Journal of Research and Reflections in Education
June 2017, Vol 11, No. 1, pp.68-85
http://www.ue.edu.pk/jrre

Academic Dishonesty at the Higher Education Level in Punjab, Pakistan

[1] Uzma Quraishi, [2] Fakhra Aziz

[1] Dean Social Sciences and Humanities, Lahore College for University
[2] Assistant Professor, Lahore College for University

The present descriptive study aimed to investigate the academic dishonesty at the higher education level in Punjab, Pakistan. The major rationale behind this study was to explore the factors responsible for the prevalence of academic dishonesty among students enrolled in HEC recognized universities Population consisted of all the undergraduate students of education from higher education institutions situated in Punjab. Sample comprised of 1000 undergraduate students from eight randomly selected institutes. Among them 43% were male and 57% were female. These undergraduate students were surveyed through questionnaires. The questionnaire was comprised of two adapted and modified parts. One part was used to measure the frequency of academic dishonest behavior of students and the second part was used to measure the factors responsible for the academic dishonesty in students. Data was analyzed through calculating simple descriptive statistics, like mean, standard deviation and percentages. Further to compare the mean score of both genders on different variables of academic dishonesty, *t-tests of independent samples* were used. Results point out a significant high level of prevalence of academic dishonesty at higher education level in Punjab. Same academic dishonest behaviors of both genders are also reported. Further, parents' pressure for maintaining good GPA leads to prevalence of academic dishonesty among male students more than female students.

Key Words*:* *Academic dishonesty**,** influence of peers, Parents 'pressure, Students 'self-efficacy, Students' intention*

Introduction

Student's attempts to use somebody else's work are the most practiced form of academic dishonesty (Jensen, Arnett, Feldman & Cauffman, 2002). Cizek (2004) provided detailed insight into the nature and possible intentions behind academic dishonest acts along with their effects on reliability of results. He defined academic cheating as: "any intentional action or behavior that disrupts the established rules governing the administration of a test or the completion of an assignment, gives one student an unfair advantage over other students on a test or an assignment, or decreases the accuracy of the intended inferences arising from a student's performance on a test or an assignment" (p. 308).

The key underlying notion of the study is that dishonest practices executed by students during their learning period have been changing with the passage of time. Traditionally students used to "cheat inside the classroom" in the form of cheat sheets during examinations which has been practiced in high proportions (Pullen, Payne, & Ortloff, 2002), and other forms involved misguiding evaluation, making false excuses in order to get more time for projects assigned by the educator, entering wrong lab data, having one's attendance signed by the disciple (Choi, 2009; Danielsen, Simon, & Pavlick, 2006).

"Cheating outside the classroom" is another traditional academic dishonest practice in which students use or purchase an article written by other, working on a task in group while it was assigned individually by the instructor (Grijalva, Nowell & Kerkvliet, 2006, Wilkerson, 2009).

> *"Plagiarism" is a traditional academic dishonest act by a student which has been classified by Clement (2001) into three types. "the unidentified source, the source without an exact page number, and cut and paste".*

Park (2003) studied number of scenarios which motivate students to cheat including peers working on mutual benefits, and undergraduates and graduates practices to produce other's work without acknowledging the real source for their own papers. Power's (2009) research answered the question why students decide to plagiarize? He opined ease of doing it; confidence about being escaped ; Seeing others as lethargic ; absence of target; assuming an assignment as time-consuming; lack of understanding the content and context; pressure for grades; they delay; they don't know how to avoid it; they are unaware that they are plagiarizing; they think that plagiarism in the school is acceptable ; they lack the ability to rephrase; and feel that they didn't get enough time to complete the assignment" . Wilkerson (2009) mentioned certain characteristics that inhibit of the students to cheat include "attitudes towards plagiarism based on peer influences and religious and ethical positions; fear of failure or penalties if caught; and the intensity of institutional anti plagiarism activities" (p.99).

With the advancement and progress in technology students have also transformed their techniques to copy from internet rather using the sources from library alone. The use of unfair technological gadgets including personal data assistants, calculators, and World Wide Web are those contemporary skills students use to manipulate their actual assessment (Yates & Maanen, 2001).

As documented by Tadesse and Getachew (2009) academic dishonesty may be a major trauma for higher level learning institutions. Higher education institutions are considered as the place of injecting moral values to the students (UNESCO, 2004) where they are solely not skilled with education but also to distinguish what is right and what is not (Brimble and Stevenson-Clarke, 2005). Society undergoes through the high intensity rates of students using unfair means to overcome their assessment with good scores paving the way to an unskilled professionals with invalid value of the earned grade (Lisle, Hyland & Bowrin, 2011).

Verdicts given by Brimble and Stevenson Clarke (2005) to the hazards caused as an aftermath effect of increase levels of unfair activities by students undermine the effectiveness of measures taken to assess students learning, and as students confine their learning on the support of using unfair means they make themselves handicapped to practically apply the learning conferred during a course. At an extensive level, such students are short at providing the value to their learning institute and professional relationships as well (p.19).

First time academic dishonesty was reported in 1940's and after it there has been reported an increase in its occurrence and complexity.(Blachino, & Weremko, 2011). Drake (1941) got 23%of school students reported cheating; Goldsen (1960) found academic dishonesty rates of 38% in 1952 and 49%in 1960; and Graham,

Monday, O'Brien, and Steffen in 1994, reported the rates of educational dishonesty as high as 90% ninety percent (as cited in Arnett, Jensen, Feldman, & Cauffman, 2002).

Jurdi, Hage & Chow (2011) found more than fifty percent students' indulgence on carrying out institutional dishonest acts. Numerically, about seventy five percent students accepted "plagiarism on written assignments" whereas more than twenty five percent students were involved in "cheating on exams" and "falsification" thus providing a foundation to the assumption made by Christensen, Huges & McCabe(2006) and Carpenter *et al.*,(2006) that the prevalence of institutional dishonesty lies more in assignments as compare to tests.

In short, academic dishonesty is a phenomenon which leads students to take shortcut in achieving their academic goals (i.e. achieving good grades while depriving themselves of the mastery goals). There are many forms of cheating including cheating on exams and tests, taking help from peers or from notes, and fabricating the data of research or lab work etc. All these things enable students to achieve good grades but they do not learn the skills necessary for their professional and further life ahead especially as teachers. When a dishonest student becomes a teacher, s/he will not be able to impart quality education to the students. Thus giving rise to more academic dishonesty in the society. The same is the case with students of every field. Thus the present study was planned to find out the percentages of students involved in academic dishonesty and the factors responsible for it in the hope that the results would help in the development of strategies to reduce the academic dishonesty among students.

Statement of the Problem

The study aimed to explore the main factors (institutional and individual) responsible for academic dishonesty among undergraduate students in higher education institutes of Punjab. Furthermore, How many undergraduate students indulge in academic dishonest practices.

Objectives

Objectives of this study were to:

1. Investigate the prevalence of academic dishonesty among undergraduate students in the higher education context.
2. Find out the factors responsible for academic dishonesty among the male and female students.
3. Devise ways and strategies to reduce academic dishonesty among these students.

Hypotheses

Following hypotheses were formulated to conduct the study

- There is no significant prevalence of academic dishonesty at higher education level
- Academic dishonest behavior of students have no gender base difference
- Factors responsible for academic dishonesty among the male and female students.
- are same
- Cheating on assignments score of male and female students are the same
- Cheating on tests scores of male and female students are the same
- Scores of male and female students on signing someone else's attendance are the same
- Plagiarizing related behavior scores of male and female students are the same

- Fabricating data behavior of male and female students is the same
- Academic achievement goal scores of male and female students are the same
- Curriculum effectiveness scores of male and female students are the same
- Teacher effectiveness scores of male and female students are the same
- Unnecessary coursework load scores of male and female students are the same
- Self-efficacy scores of male and female students are the same
- Exam preparation scores of male and female students are the same
- Parental pressure scores of male and female students are the same
- Exam anxiety scores of male and female students are the same
- Male and female students' perceptions towards academic dishonesty in relation to their academic dishonest behavior are the same
- Role of worth for high GPA scores of male and female students are the same

Method

Population of the study consisted of all undergraduate students enrolled in public institutes (universities) of Punjab. Multistage sampling technique was used, Lahore being Hub of the educational institutes was selected purposefully from 36 districts of Punjab.. Data were collected from 1000 students purposefully who were enrolled in 8 randomly selected institutes. Before this, permission letter to conduct the survey in sampled institutes was signed by the Head of Department. Informed consent was taken from corresponding persons of the institutes by explaining them the purpose of the study. Academic dishonesty was the dependent variable of the study, whereas the demographic variables including institutional type, gender, academic goals, teacher and curriculum effectiveness, parental pressure on students to maintain good scores, worth of high GPA for students, and self-efficacy level of students were the independent variables of the study. The instrument was comprised of two parts, first portion included demographic information along with adapted Academic Dishonesty Inventory (ADI) which was consisted of 26 statements to measure the frequency of students engagement in academic dishonesty. It was originally developed by Lucas and Friedrich (2005) who developed and used it for their own study. Second part of the instrument was adapted from Kimberly's study to determine the relation between students' academic dishonest behaviors and the factors responsible for their prevalence (Geddes, K.A., 2011). Pilot test was conducted to find out the reliability and validity of the modified instrument on 80 graduate students.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to calculate mean, standard deviation and percentages. Inferential statistics method i.e. *t-tests of independent samples* were used to find the significant difference between the mean scores on different variables i.e. student's general approach towards academic dishonesty, the motivators and factors responsible for their academic dishonest acts, influence of peers, pressure from parents utility of science, self-efficacy of students in relation to their academic dishonesty, and their intentions to pursue academic dishonesty between male and female undergraduate students and.

Section 1

Table 1

Cheating on exams

	Always	Sometimes	Never
My friends copy answers from me during exams.	42.9%	46.8%	10.3%
I have seen someone in my class who hide the information shared by teacher to ensure his/her distinct success in exams.	45.3%	45.1%	9.6%
I usually copy answers from nearby class fellow during exam.	57.3%	37.9%	4.8%
I usually copy answers from my friends during exam.	51.7%	42.6%	5.8%
Often, I took prohibited notes along with me to seek help during exams.	53.2%	39.0%	7.8%
I have been caught copying during exams.	57.1%	34.9%	8.0%
Often, I arrange with other students to give or receive answers during exams.	50.3%	41.2%	8.5%
I usually compare answers with other students during exams.	47.3%	45.1%	7.6%

The percentages of undergraduate students involved in cheating on exams are summarized in the table above show that majority of students practice cheating on exams, however, a very small portion of students never indulged in academic dishonest acts.

Table 2

Cheating on assignments

	Always	Sometimes	Never
I often copy someone else's answers for an assignment or homework exercise.	43.8%	49.1%	7.1%
I usually submit assignment as an individual piece of work when I had work on it with another student.	45.1%	45.2%	9.7%
I usually do other students assignment for him/her.	45.7%	45.8%	8.5%
I usually cite references which I do not use while making my assignment.	45.9%	43.2%	10.9%
I was caught when I copied someone else's assignment.	54.0%	35.9%	10.1%
I exaggerated the report of my participation in group assignment when I did little work.	52.1%	39.1%	8.8%
I usually compare answers with others while working on assignment.	43.9%	45.3%	10.9%

The percentages of undergraduate students involved in cheating on assignments are summarized in Table 2. Results show approximately an average of 47% of graduate students do cheating always, same percentage of students do cheating practice sometimes to complete their assignments

whereas about 8% of students never did cheating for completing their assignments.

Table 3

Cheating on tests

	Always	Sometimes	Never
Often, I compare answers with others during test.	49.6%	40.8%	9.5%
I have been caught copying during test.	54.6%	37.3%	8.0%
Sometimes I have given test in place of my friend when s/he was absent without letting the teacher know of it.	55.8%	36.6%	7.5%
My friend gives my test whenever I am absent during test without letting the teacher know of it.	54.7%	37.4%	7.8%

Table 3 summarizes the percentage that an average of 54 % of the participants uses unfair means during tests. On the other hand only 8% of the participants never cheated during a test.

Table 4

Signing fake attendance

	Always	Sometimes	Never
I signed someone else's attendance on the attendance sheet.	51.8%	39.6%	8.6%
Usually someone else sign my attendance when I am absent from my class.	53.4%	39.5%	7.1%

Table 4 summarizes the percentages of undergraduate students involved in signing fake attendance. The table shows an approximate average of 53% students reported signing fake attendance; however 8% of the students never signed fake attendance.

Table 5

Plagiarism

	Always	Sometimes	Never
I used material from a book without acknowledging the source.	52.7%	39.4%	7.9%

The table 5 shows that 53% of the students use material from a book but don't give the acknowledgment for the used material from a book. 39% of the students sometimes and 8% of them never practiced such dishonest act.

Table 6

Fabricating / Falsifying Data

	Always	Sometimes	Never
I have entered non-existent results into the database	53.4%	38.6%	7.9%
I often change data to obtain desired results.	48.9%	43.2%	7.9%

Table 4.6 shows that averagely 51% of the students always fabricate and falsify non- existent data and only 8% of the students never do fabrication and entering of false data.

Table 7

Academic perceptions

	Agree	Undecided	Disagree
High GPA matters more to me than to develop good understanding for the curriculum.(R)	45.9%	21.1%	33.0%
The curriculum taught has a use in my practical life.	33.4%	20.9%	45.7%
My teachers are competitive enough to explain the material properly.	31.9%	20.6%	47.4%
Unnecessary coursework leaves no time for me to study and prepare for exams. (R)	48.2%	19.7%	32.1%

The Table 7 shows that an average of 40% of the students considers academic goals more important as compare with that of mastery goals. However the same percentage of participants i.e. 40% of the participants considers mastery goals more important as compare to academic goals.

Table 8

Self-efficacy

	Agree	Undecided	Disagree
I have the ability to get good scores in exam without taking help from students.	34.4%	20.9%	44.7%
It is easier for me to cheat during exam than to study for the exam. (R)	47.3%	19.5%	33.2%
My fear of not being able to give right answers on exam questions makes me took help on answers from my friends. (R)	47.1%	21.2%	31.7%

The Table 8 shows that 43% of the participants feel that they have the ability to get good scores but as compare to their fear of not solving correct answers is concerned 47% of the students doubt their capabilities to solve exam papers.

Table 9

Exam preparation

	Agree	Undecided	Disagree
I start preparing for exams right from the beginning of semester.	29.3%	23.4%	47.4%
Usually I am completely prepared for my exam before exam starts.	30.4%	23.0%	46.6%
I usually revise the course before the beginning of exam.	31.3%	21.5%	47.2%

The Table 9 shows that only 30% of the students are prepared for exam, whereas 47% are those who are not prepared for exams before the commencement of exams.

Table 10

Parental pressure

	Agree	Undecided	Disagree
Parents pressure on me to get good GPA makes me copy paper from other students during exam. (R)	31.7%	18.3%	50.1%

The Table 4.10 shows that 32% of the participants copy during exams because of the pressure from their parents, however 50% of the participants disagree that they are pressurized by their parents.

Table 11

Peer influence

	Agree	Undecided	Disagree
Loyalty to my friends makes me help them during exam. (R)	46.7%	23.7%	29.7%

The Table 11 shows that 47% of the students make their friends copy paper from them because of their loyalty towards them. However 30% of the students disagree that their loyalty towards their friends makes them help during exam.

Table 12

Student's perceptions towards academic dishonesty

	Agree	Undecided	Disagree
To copy someone else's answers is not good for students as their capability to get something on their own begins to disappear.	40.3%	26.0%	33.7%
To get good job GPA matters more than the skills of the student related to the job. (R)	48.7%	17.0%	34.3%

The Table 12 shows that an average of 45% students agrees that to copy someone else's answers diminishes the capabilities of one's own self. However 49% of the participants opine that to gain good job GPA matters more than mastery skills of student. It can be concluded that at graduate level, students realize that academic dishonesty negatively effects their capabilities but to get high grades they do practice of it. Behind prevalence of academic dishonesty, major factors are parental pressure , lack of exams preparation, low self-efficacy and students' academic perceptions.

Section 2

Table 13

Difference between Academic Dishonest Behavior of male and female students

Gender	*N*	*X*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*
Male	372	2.6074	.95088	1.11	983	.27
Female	613	2.5418	.86333			

To compare academic dishonest behavior among male and female students, *t-test for independent samples* was carried out. No significant difference in the scores for male (X=2.60, SD=0.95) and female (X=2.54, SD=0.86) students; t =1.11, p = 0.27>0.05 level of significance was found in the results of the study. This result suggests that gender difference has no significant effect on the academic dishonest behavior of students.

Table 14

Difference between Predictors of Academic Dishonest Behavior of male and female students

Gender	*N*	*X*	*SD*	*T*	*df*	*p*
Male	372	2.8562	.96969	.450	788	.65
Female	613	2.8274	.97822			

To compare the predictors for academic dishonest behavior of male and female students an *independent-samples t-test* was conducted. No significant difference in the `scores for male (X=2.85, SD=0.96) and female (X=2.82, SD=0.98) students; t =0.45, p = 0.65>0.05 level of significance was found in the results of the data. These results suggest that the gender difference has no significant effect on the predictors of academic dishonest behaviors.

Table 15

Difference between cheating on exams of male and female students

Gender	*N*	*X*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*
Male	372	2.6166	.98672	1.020	749	.31
Female	613	2.5518	.93318			

To compare students cheating on exams among male and female students, *t-test for independent samples* was carried out. Table 15 shows no significant difference in the scores of male (X=2.61, SD=0.98) and female (X=2.55, SD=0.93) students; t =1.02, p= 0.31>0.05 level of significance. These results suggest that no significant difference was found among male and female students' cheating on exams behavior.

Table 16

Difference of cheating on assignments among male and female students

Gender	*N*	*X*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*
Male	372	2.6839	1.11267	.996	983	.32
Female	613	2.6164	.97897			

To compare students cheating on assignments among male and female students, *t-test for independent samples* was conducted. Table 16 shows that there was no significant difference in the scores of male (X=2.68, SD=1.11) and female (X=2.61, SD=0.97) students; t =0.99, p = 0.32>0.05 level of significance. These results suggest that no significant difference was found among male and female students' cheating on assignments behavior.

Table 17

Difference of cheating on tests among male and female students

Gender	*N*	*X*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*
Male	372	2.4671	1.26364	.49	983	.693
Female	613	2.4360	1.15844			

To compare students cheating on tests among private and public institution students, *t-test for independent samples* was conducted. Table 17 shows that there was no significant difference in the scores of male (*X*=2.46, *SD*=1.26) and female (*X*=2.43, *SD*=1.15) students' academic dishonest behavior; *t* =0.49, *p* = 0.69>0.05 level of significance. These results suggest that no significant difference was found among male and female students' cheating on tests behaviour.

Table 18

Difference in signing someone else's attendance among male and female students

Gender	*N*	*X*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*
Male	372	2.5148	1.26818	.566	983	.57
Female	613	2.4698	1.17169			

To compare students' signing someone else's attendance among male and female students, *t-test for independent samples* was conducted. Table 18 shows that there was no significant difference in the scores of male (*X*=2.51, *SD*=1.26) and female (*X*=2.46, *SD*=1.17) students; *t* =0.56, *p* = 0.57>0.05 level of significance. These results suggest that gender difference has no significant effect on the students' behavior of signing someone else's attendance.

Table 19

Difference in plagiarizing behavior among male and female students

Gender	*N*	*X*	*SD*	*T*	*df*	*p*
Male	372	2.6613	1.26887	.96	983	.34
Female	613	2.5856	1.16369			

To compare students' plagiarizing behavior among male and female students, *t-test for independent samples* was conducted. Table 19 shows that there was no significant difference in the scores of male (*X*=2.66, *SD*=1.26) and female (*X*=2.58, *SD*=1.16) students; *t* =0.96, *p* = 0.34>0.05 level of significance. These results suggest that gender difference has no significant effect on the students plagiarizing behavior.

Table 20

Difference in fabricating data behavior among male and female students

Gender	*N*	*X*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*
Male	372	2.6492	1.26317	1.747	983	.081
Female	613	2.5924	1.28703			

To compare students' fabricating data behavior among male and female students, *t-test for independent samples* was conducted. Table 20 shows that there was no significant difference in the scores of male (*X*=2.64, *SD*=1.26) and female (*X*=2.59, *SD*=1.28) students; *t* =1.74, *p* = 0.25>0.05 level of significance. These results suggest that gender difference has no significant effect on the students' fabricating data behavior.

Table 21

Difference in academic achievement goals among male and female students

Gender	*N*	*X*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*
Male	372	2.8575	1.37699	1.736	717	.083
Female	613	2.7064	1.23348			

To compare students' academic achievement goals among male and female students, *t-test for independent samples* was conducted. Table 21 shows that there was no significant difference in the scores of male (*X*=2.85, *SD*=1.37) and female (*X*=2.70, *SD*=1.23) students; *t* =1.73, *p*= 0.08>0.05 level of significance. These results suggest that gender difference has no significant effect on the students' academic achievement goals.

Table 22

Difference of curriculum effectiveness among male and female students

Gender	*N*	*X*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*
Male	372	2.8522	1.29780	1.135	755	.257
Female	613	2.7569	1.23985			

To compare students' views on curriculum effectiveness among male and female students, *t-test for independent samples* was conducted. Table 22 shows that there was no significant difference in the scores of male (*X*=2.85, *SD*=1.29) and female (*X*=2.75, *SD*=1.23) students; *t* =1.13, *p*= 0.25>0.05 level of significance. These results suggest that no difference has been found among male and female students views related to effectiveness of curriculum.

Table 23

Difference in teacher effectiveness among male and female students

Gender	*N*	*X*	*SD*	*T*	*df*	*p*
Male	372	2.7715	1.25204	.377	774	.706
Female	613	2.7406	1.23389			

To compare students' views on teacher effectiveness among male and female students, *t-test for independent samples* was conducted. Table 23 shows that there was no significant difference in the scores of male (*X*=2.77, *SD*=1.25) and female (*X*=2.74, *SD*=1.23) students; *t* =0.37, *p*= 0.71>0.05 level of significance. These results suggest that there is no significant gender difference in teachers' effectiveness in relation to academic dishonest behavior of students.

Table 24

Difference of unnecessary coursework load among male and female students

Gender	*N*	*X*	*SD*	*T*	*df*	*p*
Male	372	2.7581	1.25273	.390	785	.697
Female	613	2.7259	1.25633			

To compare students' views on unnecessary work load among male and female students, *t-test for independent samples* was conducted. Table 24 shows that there was no significant difference in the scores of male (*X*=2.75, *SD*=1.25) and female (*X*=2.72, *SD*=1.25) students; *t* =0.39, *p*= 0.69>0.05 level of significance. These results suggest that there is no significant difference of unnecessary coursework among male and female students academic dishonest behavior.

Table 25

Difference on self-efficacy among male and female students' academic dishonest behavior

Gender	*N*	*X*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*
Male	372	2.7715	1.26435	.259	773	.796
Female	613	2.7928	1.24341			

To compare male and female students' self-efficacy level in relation their academic dishonest behaviors, *t-test for independent samples* was conducted. Table 25 shows that there was no significant difference in the scores of male (*X*=2.79, *SD*=1.26) and female (*X*=2.77, *SD*=1.24) students; *t* =0.259 *p*= 0.79>0.05 level of significance. These results suggest that there is no significant effect of self-efficacy due to gender difference on academic dishonest behavior.

Table 26

Difference in exam preparation among male and female students' academic dishonest behavior

Gender	*N*	*X*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*
Male	372	2.7186	1.20607	.846	752	.404
Female	613	2.7836	1.14520			

To compare the effect of exam preparation among male and female students' academic dishonest behavior, *t-test for independent samples* was conducted. Table 26 shows that there was no significant difference in the scores of male (*X*=2.71, *SD*=1.21) and female (*X*=2.78, *SD*=1.14) students; *t* =0.84, *p*= 0.40>0.05 level of significance. These results suggest that there is no significant difference due to exam preparation on male and female students' academic dishonest behavior.

Table 27

Difference of parental pressure among private and public institution students

Gender	*N*	*X*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*
Male	372	3.4435	1.35166	2.085	773	.037
Female	613	3.2594	1.33073			

To compare the effect of exam preparation among private and public institution students' academic dishonest behaviour, *t-test for independent samples* was conducted. Table 27 shows that there was a significant difference in the scores of male (*X*=3.44, *SD*=1.34) and female (*X*=3.25, *SD*=1.33) students; *t* =2.08, *p*= 0.03<0.05 level of significance. These results suggest that male students are more pressurized from parents to get good GPA than female students.

Table 28

Difference of exam anxiety among male and female students' academic dishonest behavior

Gender	*N*	*X*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*P*
Male	372	2.7849	1.27889	.505	771	.614
Female	613	2.8271	1.25354			

To compare the exam anxiety among male and female students' academic dishonest behavior, *t-test for independent samples* was conducted. Table 28 shows that there was no significant difference in the scores of male (*X*=2.78, *SD*=1.27) and female (*X*=2.82, *SD*=1.25) students; *t* =0.50, *p*= 0.61>0.05 level of significance. These results suggest that there is no significant difference due to exam anxiety on the academic dishonest behavior of male and female students.

Table 29

Difference of male and female students' perceptions towards academic dishonesty in relation to their academic dishonest behavior

Gender	*N*	*X*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*
Male	372	3.1962	1.19824	1.913	817	.061
Female	613	3.0424	1.26472			

To compare the students' perceptions towards academic dishonesty among male and female students' academic dishonest behavior, *t-test for independent samples* was conducted. Table 29 shows that there was no significant difference in the scores of male (*X*=3.19, *SD*=1.19) and female (*X*=3.04, *SD*=1.26) students; *t* =1.91, *p*= 0.06>0.05 level of significance. These results suggest that there is no significant difference of male and female students' perceptions towards academic dishonesty in relation to students' academic dishonest behavior.

Table 30

Difference in the Role of Worth for High GPA among Male and Female Students Academic Dishonest Behavior

Gender	*N*	*X*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*
Male	372	2.8387	1.37196	.377	983	.707
Female	613	2.8059	1.29850			

To compare the worth for high GPA among male and female students' academic dishonest behaviour, *t-test for independent samples* was conducted. Table 30 shows that there was no significant difference in the scores of male (*X*=2.83, *SD*=1.37) and public (*X*=2.80, *SD*=1.29) students; *t* =0.37, *p*= 0.70>0.05 level of significance. These results suggest that there is no significant difference due to the worth for high GPA among male and female students academic dishonest behavior.

Discussion

Academic dishonesty has been defined as the broad notion of intentional activities of students violating rules and regulations of an institution (Sebek, 2006). In such dishonest acts a student who didn't work hard, attain good marks using unfair means attain the advantage over the other student who work hard to get good scores.

The Academic Dishonesty Inventory (ADI) adapted to measure data for this study measured many possible factors guiding academic dishonest practices among private and public institutions students. And to the best of researcher's knowledge, no previous work has been done previously on the comparison of academic dishonesty's prevalence in private and public institutions. Although no significant difference was found in the prevalence rates of academic dishonesty in students of private and public institution students, the results reportedly provided private institution students more score oriented as compare to public institution students. Private institution students found curriculum more effective as compare to public institution students. Private institution student also face more

pressure from parents in order to maintain good GPA. On the other hand research studies on gender differences in academic dishonesty's prevalence are manifold. Some of the studies found significant differences between male and female students behaviours and perceptions in relation to academic dishonesty. Some studies (Melosik, 2007; Miller, Murdock, Anderman and Poindexter, 2007) reported male students' practice of academic dishonest acts more whereas a few reported more academic dishonest incidents more on the part of female students (e.g., Graham et al., 1994, as cited in (Jurdi, Hage, & Chow, 2011). However, a number of studies (Malone, 2006; Pino & Smith, 2003, Chapman , 2004) found no significant difference in the indulgence rates of male and female students in academic dishonesty practices. The results of this study also fall under the third scenario, where there was no significant difference found between academic dishonest practices of male and female students. Only one significant difference was found according to results where male students face more pressure from parents to maintain good scores and GPA as compare to female students. Almost all hypotheses stating there is no significant difference in the prevalence of academic dishonest behaviors among male and female students were accepted as no significant difference was found in the involvement of male and female students, however only significant difference found between male and female students is due to parental pressure. According to results of the study, male students face more pressure from parents as compare to female students to maintain good GPA. This need to be taken into account by the higher education policy and provide parents orientation to aware that they do not put unnecessary demand on any specific gender to give better academic results. Overall research findings suggest that a clear policy and a set of practices required in higher education institutions to address academic dishonesty. Institutions need to be more student centered and need equipped to help students develop good academic capacity.

The following recommendations are listed for institutions and practitioners to develop effective models to address academic dishonesty unique to their specific situations.

- Findings of the present research and Literature have pointed towards the relation of academic dishonesty with classroom size and teacher's effectiveness. As the classroom is big enough to accommodate students with enough space among them in order to avoid any kind of discussion or help during exams and tests. Secondly, the teacher or invigilator must be effective and experienced enough to handle and discourage any sort of dishonest acts. Invigilation can play the most important role in controlling or spreading of academic dishonest practices. In other words, these practices can help in curbing academic dishonesty.
- The literature on academic dishonesty has an accumulation of research studies measuring the frequency of students engaged in academic dishonest acts and the possible factors associated with student decision to cheat. This issue needs to be taken to next level i.e. by experimenting different techniques to curb academic dishonesty or interviewing teachers and students to deeply understand the root cause of academic dishonesty.
- The instrument adapted to measure the frequency and factors responsible for academic dishonesty for this study had some gaps left like addition of open ended questions or closed ended

questions deduced as the result of interviews from faculty and students.

- The present study reports the influence of parent pressure and worth for achieving good grades on academic dishonest practices of students. Further society and cultural influence has also been reported in literature. As a result of societal and cultural influence academic achievement goals have become the priority of students. For achieving their academic achievement rewards, students employ unfair means intentionally in order to get good jobs and fame among family, teachers and peers. To control such practices stakeholders need to reduce such practices by acknowledging parents and society with the harm of such academic practices.
- Penalties can discourage and diminish academic dishonesty practices but they require costs of time and energy on the part of administrators and faculty to attain solid evidences against such practiced academic dishonest. This can be practiced without much cost of time and energy, if an agreement is signed by parents and students themselves to maintaining academic integrity, the violation of which can allow the institution administration to take any strict action against the student

Acknowledgements

This study was inspired by an original research work conducted by Ms Fizza for MPhil dissertation supervised by the authors.

References

Brimble, M., & Stevenson-Clarke, P. (2005). Perceptions of the prevalence and seriousness of academic dishonesty in Australian universities. *Australian Educational Researcher, 32*(3), 19–44.

Carpenter, D. D., Harding, T. S., Finelli, C. J., Montgomery, S. M., & Passow, H. J. (2006). Engineering students' perceptions of and attitudes towards cheating. *Journal of Engineering Education, 95*(3), 181–194.

Choi, C. (2009). The pull of integrity. *Prism, 18*(7), 29-33.

Cizek, G. J. (2004). Cheating in academics. In C. Spielberger (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Applied Psychology* (pp. 307-311). San Diego, CA: Academic Press

Clement, M. J. (2001). Academic dishonesty: To be or not to be. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 12*(2), 253-270.

Christensen Hughes, J. M., & McCabe, D. L. (2006). Understanding academic misconduct. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 36*(1), 49–63.

Danielsen, R. D., Simon, A. F., & Pavlick, R. (2006). The culture of cheating: From the classroom to the exam room. *Journal of Physician Assistant Education, 17*(1), 23-29.

Drake. (1941). Why Students Cheat. *Journal of Higher Education,* 12, 419.

Grijalva, N., & Kervelivt (2006). Academic honesty and online courses. *College Student Journal, 40*(1), 180-185. Retrieved from http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0FCR/is_1_40/ai_n16346361/

Jensen, L. A., Arnett, J. J., Feldman, S. S., & Cauffman, E. (2002). It's wrong, but everybody does it: Academic dishonesty among high school and college students. *Contemp. Educ. Psychol.*27: 209-228.

Jurdi, R., Hage, H. S., & Chow, H. P. H. (2011). What behaviours do students consider academically dishonest? Findings from a survey of Canadian

undergraduate students. *Social Psychology of Education.* doi: 10.1007/s11218-011-9166-y

Lisle, H. & Bowrin. (2011). "A little leaven corrupteth the whole lump": academic cheating as a hindrance to achieving quality in higher education. *Caribbean Teaching Scholar, 1*(1), 5-19.

Majid,F., Quraishi,U.,& Aziz, F (2015). *Prevalence of academic dishonesty among undergraduate students in the higher education context* . **(**Unpublished MPhil Thesis).Women university Lahore, Pakistan.

Miller, A., Murdock, T., Anderman, E. M., & Poindexter, A. L. (2007). Who are all these cheaters? Characteristics of academically dishonest students. In E. M. Anderman & T. B. Murdock (Eds.), *Psychological perspectives on academic cheating* (pp. 9-32). San Diego, CA: Elsevier.

Park, C. (2003). In other (people's words: Plagiarism by university students—literature and lessons. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 28*(5), 471-488.

Power, L. (2009). University students' perceptions of plagiarism. *The Journal of Higher Education, 80*(6), 643.

Pullen, R., Ortloff, V., Casey, S., & Payne, J. B. (2000). Analysis of academic misconduct using unobtrusive research: A study of discarded cheat sheets. *College Student Journal, 34*(4), 616-627.

Sebek, F. (2006). *Academic Dishonesty – an IDE perspective.* Retrieved May 10, 2014, from http://www.mdh.se/ide/utbildning/cheati ng/academicdishonestyIDE.pdf

Smith, L., & Davis, J. (2003). An examination of student cheating in the two-year college. *Community College Review, 31*(1), 17-34

Tadesse, T. & Getachew, K. (2009). Faculties' Perception and Responses to Academic Dishonesty of Undergraduate Students in Education, Business and Economics. *Ethiop. J. Educ. & Sc, 4* (2).

Wilkerson, J. (2009). Staff and student perceptions of plagiarism and cheating. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 20*(2), 98-105. Retrieved from http://www.isetl.org/ijtlhe/ ISSN 1812-9129.

UNESCO. (2004). *Higher Education for Sustainable Development: Education for Sustainable Development Information Brief.* Paris.

Yates, J., & Maanen, J. (2001). *Information technology and organizational transformation: History, rhetoric, and practice.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage