

Bachelor thesis

Determinants of exam cheating risk perception

Michael Goretzki

University of Twente

Student number: s1192094
First supervisor: Dr. J.M. Gutteling
Second supervisor: Peter de Vries
Date: 15.06.2015, Enschede

Abstract

Previous research shows that cheating is frequently performed task during exams at universities. In addition, cheating can also be considered to be a risk for the involved groups students and professors. This paper examines different determinants regarding risk perception and which ones predict or influence risk perception of cheating for students as well as for professors. The relevant determinants on which this research focuses are Sensation Seeking, Self efficacy and the probability to get caught/catch someone. An online survey was designed to test if the above-mentioned determinants are relevant for risk perception during cheating for students and professors. The data of 77 students and 20 docents were processed to get the results. A multiple regression analysis shows that for students only the probability to get caught determines the risk perception of cheating and for professors none of the tested determinants influences the risk perception regarding cheating.

Samenvatting

Sommige onderzoeken laten zien dat er regelmatig fraudeert wordt aan universiteiten. Verder kan fraude ook als risico beschreven worden voor de betrokkenen partijen docenten en studenten. Het volgende verslag onderzoekt verschillenden determinanten voor risk perception en welke hiervan voor studenten en docenten relevant zijn m.b.t. tot fraude. Het onderzoek focust op de determinanten sensation seeking, self-efficacy en de waarschijnlijkheid om tijdens fraude betrapt te worden of iemand te betrappen. Om deze determinanten te meten werd een online vragenlijst ontwikkelt. In totaal worden de daten van 77 studenten en 20 docenten gebruikt om de resultaten te verkrijgen. Een multiple regressie analyse laat zien dat voor studenten de waarschijnlijkheid om tijdens frauderen betrapt te worden een significante determinant is voor risico perceptie tijdens fraude. Geen van de onderzochte determinanten was een voorspeller van risico perceptie voor professoren.

Contents

Introduction	5
Actual Situation	6
Definition of cheating.....	6
Risk.....	6
Risk Perception.....	7
Practical relevance and goal of study	8
Method.....	10
Respondents.....	10
Procedure.....	10
Instruments	11
Survey.....	11
Data Analysis	14
Results	15
Descriptive analysis.....	15
Analyzing the RQ and Hypothesis	16
References	23
Appendix	26
Appendix A (Survey Students).....	26
Appendix B (Survey Professors)	31

Introduction

Nowadays, everyone in society is being confronted with all kinds of risky situations on a daily basis. For example car accidents, natural hazards, chance to get cancer, a heart attack, or simply getting injured during a soccer match are all forms of risk to which an average person could be exposed.

However, different people tend to perceive those various risks in different ways. Some might perceive a certain action more risky while others think of it as not risky at all. The latter ones are often called “sensation seekers” (Zuckerman, 1979). They tend to do more extreme sports like skiing, rafting or hiking, and have higher sensation seeking levels compared to an average person. Of course, the opposite exists as well (Zuckerman, 1983). People who see a risk in nearly anything, just driving to the supermarket. They are constantly afraid of being hit by another car or by crashing with a plane.

So to summarize, one can broadly categorize people into two different groups: people who are high sensation seekers and likely to engage into risky situations, and people who are low sensation seekers and are likely to avoid risky situations.

During the present study, the focus will be on the high sensation-seeking group, which tends to actively engage into risky situations. Specifically, this paper wants to figure out how this category of people perceives situations as more or less risky, and why they do so. Therefore, in order to make it more comprehensible and practical, this paper will make use of the example of students cheating during (an) exam(s) at Universities. This case Illustration is expected to be helpful in order to clarify the topic at hand.

Since in the cheating process there are two groups of people affected, namely students and professors, this paper wants to analyze the risk perception of students as well as of professors in regard to cheating.

Actual Situation

Scientific literature proves that cheating is actually performed during exams at universities. Whitely (1998) even states that for students, cheating is like breathing. Put differently by Moffatt (1990), cheating is a normal ability of students and compares it to the ability of reading or writing. The act of cheating occurs on a regular basis (Burrus, McGoldrick & Schuhmann, 2010). According to Baird (1980), 50 – 75 % of students cheated in their lives, while 50 – 70 % of professors have seen/ caught someone cheating during an exam.

Definition of cheating

One can say that the act of cheating can provide the student with an illegal advantage among his fellow students in order to answer the asked questions. With regard to that, literature shows that there are two different ways to achieve this advantage. On the one hand, cheating is the act of copying the answers of a fellow student during the exam (Graham, 1994). On the other hand, cheating is the act of using banned instruments (e.g. phones, cheat sheets) without permission in order to answer exam questions (Barnett, & Dalton, 1981).

Risk

The term risk itself can be defined as a behavior, which can possibly have negative consequences (Jessor, 1991). Because cheating is a good situational example where a negative consequence might follow, it seems to be an appropriate example for risk

and the issue of risk perception. Moreover, in a situation where one can cheat, there are two different groups affected, namely student and professors.

Risk Perception

According to Slovic (1987), risk perception is an “intuitive judgment” to a risk. Because risk perception is subjective, risk is perceived differently by various individuals (Sjöberg, 2000). There are various distinct determinants that have an influence on the perception of risk. Scientific literature does provide certain determinants that might be of relevance for this study.

One of these determinants is, as previously mentioned already, sensation seeking. Sensation seeking can be defined as “the need for varied, novel, and complex sensations and experiences, and the willingness to take physical and social risks for the sake of such experiences” (Zuckerman, 1979). Therewith, people high in sensation seeking are more willing to take certain risks and perceive many risks not as that dangerous or as that likely to happen at all.

Next, self-efficacy will be considered as a determinant. Self efficacy refers to an individual's belief in his or her capacity to execute behaviors necessary to produce specific performance attainments (Bandura & Wood, 1989). If self efficacy is high, one tends to underestimate risks and automatically takes higher risks more easily (Krueger, & Dickson, 1994).

A further possible determinant is the evaluation/perception of the probability that somebody gets caught/catches someone during cheating (Brewer, Chapman, Gibson, Gerard, McCaul, & Weinstein, 2007). The risk perception itself can be explained by the evaluation/perception of the possible consequences of the risk play an essential role in regard to risk perception (Jessor, 1991).

Furthermore, the Psychometric Model provides three possibly relevant determinants, which are New/Old, Dread, and number of exposures. According to his model, people perceive situations as riskier when the activity/risk is new or unknown; if a great danger can be derived from this situation, thus a dread occurs, and if one is frequently exposed to his risk (Fischhoff, Lichtenstein, Read, & Combs, 1978).

Another relevant determinant in regard to the topic is demographics. Because, according to Whitely (1998), it is assumed that younger people are more likely to cheat than older people, it seems reasonable to consider this aspect as well. Another study by Houston (1983) also refers to a difference between gender in regard to the likelihood of cheating. Male students are more likely to cheat than female.

Practical relevance and goal of study

The goal of the study is to figure out which determinants are actually relevant in regard to the risk perception of cheating for students and professors. If the study will show clear results regarding these determinants of risk perception in regard to cheating, this knowledge could be applied to the daily life at Universities directly. One could then influence the relevant determinants previously to the exam in order for students to evaluate cheating during an exam as more risky and thus as more unlikely to do. Furthermore, if professors perceive cheating as a bigger risk, they may design new guidelines for exams in order to prevent cheating. This is why the main focus within the current study is on the determinants of self-efficacy, sensation seeking and the perception of the probability to get caught/ catch someone. These determinants can be manipulated, in order to reach the goal and prevent cheating. This is not possible with e.g. the determinant demographics. Nevertheless, all relevant

determinants will be researched since scientific literature shows them to be significant.

In order to achieve this goal, I want to answer the following research question:

To which degree are Sensation Seeking, Self efficacy and probability to get caught/catch someone relevant for risk perception in the case of cheating in Universities for students as well as for professors?

Moreover, the following hypotheses will be tested in the present paper:

H0: Sensation Seeking, Self efficacy and probability to get caught/catch someone are no determinants of risk perception for students and professors in the case of cheating.

Ha: Sensation Seeking, Self efficacy and probability to get caught/catch someone are determinants of risk perception for students and professors in the case of cheating.

Method

Respondents

There are two groups of people being investigated during this research. On the one hand, there are students responding to the questionnaire. On the other hand, there are professors. In total, 117 respondents participated in that study, from which 92 are students and 25 are professors. In total, 77 students and 20 professors filled in the entire questionnaire completely. The specific demographic details of each response group and the total average can be found in Table 1. Furthermore, the respondents did not have to fulfill any further requirements, besides being officially registered as a student or professor and speaking the English language. This is necessary since all instructions and questions were asked in English.

Table 1

Overview respondent's demographic data

	Students	Professors	Total
Man	44	14	58
Woman	33	6	39
Total	77	20	97

Procedure

The respondents were being attracted by convenience sampling and originated out of the environment of the researcher. The respondents were being contacted individually via social media websites such as Facebook or via E-mail. Since no special other requirements were necessary (like origin or age) a large number of students

(approximately 350) and professors (approximately 140) were asked to fill out the survey. The survey was conducted and designed with help of the program Qualtrics. The data collection process took place between 20th April 2015 and 15th May 2015. The respondents were informed that they would participate in an online survey that measures risk perception regarding cheating. The completion of the survey takes approximately 8 minutes for students, and 4 minutes for professors. The participation in the survey was voluntary and unpaid. For the statistical analysis of this survey, the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), version 20, is being used.

Instruments

During the present study, two different instruments were being used. One survey is adjusted to the profile of a student while the other survey is being adjusted to the profile of professors. Both surveys include an informed consent at the very beginning, which includes general information that the participation is voluntary, the collected data will be processed in an anonymous way, and which overall topic is being studied with the help of that survey.

Survey

According to the theoretical analysis, the distributed survey measures different determinants that could possibly stand in relation to the perception of cheating during exams. First of all, the demographics are being inquired, specifically age and gender. Following upon that, it is being asked if the student has ever cheated in his/her life, and if so, how often. The fact of “how often” can be indicated on a scale from once – once a year – once a semester – once a quarter – every time I write an exam. Next, it is asked if the student has ever got caught while cheating. Within that scale, he can

again answer the “how often” question by indicating once up until more than three times.

The next determinant being tested is sensation seeking. Here, the Sensation Seeking Scale by Zuckerman is being used (Zuckerman et al., 1978). It is divided into four sub-scales, namely Boredom Susceptibility, Disinhibition, Experience Seeking, and Thrill and Adventure Seeking (Zuckerman, 1983). However, this detailed sub scaling in its individual parts has no relevance for the current investigation. The study is only concerned with the overall outcomes of the Sensation Seeking Scale. Before the respondent starts with this specific part of the survey, he/she gets a detailed instruction on how to answer the item questions. The Scale itself consists out of 80 statements where two statements are represented against each other, making it 40 questions. The respondent then always has to decide for one of the two statements, depending on with which he can better identify himself. An example of one such question is:

- I have no patience with dull or boring persons.
- I find something interesting in almost every person I talk with.

The reliability of the sensation seeking scale is moderately reliable with a Cronbach’s Alpha of $\alpha=0.76$. It is being scored higher on the scale if the respondent selects a statement that indicates high sensation seeking more often.

Next, the determinant self efficacy is being measured by the survey. This is being done by using a Likert Scale, where the respondents have to indicate if one of the following seven statements, in their opinion, is 1 = Not at all true; 2 = Hardly true; 3 = Moderately true; 4 = Exactly true. An example of such a statement is “I am confident that I could cheat without being caught”.The reliability for this subscale is Cronbach’s Alpha $\alpha =0.74$.

Moreover, the evaluation / perception of the probability to get caught/catch someone during cheating is being tested. Again, a Likert scale is being used, where respondents have to indicate, in their personal opinion, how likely the following scenarios are to occur for them. There are 4 items. The scale indicators are 1= Not likely at all; 2=hardly likely; 3= moderately likely; and 4=exactly likely. An example statement for this part is “When I try to use a cheating sheet during an exam, I get caught”. The reliability for this subscale is Cronbach’s Alpha $\alpha = 0.81$.

As last part of the survey, evaluation / perception of possible consequences of cheating is being measured, which is also done by using a Likert Scale with six items. The scale indicators are the same as in the previous part. An example of a statement in this part is “If I cheat, it is more likely to pass the exam”. The reliability for this subscale is Cronbach’s Alpha $\alpha = 0.63$. This final subscale is used in order to determine the risk perception of students and professors regarding cheating.

The survey for professors rarely differentiates itself from the survey for students. In general, the structure is very similar. There are only adjustments being made where it is necessary to project the question or statement to professors instead of students. The biggest difference is that the survey for professors does not include the Sensation Seeking Scale, because professors are not the persons performing the risky behavior. Moreover, professors are being asked if they consider the issue of cheating during exams to be a new problem. This question is not asked to students. As one can see in the survey (see attachment) professors only have five instead of six items regarding the possible consequences since the final item “If I cheat, it is likely that I will get suspended from the exam for one year” does not match for professors. An example of a statement measuring self-efficacy with professors is “I can always

catch someone who is using a cheat-sheet during exam”. In comparison to that, the equivalent question in the survey for students was “I can always manage to use a cheat-sheet”.

A factor analysis regarding the subscales of self-efficacy, probability to get caught and consequences show that, for self-efficacy, factor 1 (component 2) seems to indicate Self efficacy of cheating secretly, and factor 2 (component 1) seems to indicate self efficacy for the ease of cheating. Regarding the probability to get caught, no factors could be detected. Regarding the *consequences*, factor 1 (component 2) seems to indicate negative consequences while factor 2 (component 1) seems to indicate positive consequences

Data Analysis

From the collected data, survey means, standard deviations, and correlations will be determined via calculation for the five separate subscales regarding the five determinants. This is expected to show which of the five determinants are relevant for risk perception and which determinants correlate with each other. Furthermore, a linear regression analysis was executed in order to test if the independent variables the determinants (independent variable) have influence on risk perception during cheating (dependent variable). Finally, the differences between students and professors will be elaborated upon by making a regression analysis.

Results

Descriptive analysis

The whole population of students shows a relative high sensation seeking score with $M= 54.82$; $SD=5.21$. Furthermore, both students and docents estimate the probability to get caught within the bounds of possibility, with a score of $M=9.82$; $SD=2.8$ for students and $M= 10.35$; $SD=2.48$ for professors. The highest possible score is 16. For self-efficacy, students scored moderately with $M=16.79$; $SD=3.99$. The score for the professors were higher with a value of $M=18.87$; $SD=4.09$. The maximum score that could be reached was 28. Both parties, students and professors, estimate the consequences of being caught to be average with values of $M=13.54$; $SD=3.27$ and $M=13.21$; $SD=3.07$ respectively. The highest possible score is 24. Table 2 shows the means and standard deviations.

Table 2.

Descriptives: Mean (SD) of Sensation Seeking, Probability to get caught./catch someone, Consequences of cheating and age .

	Total	Students (n=77)	Profs (n= 20)
Sensation Seeking		54.82(5,41)	
Probability	9.94 (2.73)	9.82(2,8)	10.35(2,48)
Self efficacy	17.27 (4.09)	16.79(3,99)	18.87(4,09)
Consequences	13.47 (3.07)	13.54(3,27)	13.21(2,12)
Age	28.36(11.15)	23.15(1,49)	46.26(11,43)

Table 3 shows clear correlations between the relevant variables. The total of self-efficacy correlates positively with sensation seeking. Furthermore, the consequences of being caught correlate negatively with sensation seeking and probability to get caught. In addition, the consequences and self-efficacy among students correlate negatively. Within the group of professors, only the consequences correlate positively with self-efficacy. This is also the highest correlation.

Table 3.

Bivariate correlations between the relevant variables.

	Total			Students (n= 77)			Profs (n=20)		
	1.	2.	3.	1.	2.	3.	1.	2.	3.
(1) Sensation Seeking	1.00			1.00					
(2) Probability	.19	1.00		.19	1.00			1.00	
(3) Self efficacy	.32**	-.13	1.00	.35**	-.13	1.00	.17		1.00
(4)Consequences	-.24*	-.28*	-.08	.33**	-.28*	.35**	.26	.83**	

Note. * statistically significant at $\alpha = .05$ ** statistically significant at $\alpha = .01$.

Analyzing the RQ and Hypothesis

The multiple regression analysis (see table 3) for students with *consequences* being the dependent variable and *Sensation Seeking*, *probability to get caught* and *self efficacy* being the independent variables, shows that significant results can be

retrieved in order to explain risk perception of cheating $F(3;68)=5.08$; $p<.05$. It is estimated that the probability to get caught adds statistically significant explanation value to the model ($B=0.36$; $SE_b=0.14$; $df=2.53$; $p<.05$). Since B is positive, one can assume that if the probability to get caught rises, the perceived risk perception will rise as well. The other determinants do not add explanatory value to the model (Sensation Seeking: $B=0.11$; $SE_b=0.08$; $t=1.42$; $p>.05$ Self efficacy: $B=-0.13$; $SE_b=0.11$; $t=-1.17$; $p>.05$)

The multiple regression for professors with the dependent variable *consequences* and the independent variables *Sensation Seeking*, *probability to catch someone* and *self efficacy* is not significant at explaining the risk perception for cheating $F(2.16)=0.64$; $p>.05$.

Table 4.

Regression analyses for students and professors, dependent variable: Consequences of cheating, predictors: Probability to get caught, Self efficacy, Sensation Seeking

	Students (n=77)			Profs (n=20)		
	B (SE_B)	Stand. Beta	t	B (SE_B)	Stand. Beta	t
Probability	0.36* (0.14)	0.31	2.53	-0.11 (0.36)	-0.13	-0.32
Self efficacy	-0.13 (0.11)	-0.15	-1.17	0.18 (0.21)	0.37	0.88
Sensation Seeking	0.11 (0.08)	0.17	1.42			
F		5.08*			0.64	
df1; df2		3;68			2;16	

Note. * statistically significant at $\alpha = .05$ ** statistically significant at $\alpha = .01$.

Discussion

The aim of the current study was to figure out which determinants of risk perception are relevant in regard to cheating for students as well as for professors. It was expected that the following determinants have a relevant impact on risk perception: (1) sensation seeking, (2) psychometric Model, (3) demographics, (4) self-efficacy, (5) evaluation/perception of the probability to get caught/ catch someone, and (6) evaluation/perception of possible consequences.

The regression analysis shows that none of the aforementioned determinants for risk perception of cheating during an exam are relevant for professors. However, regarding the students, the regression analysis gives a different result. Specifically, it shows that the evaluation / perception of the possible probability of getting caught is a relevant determinant for risk perception during cheating.

More precise results and its explanations, as well as limitations, recommendations and suggestions for future research will be discussed in the following.

First of all the analysis shows that all students who participated scored relatively high on sensation seeking. A possible explanation for this can be the relative young average age of twenty three years. According to Whitely (1998), young people tend to engage more readily into high sensation seeking tasks than older people. The probability to get caught while cheating is being estimated as moderately high. Professors even consider the possibility to catch someone while cheating a little bit higher than students. Put differently, this shows that students are aware of the fact that the possibility to get caught exists, while it also shows that professors are aware of the fact that it is possible to catch students while cheating. This is indicated by the

practical example that individual seats and/or view barriers are being used, or toilet controls are being made during exams, in order to prevent both parties from the cheating issue. Or even using CCTV to videotape the act of cheating in order to achieve juristic evidence

Students in regard to being able to cheat, as well as professors in regard to catching someone during cheating, both show self-efficacy to do so. Professors regard their ability to catch someone while cheating even higher than students regarding cheating. This agrees with the findings from Schaubroeck & Merritt (1997), who also indicate that professors scores high on self efficacy. This can be traced back to the fact that professors need less effort and knowledge in order to recognize someone while cheating. For example, when a student wants to cheat, he has to think about an appropriate technique for how to take out a cheating sheet or smart phone unnoticed and, upon that, find and copy the relevant information. On the contrary to that, a professor only has to be attentive and observe the behavior and movements of students. Professors as well as students recognize the fact that no negative consequences follow upon cheating and catching someone while cheating. This fact is really interesting and remarkable since relevant scientific literature expresses that cheating is a risk. Burrus et al., 2010 declare that cheating is a risk and also that students perceive cheating as risk. However, the present study clarifies that professors and students are familiar to the topic of cheating and do not evaluate it to be an overly high risk. A possible explanation for this might be a limitation of information available regarding the following consequences.

Next, it is intriguing to elaborate upon the underlying reasons and explanations for the relationships between the relevant determinants. By making use of the bivariate correlation analysis, it became clear that the consequences of cheating for

students, so the risk perception, correlates positively with sensation seeking and self-efficacy. At the same time, the consequences of cheating negatively correlate with the perceived probability to get caught. This can be traced back to the fact that students who feel capable of cheating can be considered as sensation seekers. Therefore, they do not perceive the probability to get caught as very high and the consequences of it as not so negative. The same can be said for professors in regard to self-efficacy. The more capable professors feel to catch someone while cheating, the less negative they assess the consequences of catching someone.

The regression analysis shows that only the perceived probability to catch someone while cheating is a significant determinant for students, which, in turn, can explain the risk perception for cheating. All other determinants are not relevant, neither for students nor for professors. These results are very surprising since all tested determinants are determinants of risk perception. For instance; following (Zuckerman, 1979) is Sensation Seeking a determinant for risk. Therefore, it was expected that this should also be the case for risk perception regarding cheating. However, it was not. A possible explanation for this is that, as previously explained, respondents do not consider cheating as a high-risk activity, since no severe negative consequences are expected when students cheat or when professors catch students during cheating. This would also explain why only the probability to get caught determines the risk perception for students. Specifically, only if the student expects to get caught while cheating, he perceives cheating to be a possible risk.

In order to answer the research question, one can state the following: For students, the probability to get caught determines for risk perception regarding cheating. For professors, none of the tested determinants is relevant for risk perception regarding cheating.

Further possible reasons for this outcome can be traced back to the limitations of the present study: First of all, the sample respondents are an issue. Since the research includes a convenience sample, the majority of respondents originate from the researchers environment. Put differently, in order to promote the study and receive additional respondents, people, friends and acquaintances who met the requirements were being asked to fill out the survey, and to sent it further to their friends, resulting in a snowball effect. The same procedure was used for professors, which explains why the majority of the professors are occupied at the University of Twente. Moreover, the sample of this study is not representative. A suggestion for future research would be to get respondents via probability sampling in order to get a bigger distribution among the respondents.

A second possible limitation can be the measurement instrument. It is remarkable that 20 respondents did not fill out the survey completely. These are not respondents who stopped filling out the survey in the middle, but respondents who left out single answers in between. This can be due to the fact that they did not want to answer the questions or because they accidentally skipped it. Therefore, the answers of these respondents could not be utilized. In order to avoid this, one should have changed the Qualtrics settings into “forced answer” so that the survey would have been filled out completely. Furthermore, the survey includes minor spelling mistakes. These misspellings were so negligible that they did not influence the understanding of the question. However, they could have led to not filling out the survey conscientiously since it can be considered to be a reason of low seriousness.

There are also textual reasons, which might be decisive for the results. For example, the first statements in the Likert scale, which measures the possible consequences for cheating and risk perception, are formulated in a positive manner.

Specifically, the statements are formulated in a way saying that by cheating, positive consequences arise and therefore is not seen as a risk. That might have primed the respondents. Because the respondents primarily read the positive formulated items, they unconsciously associated positive consequences with cheating, wherefore the followed negative formulated items were not considered to be probable. In order to prevent this from happening, one should have mixed the positive and negative formulated items.

Because the research has certain limitations, it is advised to conduct the research again in order to answer the research question completely and in a reliable way. To sum it up, one should make use of probability sampling in order to retrieve a convenient sample, improve the measurement scale, edit spelling mistakes, settings should be changed into forced answer, and positive and negative items should be mixed in the Likert scale. Because there has been high correlation among the determinants, an entirely new research could be conducted in the future in order to figure out why this actually is the case.

References

- Bandura, A., & Wood, R. (1989). Effect of perceived controllability and performance standards on self-regulation of complex decision making. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 56(5), 805
- Barnett, D. C., & Dalton, J. C. (1981). Why college students cheat. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 22(6), 545-51.
- Brewer, N. T., Chapman, G. B., Gibbons, F. X., Gerrard, M., McCaul, K. D., & Weinstein, N. D. (2007). Meta-analysis of the relationship between risk perception and health behavior: the example of vaccination. *Health Psychology*, 26(2), 136.
- Burrus, R. T., McGoldrick, K., & Schuhmann, P. W. (2010). Self-reports of student cheating: Does a definition of cheating matter?. *The Journal of Economic Education*, 38(1), 3-16.
- Fischhoff, B., Slovic, P., Lichtenstein, S., Read, S., & Combs, B. (1978). How safe is safe enough? A psychometric study of attitudes towards technological risks and benefits. *Policy sciences*, 9(2), 127-152.
- Graham, M. A. (1994). Cheating at small colleges: An examination of student and faculty attitudes and behaviors. *Journal of College Student Development*, 35(4), 255-60.

Houston, J. P. (1983). College classroom cheating, threat, sex and prior performance.

College Student Journal.

Jessor, R. (1991). Risk behavior in adolescence: A psychosocial framework for

understanding and action. *Journal of adolescent Health*, 12(8), 597-605.

Krueger, N., & Dickson, P. R. (1994). How believing in ourselves increases risk

taking: Perceived self-efficacy and opportunity recognition. *Decision Sciences*, 25(3), 385-400.

Moffatt, M. (1990). Undergraduate Cheating.

Schaubroeck, J., & Merritt, D. E. (1997). Divergent effects of job control on coping

with work stressors: The key role of self-efficacy. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(3), 738-754.

Sjöberg, L. (2000). Factors in risk perception. *Risk analysis*, 20(1), 1-11.

Slovic, P. (1987). Perception of risk. *Science*, 236(4799), 280-285.

Whitley, B. E. (1998). Factors associated with cheating among college students: A

review. *Research in Higher Education*, 39(3), 235-274.

Zuckerman, M. (1979). Sensation seeking. *Corsini Encyclopedia of Psychology*.

Zuckerman, M. (1983). Sensation seeking and sports. *Personality and individual differences*, 4(3), 285-292.

Zuckerman, M., Eysenck, S. B., & Eysenck, H. J. (1978). Sensation seeking in England and America: cross-cultural, age, and sex comparisons. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*, 46(1), 139.

Appendix

Appendix A

Title: Survey Students

Age:

-Woman/Man

-Nationality

Have you ever cheated during an exam? Yes/No

- If yes, how often ? once/ once a year/ once a semester/ once a quarter / every time I write an exam

Did you ever get caught while cheating? Yes/No

- If yes, how many times? 1/2/3/ >3

Directions: Each of the items below contains two choices, A and B. Please circle the letter of the choice which most describes your likes or the way you feel. In some cases you may find items in which both choices describe your likes or feelings. Please choose the one which better describes your likes or feelings. In some cases you may find items in which you do not like either choice. In these cases mark the choice you dislike least. Do not leave any items blank.

It is important you respond to all items with only one choice, A or B. We are interested only in your likes or feelings, not in how others feel about these things or how one is supposed to feel. There are not right or wrong answers as in other kinds of tests. Be frank and give your honest appraisal of yourself.

- A I like “wild” uninhibited parties.

B I prefer quiet parties with good conversation.
- A There are some movies I enjoy seeing a second or even a third time.

B I can’t stand watching a movie I’ve seen before.
- A I often wish I could be a mountain climber.

B I can’t understand people who risk their necks climbing mountains.
- A I dislike all body odors.

B I like some of the earthy body smells.
- A I get bored seeing the same old faces.

B I like the comfortable familiarity of everyday friends.

6. A I like to explore a strange city or section of town by myself, even if it means getting lost.
B I prefer a guide when I am in a place I don't know well.
7. A I dislike people who do or say things just to shock or upset other people.
B When you can predict almost everything a person will do and say he or she must be a bore.
8. A I usually don't enjoy a movie or a play where I can predict what will happen in advance.
B I don't mind watching a movie or play where I can predict what will happen in advance.
9. A I have tried marijuana or would like to.
B I would never smoke marijuana.
10. A I would not like to try any drug which might produce strange and dangerous effects on me.
B I would like to try some of the new drugs that produce hallucinations.
11. A A sensible person avoids activities that are dangerous.
B I sometimes like to do things that are a little frightening.
12. A I dislike "swingers" (people who are uninhibited and free about sex).
B I enjoy the company of real "swingers."
13. A I find that stimulants make me uncomfortable.
B I often like to get high (drinking liquor or smoking marijuana).
14. A I like to try new foods that I have never tasted before.
B I order the dishes with which I am familiar, so as to avoid disappointment and unpleasantness.
15. A I enjoy looking at home movies, travel slides, or home videos.
B Looking at someone's home movies, travel slides, or home videos bores me tremendously.
16. A I would like to take up the sport of water-skiing.
B I would not like to take up water-skiing.
17. A I would like to try surf-board riding.
B I would not like to try surf-board riding.
18. A I would like to take off on a trip with no pre-planned or definite routes, or timetable.
B When I go on a trip I like to plan my route and timetable fairly carefully.
19. A I prefer the "down-to-earth" kinds of people as friends.
B I would like to make friends in some of the "far-out" groups like artists or

“punks.”

20. A I would not like to learn to fly an airplane.
B I would like to learn to fly an airplane.
21. A I prefer the surface of the water to the depths.
B I would like to go scuba diving.
22. A I would like to meet some persons who are homosexual (men or women).
B I stay away from anyone I suspect of being “gay” or “lesbian.”
23. A I would like to try parachute jumping.
B I would never want to try jumping out of a plane with or without a parachute.
24. A I prefer friends who are excitingly unpredictable.
B I prefer friends who are reliable and predictable.
25. A I am not interested in experience for its own sake.
B I like to have new and exciting experiences and sensations even if they are a little frightening, unconventional, or illegal.
26. A The essence of good art is in its clarity, symmetry of form and harmony of colors.
B I often find beauty in the “clashing” colors and irregular forms of modern paintings.
27. A I enjoy spending time in the familiar surroundings of home.
B I get very restless if I have to stay around home for any length of time.
28. A I like to dive off the high board.
B I don’t like the feeling I get standing on the high board (or I don’t go near it at all).
29. A I like to date members of the opposite sex who are physically exciting.
B I like to date members of the opposite sex who share my values.
30. A Heavy drinking usually ruins a party because some people get loud and boisterous.
B Keeping the drinks full is the key to a good party.
31. A The worst social sin is to be rude.
B The worst social sin is to be a bore.
32. A A person should have considerable sexual experience before marriage.
B It’s better if two married persons begin their sexual experience with each other.
33. A Even if I had the money I would not care to associate with flighty rich persons in the ‘jet set.’

- B I could conceive of myself seeking pleasures around the world with the “jet set.”
34. A I like people who are sharp and witty even if they do sometimes insult others.
B I dislike people who have their fun at the expense of hurting the feelings of others.
35. A There is altogether too much portrayal of sex in movies.
B I enjoy watching many of the “sexy” scenes in the movies.
36. A I feel best after taking a couple of drinks.
B Something is wrong with people who need liquor to feel good.
37. A People should dress according to some standards of taste, neatness, and style.
B People should dress in individual ways even if the effects are sometimes strange.
38. A Sailing long distances in small sailing crafts is foolhardy.
B I would like to sail a long distance in a small but seaworthy sailing craft.
39. A I have no patience with dull or boring persons.
B I find something interesting in almost every person I talk with.
40. A Skiing fast down a high mountain slope is a good way to end up on crutches.
B I think I would enjoy the sensations of skiing very fast down a high mountain slope.

Please indicate if, in your opinion, the following statements are:

1 = Not at all true 2 = Hardly true 3 = Moderately true 4 = Exactly true

1 2

3 4

I am confident that I could cheat without being caught
If someone catches me, I can find a way to handle this situation
I can solve most exams questions, if I use my smart phone
I can always manage to use a cheat-sheet
It is easy for me to copy the answers of someone else's exam
I can always manage to cheat, if I try hard enough
I can usually cheat, even if there is a lot of patrol

In your opinion, how likely are the following scenarios to occur

1= Not likely at all 2=hardly likely 3= moderately likely 4=exactly likely

1 2 3 4

When I try to copy the answers of my fellow student, I get caught

When I try to use my smart phone during an exam, I get caught

When I try to use a cheating sheet during an exam, I get caught

If there is a lot of patrol, I get caught while cheating

In your opinion, how likely are the following scenarios to occur

1= Not likely at all 2=hardly likely 3= moderately likely 4=exactly likely

1 2

3 4

If I cheat, I will improve my grade

If I cheat, it is more likely to pass the exam

If I cheat, it is likely that I fail the exam

If I cheat, it is likely that my enrolment is vulnerable

If I cheat, it is likely that I have to do a retake

If I cheat, it is likely that I will get suspended from the exam for one year

Appendix B

Title: Survey professors

-Age

-Woman/Man

-Nationality

Have you ever seen someone cheat during an exam? Yes / No

- If yes, how often? once/ once a year/ once a semester/ once a quarter / every time I write an exam

Could you ever catch someone while cheating? Yes/No

- If yes, how many times? 1/2/3/ >3

Following statements are:

1 = Not at all true 2 = Hardly true 3 = Moderately true 4 = Exactly true

1

2 3 4

I am confident that I could catch someone who is trying to cheat

If I caught someone who was cheating, I can find a way to handle this situation

I am always able to catch someone who is using his smart phone during exam.

I can always catch someone who is using a cheat-sheet during exam.

It is easy for me to catch someone who is copying the answers of someone's else exam

I can always figure out if somebody is cheating, if I try hard enough

I can usually catch everyone who is cheating, even if there are a lot of students cheating

In your opinion, how likely are the following scenarios to occur

1= Not likely at all 2=hardly likely 3= moderately likely 4=exactly likely

1 2 3 4

When somebody tries to copy the answers of a fellow student, I am able to catch him

When somebody tries to use his smart phone during an exam, I am able to catch him

When somebody tries to use a cheating sheet during an exam, I am able to catch him

If there are a lot of students cheating, I am able to catch everybody

In your opinion, how likely are the following scenarios to occur

1= Not likely at all 2=hardly likely 3= moderately likely 4=exactly likely

1 2

3 4

If my students cheat, I will make up their grades

If my students cheat, it is more likely for them to pass the exam

If my students cheat, it is likely that they fail the exam

If my students cheat, it is likely that my reputation as docent is vulnerable

If my students cheat, it is likely that my job is vulnerable