
83. Hooper, D., Coughlan, J. and Mullen, M. R. (2008). *Structural Equation Modelling:*
84. *Guidelines for Determining Model Fit*. *The Electronic Journal of Business Research*
85. *Methods*, 6(1), 53 – 60.

86. Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural equation modeling: a multidisciplinary journal*, 6(1), 1-55.
87. Iberahim, H., Hussein, N., Samat, N., Noordin, F., & Daud, N. (2013). Academic dishonesty: why business students participate in these practices?. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 90, 152-156.
88. Imran, A. M., & Nordin, M. S. (2013). Predicting the underlying factors of academic dishonesty among undergraduates in public universities: a path analysis approach. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 11(2), 103-120.
89. Iyer, R., and Eastman, J. K. (2008). The Impact of Unethical Reasoning on Academic Dishonesty: Exploring the Moderating Effect of Social Desirability. *Marketing Education Review*, 18(2), 1-13.
90. Iyer, Rajesh, and J. K. Eastman: 2006, Academic Dishonesty: Are Business Students Different from other College Students?. *Journal of Education for Business*, 82(2), 101-110.
91. Jones, D. R. L. (2011). Academic Dishonesty: Are more students cheating? *Business Communication Quarterly*. 74, 141-150.
92. Joreskog, K. G., & Sorbom, D. (1993). *Lisrel 8: Structural equation modeling with the simplis command language*. Lincolnwood: Scientific Software International, Inc.
93. Jurdi, R., Hage, H. S., & Chow, H. P. (2011). Academic dishonesty in the Canadian classroom: Behaviours of a sample of university students. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 41(3), 1-35.
94. Kaur, K. (2011). A study of academic cheating among adolescents in relation to their personality, study involvement and socioeconomic status. PhD thesis submitted to MD University Rohtak, Haryana.
95. Keith-Spiegel, P., & Whitley, B. (2001). Introduction to the special issue. *Ethics & Behavior*, 11(3), 217-218.
96. Kidwell, L. A., Wozniak, K., & Laurel, J. P. (2003). Student reports and faculty perceptions of academic dishonesty. *Teaching Business Ethics*, 7(3), 205-214.
97. Kline, R. B. (2005). *Principles and practice of structural equation Modelling* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford Publications, Inc.
98. Kothari, C. R., & Garg, G. (2014). *Research methodology methods and techniques* (3rd edition). New Delhi: New Age International (P) Limited, Publishers.
99. Koul, L. (2009). *Methodology of Educational Research* (4th Edition). New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House.
100. Jones, D. R. L. (2011). Academic Dishonesty: Are more students cheating? *Business Communication Quarterly*. 74, 141-150.
101. Ledesma, R. G. (2011). Academic dishonesty among undergraduate students in a Korean university. *Research in World Economy*, 2(2), 25.
102. Likert, R. A. (1932). A Technique for the Measurement of Attitudes. *Archives of Psychology*, 22(140), 55.
103. Lim, V. K. G., & See, S. K. B. (2001). Attitudes toward, and intentions to report, academic cheating among students in Singapore. *Ethics & Behavior*, 11(3), 261–274.
104. Lima-Rodríguez, J. S., Lima-Serrano, M., & Domínguez-Sánchez, I. (2015). Psychometric prope2006). Academic dishonesty in graduate business programs: Prevalence,causes, and proposed action .*Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 5(3): 294-305.
105. Munoz-Garcia, 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 & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 39(3), 349-363.
106. Norton, L.S., Tilley, A.J., Newstead, S.E. and Franklyn-Stokes, A.(2001) “The pressures of assessment in undergraduate courses and their effect on student behaviours”, *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education* 26(3), 269–284.
107. Naghdipour, B., & Emeagwali, O. L. (2013). Students’ justifications for academic

129. dishonesty: Call for action. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 83, 261-265.
130. Nazir, M. S., & Aslam, M. S. (2010). Academic dishonesty and perceptions of
131. Pakistani students. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 24(7), 655-668.
132. Netter, S. (2010, December 13). Confessions of a ghostwriter: Man's career thrives helping students cheat [Online video]. Retrieved from <http://abcnews.go.com/US/confessionsghostwriter-man-builds-career-helping-students-cheat/story?id=12381763&page=1>
133. Nelson, T., & Shaefer, N. (1986). Cheating among college students estimated with the randomized-response technique. *College Student Journal*, 20(Fall), 321–325.
134. Netemeyer, R. G., Bearden, W. O., & Sharma, S. (2003). *Scaling procedures: Issues and applications*. Sage Publications.
135. Nonis, S. & Swift, C. O. (2010). An Examination of the Relationship between Academic Dishonesty and Workplace Dishonesty: A Multicampus Investigation, *Journal of Education for Business*, 77(2), 69-77.
136. Norton, L.S., Tilley, A.J., Newstead, S.E. and Franklyn-Stokes, A. (2001) "The pressures of assessment in undergraduate courses and their effect on student behaviours", *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education* 26(3), 269–284.
137. M. Y., & Isakson, H. R. (2000). Ethics of Tomorrow's Business Managers the Influence of Personal Beliefs and Values, Individual Characteristics, and Situational
138. Factors. *Journal of Education for Business*, 75(6), 321-330.
139. Ribble, M. (2011). Nine elements of digital citizenship. In *Digital citizenship: Using technology appropriately*. Retrieved from http://www.digitalcitizenship.net/Nine_Elements.html
140. Rawwas, M. Y., Al-Khatib, J. A., & Vitell, S. J. (2004). Academic dishonesty: A crosscultural comparison of US and Chinese marketing students. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 26(1), 89-100.
141. Sims, R. L. (1995). The severity of academic dishonesty: A comparison of faculty and
142. students views. *Psychology in the Schools*, 32(3), 233-238.
143. Storch, E.A. and Storch, J.B. (2002) "Fraternities, sororities, and academic dishonesty", *College Student Journal* 3, 247–251.
144. Shaw, W. H. (2008). *Business Ethics* (6th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thompson Wadsworth.
145. Tom, G., & Borin, N. (1988). Cheating in academe. *Journal of Education for Business*, 63(4), 153-157.
146. Ward, David A. (1986). Self-esteem and dishonest behavior revisited. *Journal of*
147. *Social Psychology*, 123. 709-7 13.
148. Whitley. B. E .• Jr. (1998). Factors associated with cheating among college students: A review. *Research in Higher Education*, 39, 235-274.
149. William L. Kibler, "Academic Dishonesty: A Student Development Dilemma," *NASPA Journal* 30 (summer 1993): 253.