

1-1-1995

Lying And Cheating Behavior In School Children

David Workman

Eastern Illinois University

This research is a product of the graduate program in [Psychology](#) at Eastern Illinois University. [Find out more](#) about the program.

Recommended Citation

Workman, David, "Lying And Cheating Behavior In School Children" (1995). *Masters Theses*. 648.
<http://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/648>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

LB
1861
.C57x
P8
1995
W6
copy 2

LYING AND CHEATING BEHAVIOR IN
SCHOOL CHILDREN

WORKMAN

THESIS REPRODUCTION CERTIFICATE

TO: Graduate Degree Candidates (who have written formal theses)

SUBJECT: Permission to Reproduce Theses

The University Library is receiving a number of requests from other institutions asking permission to reproduce dissertations for inclusion in their library holdings. Although no copyright laws are involved, we feel that professional courtesy demands that permission be obtained from the author before we allow theses to be copied.

PLEASE SIGN ONE OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS:

Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University has my permission to lend my thesis to a reputable college or university for the purpose of copying it for inclusion in that institution's library or research holdings.

David C. Weber
Author

5-12-95
Date

I respectfully request Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University not allow my thesis to be reproduced because:

Author

Date

Lying and Cheating Behavior

in School Children
(TITLE)

BY

David Workman

THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF

Specialist in School Psychology

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1995
YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING
THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITED ABOVE

5/12/95
DATE

5/12/95
DATE

Terry A. Shinnett
ADVISER

Fred J. Yaffe
DEPARTMENT HEAD

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
List of Tables.....	ii
Acknowledgments.....	iii
Abstract.....	iv
Introduction and Review of Literature.....	1
Method.....	17
Participants.....	17
Instrumentation.....	17
Procedure.....	19
Results.....	20
Discussion.....	26
References.....	29
Appendix A.....	34
Appendix B.....	35
Appendix C.....	37

LIST OF TABLES

Table

Page

1	Means and Standard Deviations for Lie Scale-Parent Form, Cheating Scale-Parent Form, Lie Scale-Student Form, and Cheating Scale-Student Form by Gender and Grade.....	21
2	Correlations between Chronological Age, Cheat Scale-Parent Form, Lie Scale-Parent Form, Cheat Scale-Student Form, and Lie Scale-Parent Form.....	23
3	ANOVA Summary Table for Lie Scale-Parent Form by Sex and Grade.....	24
4	ANOVA Summary Table for Lie Scale-Student Form by Sex and Grade.....	24
5	Student-Newman-Keuls Multiple Range Test for Lie Scale-Student Form by Grade.....	24
6	ANOVA Summary Table for Cheat Scale-Parent Form by Sex and Grade.....	25
7	ANOVA Summary Table for Cheat Scale-Student Form by Sex and Grade.....	25

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the teachers, students, and parents who volunteered their time and service to participate in this study. Their cooperation is greatly appreciated.

I would like to thank Dr. Terry Stinnett, Dr. Michael Havey, and Dr. Julia Jorgensen for their direction, assistance, and encouragement. Special thanks to Dr. Stinnett for his persistence, time, support, and patience.

I would like to thank my wife, Maura, for her support and encouragement that kept me going throughout graduate school. I would also like to thank my parents, Terry and Jane, for instilling the values and beliefs that have made me the person I am today.

I would like to dedicate this research thesis to my grandfather, Fred Coombe.

ABSTRACT

The relationship between lying and cheating behavior in children was examined. A questionnaire was administered to students in grades 3, 5, and 7 attending a small Midwestern public school. An additional questionnaire was given to one of the child's parents. Parents and students reported on nine lying and 18 cheating questions. It was noted that males lie more than females and older students lie more than younger students. A positive correlation between lying and cheating was found. Students and parents who report cheating also report lying. Therefore, we can conclude that lying and cheating are related in children. Parental reports and student reports were found to be consistent for lying behavior. It is concluded that if schools are to launch children and adolescents into the adult society, they should integrate character formation with cognitive knowledge.

CHAPTER I

Lying and Cheating Behavior in School Children

Research literature on every topic is full of contradictions. The research on lying and cheating is no different. Studies on both topics seem to indicate that males lie (Tuddenham, Brooks, & Milkovich, 1974; Stouthamer-Loeber, 1986) and cheat (Anderson, 1957; David, 1973; Ward & Beck, 1990; Jendrek, 1992) more than females. There have been differences noted based on gender (Feldman & Feldman, 1967) and boys do both more than girls; this suggests a relationship between the two. However, there have been few, if any, studies that have examined the relationship between lying and cheating. This study will examine the relation between reports of lying and cheating in school children.

Cheating

Cheating behavior in children is common. At one time or another almost every child has changed rules to games, looked at his or her neighbor's paper to complete a task, or let others copy homework assignments. These types of behaviors and many more have long been of interest to various disciplines (Bushway & Nash, 1977). Educators and psychologists have studied cheating throughout the years. Most studies have focused on the characteristics of cheating, situational factors that influence cheating, and reasons' children give for cheating.

Characteristics

The characteristics of people who cheat have been examined extensively. The relationship of cheating with intelligence and school achievement has been evaluated. The average intellectual ability of noncheaters has been reported to be slightly higher than that of cheaters (Gross, 1946) and Vitro (1971) reported that cheating was more prevalent among students with low grade averages. However, Ellenburg (1973) found that approximately half of the cheaters in his study had a grade average above 85%, whereas the averages of the other half of the cheaters were below that level. Also 90% of the noncheaters in that study had a grade average above 85%. In contrast, other researchers have found that the low-achieving students cheat more than higher-achieving students (Kanfer & Duerfeldt, 1968; Kelly & Worrell, 1978; Jendrek, 1992). In general though, the majority of studies indicate that students who are lower in intelligence or school achievement may cheat more frequently.

The relationship between gender and incidence of cheating has also been researched. Anderson (1957) found statistically significant differences between the attitudes of men and women towards cheating behavior, with women professing much stricter attitudes and, therefore, possibly cheating less frequently. However, Black (1962) reported no significant relationship between gender and cheating. Feldman and Feldman (1967) suggested that females cheated more in the earlier grades, but that males surpassed them in cheating by the

senior year in high school. In one study it was found that females cheated more than males (Burton, 1971). Ward and Beck (1990) also concluded that women are less likely than men to be dishonest when confronted with opportunities to cheat. Jendrek (1992) found that men were more likely than women to cheat, as well as ignore cheating by others. This holds true for adults, but the research on children is somewhat scarce. David (1973) demonstrated that boys, in a ghetto elementary school, tended to cheat more frequently than girls on a vocabulary test, with the reverse occurring on a math test. Overall, the findings seem to indicate (with few exceptions) that the amount of cheating among females is somewhat less than the cheating engaged in by males. In summary, gender and age might interact to affect cheating behavior. Younger girls are more likely than younger boys to cheat (Feldman & Feldman, 1967), however, some studies have shown the opposite (David, 1973; Ward & Beck, 1990).

Other investigators have concerned themselves with a diversity of other behavioral characteristics and their relationship to cheating. Black (1962) stated that there were no significant differences in the cheating behavior of students who attended class regularly and those who frequently cut class, as well as no significant differences in various age groups. Steininger, Johnson, and Kirts (1964) found a definite relationship between lack of meaningfulness of courses and cheating. In courses that students perceived as meaningful to their educational growth, cheating occurred less. Zastrow (1970), in contrast to all these

findings, found no significant personal differences in cheating and noncheating students. Vitro (1971) discovered that cheaters generally had parents who punished them severely or not at all. Vitro suggested that a moderate level of discipline results in children who internalize moral values and are thus honest in their school work. It has also been revealed that cheating occurred most often in math and science courses (Schab, 1991). In most cases though, research studies do suggest that there are differences in the personal and behavioral characteristics of cheaters and noncheaters.

Situational Factors

Researchers have identified situational influences on cheating. Steininger, Johnson, and Kirts (1964) stated that a professor's leaving the room during an exam could cause some students to cheat more than they might have, but that the cheaters subsequently would feel more guilty because of having cheated in that situation. Fischer (1970) examined five classroom situations in an attempt to determine when students would be most likely to cheat. The five conditions were: (a) a "control" condition in which students were given instructions for the test; (b) an "informative appeal to honesty" condition in which students were given the instructions and were also told that their being honest on the test was important in providing results that could be used in helping the teacher assess his/her teaching techniques; (c) a "public affirmation of value" condition in which a pretest discussion was held about cheating and the students were asked to state why they

would not cheat on the upcoming test; (d) a "value-relevant threat of punishment" condition in which students were told before the examination that if they were caught cheating they would have to write fifty times a sentence about cheating; and (e) a "nonvalue-relevant threat of punishment" condition in which students were told that their punishment for cheating would be writing numbers repeatedly. Under the first two conditions, Fischer reported that approximately two-thirds of the "control" and three-fourths of the "informative appeal" groups cheated. The incidence of cheating was lower in the other three situations, but no significant differences in incidence of cheating were found among the three. Thus, punishment conditions appear to be as effective as nonpunishment conditions in their influence on cheating behavior. In a similar review, Stokes and Osnes (1989) reported that honesty at school does not emerge naturally regardless of management by school personnel. They also stated that naturally occurring consequences at school, home, and other important settings may encourage honest behavior, but there are likely other supporting contingencies for the development of lying and cheating.

The chance of success is another situational variable that can influence cheating behavior. Vitro and Schoer (1972) found that the highest incidence of cheating occurred among students who were unlikely to do well on the test, who were unlikely to get caught, and to whom the particular test was very important. Calabrese and Cochran (1990) studied students from a large urban high school and a private

school in the same community and found that cheating was more prevalent among white males who attended private schools. Females and Asian students in the study were generally less likely to cheat than males. However, females and Asian students did have a greater tendency to cheat if they were helping others succeed, while white males were more likely to cheat to succeed personally. The differences could be attributed to other situational variables, personality and teaching style of the teacher.

Personality and teaching style of the teacher or professor may also contribute to student cheating. Steininger, Johnson, and Kirts (1964) found that professors, perceived by students to be a poor teacher, produced more student cheating. They also suggest the giving of excessively difficult tests by a teacher may lead to increased cheating. Perhaps, excessively difficult tests may lead to feelings of hopelessness in students. Johnson and Klores (1968) found that a dissatisfying classroom situation, as judged by students, produced a greater amount of cheating. According to Montor (1971), students felt that a negative attitude of a teacher towards an inquisitive student was a factor in encouraging some students to cheat. Also, Montor (1971) concluded that some students saw a teacher's grading on a curve as an inducement to cheating because under such a grading system poor students would have to cheat or would receive a low grade.

Reasons for Cheating

The reasons for cheating are varied and numerous. Zastrow (1970) reported "handicaps," such as extracurricular activities or jobs, and being unprepared for a test as reasons given by some students. Montor (1971) stated that pressure to get good grades to gain admittance to college or pressure to maintain their existing grade average caused many students to cheat. Further more students who cheated for these reasons did not understand why it was wrong. Schab (1991) stated that the fear of failure was one of the most common reasons for cheating. Davis, Grover, Becker, and McGregor (1992) found that besides pressures for good grades, student stress, ineffective deterrents, and condoning teachers, students demonstrated a diminished sense of academic integrity. Hinshaw, Heller, and McHale (1992) studied Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder children and found that the medication, methylphenidate, increased cheating behavior. The increase in cheating behavior was attributed to an association with greater task involvement in the study. It must be noted that most of the research relies upon participants to provide information through self-reports. Beck and Ajzen (1991) pointed out that the practice of relying on self-reports is likely to continue, even though it is well recognized that they may be systematically biased by tendencies to give socially desirable responses.

Lying

The research on lying in children is more abundant. The literature on lying is plagued by a lack of consensus regarding the definition. Lying has been judged by adults to be a problem behavior in children and adolescents (Stouthamer-Loeber, 1986). It has been speculated that when children are of preschool age many of the reasons for verbal misrepresentations of reality are temporary and are tied to their developmental stage (Stouthamer-Loeber & Loeber, 1986). The research on lying in children typically has examined definitions, types of lies, as well as the prevalence of lying.

Definition

Many researchers have tried to develop a definition of lying that can fit all situations. Stouthamer-Loeber (1986) defines lying as a verbal statement that is intended to deceive. Lying is difficult to measure because the intent to deceive is very hard to distinguish. The intention to misrepresent the truth is usually determined by knowing that the other person has the right information available to them, a strong motive to deceive, or is admitted by the person who lied. There is always some degree of doubt whether the statement is a lie or not. Stouthamer-Loeber (1986) noted that with young children it is possible that their representations of reality and fantasy are not yet separated, thus the matter of intention is even more unclear. Also it has been shown that different age groups of children require different levels of evidence before they call a statement a lie. Stouthamer-Loeber (1986)

also pointed out that most studies do not define lying, and therefore the term lying in most studies represents an adult's interpretations of children's verbal statements.

Types of Lies

The literature dealing with the types of children's lies is scant. Ackerman and Kappelman (1979) distinguished between five different types of lies in children: (1) the exploratory lie where children try out what is to be found on the other side of the truth; (2) the cover-up lie to avoid punishment, which, in young children mainly takes the form of denial, but as children grow older this type of lie becomes more sophisticated and premeditated; (3) the whopper lie that consists of bragging and exaggerating; (4) the blatant lie as an attention-seeking device when the child is aware that the other party knows the truth; and (5) the fantasy lie where elements from a make-believe world are invoked to take the blame or serve as an excuse. Ackerman and Kappelman (1979) state that even though the categories seem to follow a logical order, they are not based on empirical findings. Although there is not a definite and stable definition for children's lies, it appears that the motivations for lies change over time.

Children's lies might change from the early lying to escape punishment, to those planned to obtain rewards, and even later altruistic lies to cover for peers (Peterson, Peterson, & Seeto, 1983; Stouthamer-Loeber, 1986). Stouthamer-Loeber (1986) also suggests that a child may become more self-conscious and more conscious of other

people's opinion of him or her with age, and that the protection of self-esteem becomes a more powerful motive for not telling the truth.

Prevalence

All children and adults tell untruths at some time or another. Studies that report the prevalence of lying in children are inconsistent. There is no consistent definition of lying and no consistent way to measure lying, making it difficult to determine the exact overall prevalence of lying in children, however, it has been suggested that the prevalence of lying is relatively stable across childhood and adolescence (Achenbach & Edelbrock, 1981). Stouthamer-Loeber (1986) conducted an extensive review of studies that examined the rate of lying in children and found that the reported percentages varied substantially from study to study. She suggested that because each study used different instructions and sample items, it was difficult to explain the variation. However, Stouthamer-Loeber's review demonstrated that older children were less frequent liars. Similar studies (Achenbach & Edelbrock, 1981; Stouthamer-Loeber & Loeber, 1986; Tuddenham, Brooks, & Milkovich, 1974) have looked at factors such as age and sexual differences in the incidence of lying in young children.

Although research on lying is extensive, few studies involve children. However, Achenbach and Edelbrock (1981) reported the incidence of lying to be between 21% to 49% for a large percentage of 4- and 5-year-olds, although these percentages were not different for older age groups in the study. In fact, no significant age differences for lying

were found. Stouthamer-Loeber and Loeber (1986) report that the prevalence of lying in older children drops, but the number of liars stayed the same or increased. Thus, the number of lies told by an older child decreases but the number of children who lie remained stable. This could be attributed to a more stringent definition of lying in older children. This raises a question: Are young children able to differentiate between a lie and a truth? Bussey (1992) conducted a study to gain insight into this question. She found that while older children correctly differentiated between the falsity of statements and truthfulness of statements almost all the time, preschoolers correctly identified about 70% of lies and truthful statements. For all children, Bussey (1992) found that the falsity of the statement rather than its belief, the punishment behind it, or that it involved a misdeed was a major determinant of its definition. Similar to this, Peterson, Peterson, and Seeto (1983) found that as children get older their definitions of lying tend to change.

Sex differences in lying show that boys have a significantly higher prevalence rate than girls (Tuddenham, Brooks, & Milkovich, 1974). No studies were found that displayed higher prevalence rates of lying for girls than for boys. Achenbach and Edelbrock (1981) found no significant difference between boys and girls. A review of the literature by Stouthamer-Loeber (1986) showed that boys are more likely than girls to lie. The literature on cheating is more decisive regarding gender differences than the literature on lying.

Achenbach and Edelbrock (1981) did find a higher prevalence rate of lying for lower socioeconomic groups. This study had a large sample carefully drawn to represent the various SES levels. However, there have been studies showing no differences between SES levels (Stouthamer-Loeber & Loeber, 1986). The Stouthamer-Loeber and Loeber study (1986) may not have shown an SES effect because the sample was too small and did not accurately represent the whole population (Stouthamer-Loeber, 1986).

Burton (1976) looked at several studies related to parental rejection and lying and found that parental warmth increases honesty or truthfulness. Thus, one could speculate that children who lie or are dishonest are less likable, and that it may be more difficult for their parents to be warm towards them, or that the children who lie have parents who display poor parenting skills. In an extensive study of lying in boys, Stouthamer-Loeber and Loeber (1986) found many different conditions related to lying. It was found that maternal rejection was significantly related to lying in fourth, seventh, and tenth grade boys. They also found that boys of single mothers, as well as those of less happily married mothers, lied significantly more than children of happily married mothers, however no difference was found between less happily married and single mothers. The possible reason for such discrepancy was attributed to happily married mothers spending more time supervising their boys than mothers in the other two groups.

Lying & Cheating

Very few studies have looked at lying and cheating together. Stokes and Osnes (1991) provide a distinction between different sources of lying and cheating. They state three basic ways to detect students lying and cheating through verbal reports, written reports, and inappropriate access to restricted information. The first source, verbal reports, relies on the students' verbalizations of information, past and future activities. Inaccurate verbal reports of lying and cheating may surface for a variety of reasons. They may be attributed to the lack of observational skills necessary to gain accurate information or simply a report of untruths by the child. With these types of verbal reports the task of the teacher, parent, or school psychologist is to determine whether there has been a match between the verbalization and the actual behavior. In other words, does or did the child do what they said. Written reports offer a permanent product that can be put through questioning in the same manner as verbal reports. Inappropriate access to restricted information is the last source identified by Stokes and Osnes (1991). They define this as acquiring information through alternative or unacceptable behaviors. Examples of this type of behavior include cheating, copying answers from others, letting others copy homework, plagiarizing, and using hidden notes for assistance on a test (Bushway and Nash, 1977; Stokes and Osnes, 1991). They state that lying and cheating can be very difficult to detect. This may be one reason for the lack of research in this area.

Moral Development

Research on moral development provides some explanation as to why and when people lie and cheat. Burton (1976) examined the research findings in the area of honesty. It is pointed out that the most thorough program of research on honesty was conducted by Hartshorne and May in 1928 (Burton, 1963; 1976). In the 1928 study by Hartshorne and May, the theoretical question of morality being general or situation specific was addressed. In that study three loosely related types of deceit were measured: lying, cheating, and stealing. Burton (1963) reiterates that:

Parental consistency in interpreting the moral elements of a situation and in the positive or negative characteristic of the reinforcement they dispense depending on the child's behavior, combined with a gradual inconsistency in their dispensing of such reinforcement are the conditions maximizing the learning, generalization, and persistence of a moral response. (p. 493)

Therefore, if a parent is consistent in their reinforcement of correct moral reactions across different situations, a child is less likely to lie, cheat, or steal in those reinforced situations. Burton (1976) concluded that learning experiences might lead some individuals to be relatively consistent in their honesty or dishonesty and others to be relatively inconsistent. The differences in consistency are contingent on the learning conditions found to influence the generalization of what is learned in one situation to a different setting. Thus the consistency of

reinforcement of morality given to children by parents could be a factor contributing to the prevalence of lying and cheating. Turiel (1983) found that preschoolers showed an elaborate moral knowledge, being able to give perfectly adequate reasons why rules should be binding. However, Nunner-Winkler and Sodian (1988) state that young children do not seem to be aware of the significance of conformity to moral rules for a person's self-evaluative and empathic emotions. Thus, parental consistency of reinforcement of morality may provide the child with the moral information, but it is not until later do they seem to treat the rules as personally binding obligations. Another contributing factor to the prevalence of lying and cheating is individual differences of children. Asendorpf and Nunner-Winkler (1992) suggest that inter-individual differences as well as inter-group differences in immoral behavior can be predicted to some extent by individual motivational characteristics. They found a relation between the moral motive strength and temperamental inhibition. The higher the moral motive strength and higher temperamental inhibition reduced immoral behavior.

Although the research on lying and cheating is full of contradictions, there are some general conclusions. Males lie (Tuddenham, Brooks, & Milkovich, 1974; Stouthamer-Loeber, 1986) and cheat (Anderson, 1957; David, 1973; Ward & Beck, 1990; Jendrek, 1992) more than females. Generally the prevalence of lying is relatively stable across childhood and adolescence (Achenbach &

Edelbrock, 1981; Stouthamer-Loeber & Loeber, 1986), and childrens' definitions of lies get more stringent as they get older (Peterson, Peterson, & Seeto, 1983; Stouthamer-Loeber & Loeber, 1986). It was hypothesized in this study that: there exists a positive relation between children's lying and cheating; males lie and cheat more than females; there is an inverse relationship between parental reports and children's self-reports of children's lying and cheating, with children's reports being higher; and that there is no difference between the number of younger and older children who lie.

CHAPTER II

Method

Participants

Children attending grades 3, 5, and 7 from a public school in a small Midwestern community ($n = 64$) and one of the child's parents participated. There were 24 children in the third grade (M age = 9.17, $SD = .28$) and 20 children in the fifth ($M = 11.22$, $SD = .27$) and seventh grades ($M = 13.14$, $SD = .52$) who participated. There were 33 boys and 31 girls and 58 female and 6 male parents. The participants were randomly selected from a pool of volunteers. Appendix A contains the letter of explanation and consent that was given to potential participants.

Instrumentation

An experimenter-made questionnaire was developed to assess lying and cheating behavior in children. There were two forms of the questionnaire, a parent-report form and a student-report form. There were 23 items divided into two parts. There were 14 cheating items and nine lying items. The 14 questions dealing with cheating were incorporated from an 18 question inventory employed by Calabrese and Cochran (1990) from previous research done by Stevens (1984). Responses to these items were fixed and coded on a 5-point scale. Four of the 18 questions were discarded because young students would not have the opportunity to be in a particular situation, e.g., listing false references on a term paper. The inventory includes passive behaviors

(acts of omission) and active behaviors (acts of commission). Failing to report a student observed cheating on an exam is an example of an act of omission, while giving answers to a student during a test is an act of commission. The cheating questions are also distinguished according to whether the actor is the primary beneficiary. Calabrese and Cochran (1990) indicate that factor analysis on the items in each of the nine scales produced moderate to strong factor loadings ($.25 > < .75$) with the exception of item 14, which is retained nonetheless, based on its theoretical contribution. The nine questions dealing with lying were generated based on Ackerman and Kappelman's (1979) description of five types of lies in children. Ackerman and Kappelman (1979) distinguished among five different types of lies in children: (1) the exploratory lie; (2) the cover-up lie; (3) the whopper lie; (4) the blatant lie; and (5) the fantasy lie. Two questions from each type of lie were developed except for the blatant lie, where only one question was developed. An example of the questions made up from the types of lies are: "Would you tell a lie to see if you get in trouble?" (exploratory); "Would you tell a lie so you won't get into trouble for something you did wrong?" (cover-up); "Would you brag about something to be friends with someone?" (whopper); "Would you tell other people fibs, to get the attention of others, even though the other people know the truth?" (blatant); and "Would you, if in trouble, put the blame on a make-believe person or thing?." Ackerman and Kappelman (1979) state that even though the categories seem to follow

a logical order, they are not based on empirical findings. This would also be true of the questions developed from the categories. Copies of the scales are in Appendix B.

Procedure

The students and parents were requested to complete the survey voluntarily. Parental permission was obtained for each student subject involved in the study. Enclosed with the permission slip was the parental questionnaire to be filled out. The permission slip briefly explained the purpose of the study and a confidentiality statement for the parents. Upon receipt of the permission slips for a class as a whole, the confidentiality statement was read to the student subjects and assessed for understanding. Each of the subjects were asked to respond to the 23 items. The students were given the questionnaire as a group in their classroom and asked to complete it as accurately as possible. They were cautioned to not leave any identifying marks on the survey, except for their first name, grade and sex. The experimenter administered the survey and was available to the students to answer possible questions. After the questionnaire was completed by the group the experimenter allowed the students to ask questions about the purpose of the study.

CHAPTER III

Results

Scale Characteristics

Alpha reliability coefficients were computed for each of the four scales (Cheating Scale-Parent, Cheating Scale-Student, Lying Scale-Parent, Lying Scale-Student) to assess internal consistency. Scale internal consistencies were acceptable for all four scales. The coefficients obtained on the four scales were: .62, Cheating Scale-Student Form; .75, Cheating Scale-Parent Form; .80, Lying Scale-Parent Form; and .91, Lying Scale-Student Form. Table 1 presents means and standard deviations for each scale by grade and gender.

EXAMINATION # 0100

Table 1
Means and Standard Deviations for Lie Scale-Parent Form, Cheating Scale-Parent Form, Lie Scale-Student Form, and Cheating Scale-Student Form by Gender and Grade

		CS-P	LS-P	CS-S	LS-S
Grade 3					
Boys (n = 13)	M	11.77	12.23	7.69	4.92
	SD	5.99	5.43	5.38	4.39
Girls (n = 11)	M	9.64	7.18	9.82	3.00
	SD	6.44	7.15	4.62	3.00
Total (n = 24)	M	10.79	9.92	8.67	4.04
	SD	6.16	6.65	5.05	3.86
Grade 5					
Boys (n = 11)	M	15.64	12.45	8.45	6.27
	SD	5.71	6.44	5.84	4.96
Girls (n = 9)	M	9.33	7.44	7.67	4.67
	SD	5.07	6.65	5.27	5.22
Total (n = 20)	M	12.80	10.20	8.10	5.55
	SD	6.20	6.86	5.46	5.01
Grade 7					
Boys (n = 9)	M	9.11	8.22	14.00	10.89
	SD	3.37	9.32	6.32	8.96
Girls (n = 11)	M	10.27	7.00	8.55	6.09
	SD	5.66	6.77	5.75	3.45
Total (n = 20)	M	9.75	7.55	11.00	8.25
	SD	4.69	7.82	6.48	6.79
Total Sample (N = 64)					
Boys (n = 33)	M	12.33	11.21	9.64	6.91
	SD	5.77	7.02	6.16	6.37
Girls (n = 31)	M	9.58	7.32	8.68	4.65
	SD	5.64	6.58	5.21	3.94
Total (n = 64)	M	11.09	9.27	9.22	5.83
	SD	1.70	5.79	7.08	5.70

Relationship of Age, Parental reports of Lying and Cheating, and Student Self-Reports

Pearson Product-Moment correlations were calculated to examine the following relationships: (1) parents perception of their child's lying with the parents perception of their child's cheating; (2) child's self-report of lying with child's self-report of cheating; (3) parents perception of their child's lying with child's report of lying; (4) parents perception of their child's cheating with child's report of cheating; and (5) age with self-report of lying and cheating.

A relationship between the students' chronological age and student self-report of lying was noted ($r = .35, p < .01$). A relationship between parent report of lying and parent report of cheating was also noted ($r = .57, p < .001$). A significant positive correlation was also found between student self-report of lying and parental report of lying ($r = .33, p < .01$). A strong positive correlation was also noted between students self-report of lying and cheating ($r = .43, p < .001$). Table 2 summarizes all correlations calculated.

Estimates of variance accounted for were calculated with r^2 . The knowledge of age accounted for 12% of the variance in students self-reports of lying. Parental reports of lying accounted for 32% of the variance in parental reports of cheating. Self-reports of lying accounted for 11% of the variance in parental reports of lying, and self-reports of lying accounted for 18% of the variance in self-reports of cheating.

Table 2
Correlations between Chronological Age, Cheat Scale-Parent Form, Lie Scale-Parent Form, Cheat Scale-Student Form, and Lie Scale-Parent Form

	CA	CS-P	LS-P	CS-S	LS-S
CA	1.00	-.05	-.10	.21	.35 *
CS-P		1.00	.57 **	.07	.02
LS-P			1.00	.14	.33 *
CS-S				1.00	.43 **
LS-S					1.00

Note. One Tailed Significance: * $p < .01$ ** $p < .001$
 All correlations based on $N = 64$

Grade and Gender Differences by Method of Report

Grade and gender differences for lying and cheating were examined with a series of two-way Analyses of Variance. A significant main effect was noted for gender on the parental report of lying. Boys were rated by parents to be more likely to lie than girls. The mean score for boys was 11.21 (SD = 7.02) while the mean score for girls was 7.32 (SD = 6.58) (see Table 1). There was no interaction effect. Table 3 presents the ANOVA summary. Significant main effects were noted for gender and grade on student self-report of lying (see Table 4). Boys reported lying significantly more than girls. The mean score for boys was 6.91 (SD = 6.37) while the mean score for girls was 4.65 (SD = 3.94) (see Table 1). Post-hoc Student-Newman-Keuls Multiple Range Test was calculated to examine the main effect for grade. Seventh graders reported lying significantly more than third graders. No other significant grade comparisons were noted (see Table 5).

Table 3
ANOVA Summary Table for Lie Scale-Parent Form by Sex and Grade

Source	SS	df	MS	F	P
Grade	62.50	2	31.25	.65	.53
Sex	234.13	1	234.13	4.87	.03 *
Grade x Sex	49.41	2	24.70	.51	.60
Error	2788.45	58	48.08		
Total	3158.48	63	50.14		

Note: * significant main effect, $p < .05$

Table 4
ANOVA Summary Table for Lie Scale-Student Form by Sex and Grade

Source	SS	df	MS	F	P
Grade	219.35	2	109.67	4.11	.02 *
Sex	117.46	1	117.46	4.40	.04 *
Grade x Sex	31.30	2	15.65	.59	.56
Error	1546.90	58	26.67		
Total	1891.11	63	30.02		

Note: * significant main effect, $p < .05$

Table 5
Student-Newman-Keuls Multiple Range Test for Lie Scale-Student Form by Grade

Grade	LS-S Means and Mean Differences by Grade			No. Steps	Critical M Diff	
	3rd	5th	7th		p =	
Mean	4.04	5.55	8.25		.05	.01
3rd		1.51	4.21**	3	2.97	3.95
5th			2.70	2	3.57	4.49

Note: ** significant main effect, $p < .01$

There were no significant differences were noted by gender or grade for the parent report of cheating or student self-report of cheating. Tables 6 and 7 present these analyses.

Table 6
ANOVA Summary Table for Cheat Scale-Parent Form by Sex and Grade

Source	SS	df	MS	F	P
Grade	83.66	2	41.83	1.36	.27
Sex	91.82	1	91.82	2.98	.09
Grade x Sex	138.62	2	69.31	2.25	.12
Error	1788.47	58	30.84		
Total	2115.44	63	33.58		

Note: * significant main effect, $p < .05$

Table 7
ANOVA Summary Table for Cheat Scale-Student Form by Sex and Grade

Source	SS	df	MS	F	P
Grade	103.10	2	51.55	1.69	.19
Sex	20.96	1	20.96	.69	.41
Grade x Sex	156.31	2	78.16	2.56	.09
Error	1773.86	58	30.58		
Total	2046.94	63	32.49		

Note: * significant main effect, $p < .05$

CHAPTER IV

Discussion

Parental reports and student's self-reports indicate that males lie more than females. The data partially confirms the original hypothesis that males lie and cheat more than females. Although a difference exists between males and females on the parent reports and student reports of cheating, the difference is not statistically significant. This could be attributed to the age of the child and pressure put upon them to achieve. As children get older the pressure to succeed becomes more influential in the manner in which children achieve success. Calabrese and Cochran (1990) point out that adolescents do not want to disappoint their parents or feel the pain of frustration and therefore may seek alternative means (i.e., cheating) of fulfilling parental and personal expectations.

A relationship exists between student's chronological age and student's self-report of lying. Older students are more likely to report lying than younger students. This may be attributed to changes in the definition of lying as children get older. Stouthamer-Loeber (1986) indicate that with younger children a problem of misrepresentation of reality is apparent and the intentionality of a lie may not be as clear as it is with older children. The intentions of a statement or lie may play an important role whether something is classified a lie. As children grow older, the approval of peers becomes more important. This may occur to such an extent that lies are necessary to hide truths that peers might

consider unfavorable, and to prevent parents from finding out what the child does to conform to peer groups (Fine, 1981). This might account for the difference between third and seventh grade students. It is also possible that as children become more self-conscious of other people's opinion with age, the protection of self-esteem becomes a more powerful motive for not telling the truth.

Parental reports and student reports were found to be somewhat consistent on lying behavior. This should not be surprising, because parents typically are in the best position to evaluate the lying behavior of their children (i.e., by distinguishing between what the child says and what the child does). Research on the issue of self-report techniques, consistently suggests that the self-report technique produces reliable and valid measures (Akers, Massey, Clarke, & Lauer, 1983; Hardt & Peterson-Hardt, 1977; Hindelang, Hirschi, & Weis, 1981). The hypothesis that an inverse relationship between parental reports and children's self-reports of children's lying and cheating behavior, with children's reports being higher, was unfounded.

There is a positive relation between lying and cheating behavior in children. Parents who reported their child as having lied, also reported their child as having cheated. Additionally students who reported lying behaviors, also reported cheating behaviors. Therefore, a positive correlation exists between lying and cheating in children as reported by parents and students. We can conclude that lying and cheating are related in children. Burton (1976) stated parental

consistency in reinforcement of correct moral actions may lead children to be relatively consistent in their honesty and dishonesty. By this reasoning, consistency of honesty and dishonesty in children can be expected by parents who are uniform in their reinforcement of correct moral actions. Parents are not the only factor that helps to mold a child's moral actions. Children are molded by teachers and other personnel within and outside the school systems.

Schools should search for alternative models based on responsibility, honesty, and trust. If schools are to launch children and adolescents into the adult society, then they should integrate character formation with cognitive knowledge. Research in the area of the causes and incidence of lying and cheating can be extremely useful for the development of treatment and prevention methods of lying and cheating.

References

Achenbach, T. M., & Edelbrock, C. S. (1981). Behavioral problems and competencies reported by parents of normal and disturbed children aged four through sixteen. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 46, 1-82.

Ackerman, P., & Kappelman, M. (1979). When your child lies or steals, he's trying to tell you something. But what? A sensitive look at a very delicate problem. Family Health, 11, 26-29.

Akers, R., Massey, J., Clarke, W., & Lauer, R. (1983). Are self-report of adolescent deviance valid? Biochemical measures, randomized response, and the bogus pipeline in smoking behavior. Social Forces, 62, 234-251.

Anderson, W. F. (1957). Attitudes of university students toward cheating. Journal of Educational Research, 50, 581-588.

Asendorpf, J. B., & Nunner-Winkler, G. (1992). Children's moral motive strength and temperamental inhibition reduce their immoral behavior in real moral conflicts. Child Development, 63, 1223-1235.

Beck, L., & Ajzen, I. (1991). Predicting dishonest actions using the theory of planned behavior. Journal of Research in Personality, 25, 285-301.

Black, D. B. (1962). The falsification of reported examination marks in a senior university education course. Journal of Educational Sociology, 35, 346-354.

- Burton, R. V. (1963). Generality of honesty reconsidered. Psychological Review, 70, 481-499.
- Burton, R. V. (1971). Correspondence between behavioral and doll-play measures of conscience. Developmental Psychology, 5, 320-332.
- Burton, R. V. (1976). Honesty and dishonesty. In T. Lickona (Eds.), Moral development and behavior (pp. 173-197). New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.
- Bushway, A., & Nash, W. R. (1977). School cheating behavior. Review of Educational Research, 47(4), 623-632.
- Bussey, K. (1992). Lying and truthfulness: Children's definitions, standards, and evaluative reactions. Child Development, 63, 129-137.
- Calabrese, R. L., & Cochran, J. T. (1990). The relationship of alienation to cheating among a sample of American adolescents. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 23(2), 65-72.
- David, P. (1973). Correlates of cheating behavior in a ghetto elementary school. Graduate Research in Education and Related Disciplines, 7, 35-63.
- Davis, S. F., Grover, C. A., Becker, A. H., & McGregor, L. N. (1992). Academic dishonesty: Prevalence, determinants, techniques, and punishment. Teaching of Psychology, 19(1), 16-20.
- Ellenburg, F. C. (1973). Cheating on tests: Are high achievers greater offenders than low achievers?. Clearing House, 47, 427-429.

Feldman, S. E., & Feldman, M. T. (1967). Transition of sex differences in cheating. Psychological Reports, 20, 957-958.

Fine, G. A. (1981). Friends, impression management, and preadolescent behavior. In S. R. Asher & J. M. Gottman (Eds.), The development of children's friendships (pp. 29-52). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fischer, C. T. (1970). Levels of cheating under conditions of informative appeal to honesty, public affirmation of value and threats of punishment. Journal of Educational Research, 64, 12-16.

Gross, Sister M. M. (1946). The effect of certain types of motivation on the "honesty" of children. Journal of Educational Research, 40, 133-140.

Hardt, R. H., & Peterson-Hardt, S. (1977). On determining the quality of the delinquency self-report method. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 14, 247-261.

Hindelang, M., Hirschi, T., & Weis, J. (1981). Measuring delinquency. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Hinshaw, S. P., Heller, T., & McHale, J. P. (1992). Covert antisocial behavior in boys with Attention-Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder: External validation and effects of Methylphenidate. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 60(2), 274-281.

Jendrek, M. P. (1992). Students reactions to academic dishonesty. Journal of College Student Development, 33, 260-273.

Johnson, R. E., & Klores, M. S. (1968). Attitudes toward cheating as a function of classroom dissatisfaction and peer norms. The Journal of Educational Research, 62(2), 60-64.

Kanfer, F. H., & Duerfeldt, P. H. (1968). Age, class standing, and commitment as determinants of cheating in children. Child Development, 39, 545-557.

Kelly, J. A., & Worrell, L. (1978). Personality characteristics, parent behaviors, and sex of the subject in relation to cheating. Journal of research in Personality, 12, 179-188.

Montor, K. (1971). Cheating in high school. School and Society, 99, 96-98.

Nunner-Winkler, G., & Sodian, B. (1988). Children's understanding of moral emotions. Child Development, 59, 1323-1338.

Peterson, C. C., Peterson, J. L., & Seeto, D. (1983). Developmental changes in ideas about lying. Child Development, 54, 1529-1535.

Schab, F. (1991). Schooling without learning: Thirty years of cheating in high school. Adolescence, 26, 839-847.

Steininger, M., Johnson, R. E., & Kirts, D. K. (1964). Cheating on college examinations as a function of situationally aroused anxiety and hostility. Journal of Educational Psychology, 55(6), 317-324.

Stevens, G. (1984). Ethical inclinations of tomorrow's citizens: Actions speak louder. Journal of Business Education, 59, 147-152.

Stokes, T. F., & Osnes, P. G. (1989). An operant pursuit of generalization. Behavior Therapy, 20, 337-355.

Stokes, T. F., & Osnes, P. G. (1991). Honesty, lying, and cheating: Their elaboration and management. In G. Stoner, M. R. Shinn, & H. M. Walker (Ed.), Interventions for Achievement and Behavior Problems (pp. 617-631). Silver Springs, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Stouthamer-Loeber, M. (1986). Lying as a problem behavior in children: A review. Clinical Psychology Review, *6*, 267-289.

Stouthamer-Loeber, M., & Loeber, R. (1986). Boys who lie. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, *14*(4), 551-564.

Tuddenham, R. D., Brooks, J., & Milkovich, L. (1974). Mothers' reports of behavior of ten-year-olds: Relationships with sex, ethnicity, and mothers' education. Developmental Psychology, *10*, 959-995.

Turiel, E. (1983). The development of social knowledge: Morality and convention. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vitro, F. T. (1971). The relationship of classroom dishonesty to perceived parental discipline. Journal of College Student, *12*, 427-429.

Vitro, F. T., & Schoer, L. A. (1972). The effects of probability of test success, test importance, and risk of detection on the incidence of cheating. Journal of School Psychology, *10*(3), 267-277.

Ward, D. A., & Beck, W. L. (1990). Gender and dishonesty. The Journal of Social Psychology, *130*(3), 333-339.

Zastrow, C. H. (1970). Cheating among college graduate students. The Journal of Educational Research, *64*(4), 157-160.

Appendix A

Request for Student and Parent Participation

Date: _____

ID Number: _____

Hello,

My name is David Workman and I am a graduate student at Eastern Illinois University working on my Specialists degree in School Psychology. I graduated from St. Joseph-Ogden High, and have lived in the area for 15 years. I would like to ask you for some help finishing my degree. I am working on my Specialists Thesis pertaining to attitudes of children towards lying and cheating. I would like to give your child, _____ a questionnaire pertaining to their lying and cheating attitudes. The questionnaire will take about 15 minutes and will be administered in your child's __ grade classroom at St. Joseph Grade school. In addition to a student questionnaire, I would like you to fill out a parent questionnaire pertaining to your child's lying and cheating attitudes as you percieve them. It should take about 10 minutes to complete. All information will be strickly confidential.

- I give David Workman permission to use my child in his study on lying and cheating.
- I do not give David Workman permission to use my child in his study on lying and cheating.

Parent / Gardian Signature_____
Date

Thank you for your assistance and time..
Sincerely,

David Workman, School
Psychology Graduate
Student, Eastern Illinois
University

Appendix B

Parent Form of the Lying and Cheating Survey**Parent Survey**

Child's Name: _____ Date of Birth: _____

Sex: Male ___ Female ___ Grade Level: _____

Your Relation: Father ___ Mother ___

Please rate your child, based upon your perception, using the following scale.

N = Never S = Sometimes U = Undecided O = Often A = Always

Would your child:

1. copy a report out of a book, newspaper. etc.N S U O A
2. not tell the teacher he/she received a grade
that was higher than they deserved.N S U O A
3. copy someone else's homework.N S U O A
4. write answers to tests on their hand or on
small pieces of paper.N S U O A
5. give exam questions and answers to the people
who are suppose to take the test later in
the day.N S U O A
6. use someone else's notes to study for an
examination.N S U O A
7. not contribute their fair share to a group project.N S U O A
8. ask a classmate for an answer during a test.N S U O A
9. talk to a teacher after a test to try to get on
their good side to get higher mark.N S U O A

N = Never S = Sometimes U = Undecided O = Often A = Always

Would your child:

10. study a copy of the test before the examination.N S U O A
11. give someone answers during an examination.N S U O A
12. have someone write a term paper for them.N S U O A
13. discuss exam questions with someone who had
the test in an earlier class.N S U O A
14. report someone they saw cheating on an
examination.N S U O A
15. tell a lie to test the limits of authority.N S U O A
16. tell exaggerations to see a reaction of the
authority figure.N S U O A
17. tell an untruth to avoid punishment.N S U O A
18. tell an untruth to cover-up or protect him or
herself from punishment.N S U O A
19. brag about something that is not true to feel
apart of the crowd.N S U O A
20. make exaggerations knowing that they are not
true to gain friendship.N S U O A
21. tell others untruths, to seek attention,
knowing the other people know the truth.N S U O A
22. when in trouble puts blame on a make-believe
person or thing.N S U O A
23. gives excuses for getting in trouble by making
up a fantasy story.N S U O A

Student Form of the Lying and Cheating Survey**Student Interview**

Name: _____ Date of Birth: _____

Sex: Male ___ Female ___ Grade Level: _____

Please use this scale to rate yourself.

N = Never S = Sometimes U = Undecided O = Often A = Always

Would you:

1. copy a report out of a book, newspaper. etc.N S U O A
2. not tell the teacher you received a grade
that was higher than you deserved.N S U O A
3. copy someone else's homework.N S U O A
4. write answers to tests on your hand or on
small pieces of paper.N S U O A
5. give test questions and answers to the people
who will take the test later in the day.N S U O A
6. use someone else's notes to study for an test.N S U O A
7. not contribute your fair share to a group
project.N S U O A
8. ask a classmate for an answer during a test.N S U O A
9. talk to a teacher after a test to try to get on
their good side to get higher mark.N S U O A
10. study a copy of the test before the test.N S U O A
11. give someone answers during a test.N S U O A

N = Never S = Sometimes U = Undecided O = Often A = Always

Would you:

12. have someone write a paper for you. **N S U O A**
13. discuss test questions with someone who had
the test in an earlier class. **N S U O A**
14. report someone you saw cheating on a test. **N S U O A**
15. tell a lie to see if you get in trouble. **N S U O A**
16. tell a fib to see what your parents will do. **N S U O A**
17. tell a lie so you won't get in trouble for
something you did wrong. **N S U O A**
18. tell a fib to hide the truth. **N S U O A**
19. brag by making up something untrue about
something to be friends with someone. **N S U O A**
20. make up stories, knowing that they are not
true, to impress your friends. **N S U O A**
21. tell other people fibs, to get the attention of
others, even though the other people
know the truth. **N S U O A**
22. if in trouble put the blame on a make-believe
person or thing. **N S U O A**
23. give an excuse for getting in trouble by making
up an untrue story. **N S U O A**