DOI: https://doi.org/10.20372/star.V13.i4.11
ISSN: 2226-7522 (Print) and 2305-3372 (Online)
Science, Technology and Arts Research Journal
Sci. Technol. Arts Res. J., Oct. – Dec. 2024, 13(4), 154-166
Journal Homepage: https://journals.wgu.edu.et

Original Research

Perceived Opportunity, Academic Self-Efficacy, and Students' Attitude as Predictors of Exam Cheating Behaviours

Adugna Bersissa Merdassa*

College of Educational Sciences, Kotobe University of Education, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Abstract

The objective of this study was to examine the relationship between perceived opportunity, academic self-efficacy, attitude toward exam cheating, and students' exam cheating behaviours. To this end, the correlational research design was employed. The questionnaire was used as a data-gathering instrument. The samples of the study were 388 grade 12 students selected randomly from the three Wollega Zonal towns to fill out the questionnaire. The result revealed that exam cheating behaviours are highly prevalent among grade 12 students in the study areas. The majority (52.36%) of grade 12 students engaged in some exam cheating behaviours. Moreover, the present study findings show that attitude towards exam cheating positively and significantly correlated with exam cheating behaviours, while academic self-efficacy was negatively and significantly correlated with exam cheating behaviours. The finding of this study further revealed that attitude towards exam cheating contributed significantly to the variance in exam cheating behaviours in the positive direction, while the contribution of perceived opportunity and academic self-efficacy were non-significant. It is recommended that interventions aimed at changing students' attitudes toward exam cheating should be planned and executed by concerned bodies such as counsellors, principals, and teachers.

Article Information

Article History:
Received: 15-10-2024
Revised: 13-11-2024
Accepted: 27-12-2024

Keywords:
Attitude, Exam Cheating, Perceived Opportunity, Self-Efficacy

*Corresponding Author:

Adugna Bersissa Merdassa

E-mail: adugnaber@yahoo.com

Introduction

The reason behind the teachers giving tests and examinations to their students is to select the most competent students to be promoted from grade level to the next grade level. However, students' exam cheating behaviours become barriers to the attainment of this objective. Debella et al. (2019) reported that the problem of exam cheating is more serious during the final examinations given at the end of every semester and national examinations given upon the compilation of grade 12. It is well documented in research that the teaching-learning process is influenced negatively by cheating on exams. In this regard, Whitley and Nelly (2002) attested that exam cheating hinders the teacher from identifying the gaps the students might have in the subject he/she teaches. Moreover, Anderman and Midgley (2004) argue that exam cheating damages teachers` and students` morale and the social reputation of schools. Exam cheating also makes the school`s effort to realize the

mission and vision it set meaningless and valueless.

Exam cheating among secondary school students is becoming a global phenomenon and growing at an exponential rate and alarmingly. Previous research findings (McCabe et al., 2001) show that academic cheating is a serious problem at all educational levels in the entire world. Research findings also revealed that not only low-achieving high school students were engaged in exam cheating but also high-achieving students practice it. Supporting this view, Anderman et al. (2009) reported that about 80% of high-achieving high school students and 75% of college students admit having cheated, a percentage that has been rising over the past six decades.

Different studies done in various countries revealed that students cheat on exams and tests for different reasons: to secure pass marks, better grade points, or to pass national examinations. Crib sheets and wandering eyes are not the only techniques students use to cheat exams. Research findings show that cheating has evolved to take on many different forms while these practices are still common; for example, McCabe, 2009; Power, 2009 reported various exam cheating techniques, which include giving and receiving test answers, writing on a wall or desk, and using a scribe paper during examinations. Similarly, the exam cheating techniques reported by O'Rourke et al. (2010) include: communicating in codes, wandering eyes when taking exams, use of crib sheets, writing on arms, legs, or hands, and allowing someone to copy in a test. Likewise, Debella et al. (2019) reported that students who cheat are either caught in possession of written materials in the form of crib notes, with written notes on the desks, copying from each other's work, or with formulas written on different materials in examination rooms.

Research findings (Dejene, 2021) also indicated using technology for exam cheating is on the rise. This scholar claims that technology has made exam cheating easier. Common uses of technology for exam cheating include: using cell phones to get the exam information, communicating with others outside the exam room to obtain answers, programming answers into calculators without permission, and searching for answers on the web during an exam such techniques are posing a new challenge in today's education, and giving, or receiving information about exams through cell phones e.g., sending pictures of questions or texting (Dejene, 2021; Johnson & Martin, 2005).

Existing literature shows that multiple factors predict exam cheating, some of which deal with individual and demographic factors such as age, gender, course enrolment, and family (Hensley et al., 2013), while others are contextual variables such as peer influence, honour code, school recklessness (McCabe et al., 2001). These studies approached exam cheating from different angles, but they weren`t able to halt the problem efficiently. However, psychological variables such as perceived opportunity, academic self-efficacy (Finn & Frone, 2004), and attitudes towards exam cheating, which were identified by few researchers as important contributing factors for exam cheating are less focused in previous literature and are the focus of the present study.

Perceived opportunity refers to getting an advantage over others through dishonest means such as cheating. When students engage in exam cheating, they are committing fraud since they may be getting an advantage over others in unfairly scoring better marks. A

student may be under pressure to commit fraud such as engaging in exam cheating, but that would only be possible if there was an opportunity, in most cases due to the weaknesses in schools since they are less likely to be caught.

In this study, attitude towards exam cheating means how a student responds to exam cheating, that is, whether such a student has a favourable attitude towards exam cheating or has an unfavourable attitude. Most students who cheat on exams usually have a negative attitude towards studying hard, since they have a positive attitude towards engaging in the exam cheating and can easily get better marks through cheating in the examinations.

Academic self-efficacy refers to a person's beliefs about his or her ability to successfully perform a given academic task. Studies have examined the relationship between self-efficacy beliefs and students` exam cheating behaviours. For example, Murdock et al. (2001) reported an inverse relation between exam cheating and academic self-efficacy. Other studies (Anderman & Murdock, 2007) have associated exam cheating with various emotional arousals like fear of failure, test anxiety, and doubt about one's performance, all of which serve as low efficacy cues.

In the Ethiopian context, complaints have been heard from different corners, including the Ministry of Education, teachers, students, and school managers from elementary schools to higher education institutions, on the devastating increase in exam cheating. It has been reported that the majority of secondary school students are actively engaged in most academic cheating behaviours, with a prevalence rate of about 80% (Dejene, 2021). Dejene's findings have clearly shown that the majority of students engage in exam cheating, and yet these students exhibit lower perceptions of the seriousness of the exam cheating behaviours for the following two reasons: less probability of being caught and the absence of severe punishment.

Similarly, Abeshu and Daksa (2017) stated that most of the students in secondary school cheat on exams from other students to promote from class to the next level. Abeshu and Daksa further described that the students who cheat on exams are seen by their friends as active, modern, considerate, and discreet. However, it is not surprising to imagine that students who reached grade 12 by cheating on exams are still likely to continue cheating on national examinations to get passing marks to join the university.

In Ethiopia, a very small number of research studies have examined exam cheating among secondary school students in general and that of grade 12 students in particular (Dejene, 2021; Debella et al., 2019; Taddese & Getachew, 2009). These studies have roughly focused on the rate and prevalence of exam cheating behaviours among students, but little has been done on the psychological variables such as perceived opportunity, academic self-efficacy, and attitudes towards exam cheating as correlates of students' exam cheating behaviour. Therefore, the major objective of this study is to fill in this gap in the Ethiopian literature on exam cheating by examining the relationship between perceived opportunity, academic self-efficacy, attitudes towards exam cheating, and exam cheating behaviour among grade 12 students. Accordingly, this study was intended to answer the following basic research questions:

1. *What is the prevalence of exam cheating behaviours among grade 12 students?*
2. *How are grade 12 students' exam cheating behaviours related to perceived*

opportunity, academic self-efficacy, and attitudes toward exam cheating?

3. To what extent do perceived opportunity, academic self-efficacy, and attitudes toward exam cheating predict grade 12 students' exam cheating behaviours?

4. Is there a significant sex difference in exam cheating behaviours between male and female grade 12 students?

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Research Design

A correlational research design was used in this study in order to determine the relationship between perceived opportunity, academic self-efficacy, attitudes towards exam cheating, and grade 12 students' exam cheating behaviours.

Population and Sampling

The population of this study were grade 12 students in the three Wollega zonal towns (Nekemte, Gimbi, and Shambu) in the year 2022/23. From each zonal town, three secondary schools were randomly selected; hence, 9 secondary schools were included in the study. The exact total population of grade 12 students was obtained from the respective Zonal Education Offices. Accordingly, 5,214 grade 12 students were enrolled in Shambu Secondary, Shambu Preparatory and Secondary, Goticha Abishe Gerba Secondary, Gimbi Secondary, Sena Gimbi Secondary, Biftu Gimbi Secondary, Biftu Nekemte Secondary, Nekemte Secondary, and Dalo Secondary schools. Naing et al. (2006) sample size determination formula was used in this study.

$$n = \frac{Z^2 P(1-P)}{d^2}$$

Consequently, the above formula yielded a sample size of 384 grade 12 students. Expecting missing data and non-responses, the researcher oversampled grade 12 students by 10%, which gave rise to the sample size of 422. But the responses of 34 grade 12 students were found to be incomplete and hence excluded from the data analysis. Therefore, data analysis and interpretations were made based on the responses of 388 students. The proportional method was used to include students from each school. To deal with this, students' population and samples drawn were summarised according to Table 1.

Table 1

Grade 12 Students' Population and Samples in 2022/23

School	Population	Expected Sample Size	Actual Sample Size
Shambu Secondary	532	43	40
Shambu Preparatory & Sec	548	44	40
Goticha Abishe Gerba Sec	460	37	35
Gimbi Secondary	256	21	19
Sena Gimbi Secondary	551	45	43
Biftu Gimbi Secondary	553	45	43
Biftu Nekemte Secondary	728	59	45
Nekemte Secondary	972	78	76
Dalo Secondary	614	50	47
Total	5214	422	388

Data Gathering Instruments

The perceived Opportunity Scale (McCabe & Trevino, 1997) was used to assess to what extent some grade 12 students are getting an advantage over the others through exam cheating. Participants completed the 8 items perceived opportunity scale. Students have chosen from out of five possible responses: "Strongly disagree", "Disagree", "Neither disagree nor agree", "Agree", and "Strongly agree". Each question's score ranges from 1 to 5 with "Strongly disagree" being scored as 1. The total score of this scale described the perceived opportunity of exam cheating, with higher scores indicating a perceived larger opportunity to plagiarise.

Academic Self-Efficacy Scale (ASES) adapted by Abesha (2012) was employed to assess the academic self-efficacy beliefs of students. Grade 12 students were asked to choose from out of four possible responses ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree) to show their level of agreement with each statement regarding their academic ability and confidence. High score on the scale indicates higher academic self-efficacy.

Attitudes towards Exam Cheating Scale (Davis et al., 1992) was used to assess students' attitudes towards exam cheating. Participants completed 4 items Attitudes towards Exam Cheating Scale. Students have chosen from out of five possible responses: "Strongly disagree", "Disagree", "Neither disagree nor agree", "Agree", and "Strongly agree". Each question's score ranges from 1 to 5 with "Strongly disagree" was scored as 1.

Exam Cheating Behaviours Scale was used to measure students' exam cheating behaviours. Based on the review of the literature, the researcher developed this part of the instrument. Participants completed 5 items Exam Cheating Behaviours Scale. Students have chosen from out of five possible responses: "Not even one time", "Rarely", "Sometimes", "Often", and "Many times". Each question's score ranges from 0 to 4 with "Not even one time" being scored as 0.

The English versions of these instruments (Perceived Opportunity Scale, Academic Self-Efficacy Scale, Attitudes towards Exam Cheating Scale, and Exam Cheating Behaviours Scale) were translated into Afan Oromo by one TEFL PhD student (currently a PhD holder). Finally, the Afan Oromo version was translated back to English (i.e., without seeing the original English version) by another TEFL PhD holder.

Method of Data Analysis

After collecting and coding data, statistical tests were performed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) for Windows, version 23.0. Both descriptive and inferential statistical tests were employed in the analysis. Descriptive statistics was carried out to determine the prevalence of exam cheating behaviours; Pearson correlation was calculated to examine the relationships among perceived opportunity, academic self-efficacy, students' attitude, and their exam cheating behaviours; Standard multiple linear regressions was conducted to examine whether students' exam cheating behaviour is regressed on perceived opportunity, academic self-efficacy, attitudes towards exam cheating or not.

Ethical Considerations

In the first place before the administration of the instrument, the purpose of the study was communicated to the study participants. This was followed by the request of the participants

consent to participate in the study. Respondents were also informed as their participation is voluntary and they are guaranteed to quit their participation in case they feel unhappy. The information provided by respondents was kept confidential. Moreover, the study anonymity was assured as the participants were informed not to write their names on the survey questionnaire. In addition, participants of the study were communicated that the data they provide is to be used only for academic purposes.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Results

This section is devoted to the presentation and interpretation of the data based on the responses of 388 grade 12 students. Presentations of the findings were made in line with the research questions.

Table 2

Socio-Demographic Characteristics of the Participant Grade 12 Students

Socio-Demographic Variables		N	%
Sex	Male	194	50.0
	Female	194	50.0
Age	14-16 years	3	.8
	17-19 years	300	77.3
	20 and above	85	21.9
Place grown up	Rural	172	44.3
	Suburban	61	15.7
	Urban	155	39.9
Father's level of education	No formal education	102	26.3
	Primary/Junior secondary	98	25.3
	Senior secondary	94	24.2
	Certificate/Diploma	24	6.2
	First degree and above	70	18.0
Mother's level of education	No formal education	120	30.9
	Primary/Junior secondary	132	34.0
	Senior secondary	78	20.1
	Certificate/Diploma	14	3.6
	First degree and above	44	11.3

As shown in Table 2, equal number of male and female grade 12 students partaken in the study. Regarding age of the participants, majority of them, 300 (77.3 %) were within the age range between 17 to 19 years, and the remaining 85 (21.9%) and 3 (.8%) were 20 and above years, and between 14 to 16 years, respectively. In terms of place grownup majority of the participants, 172 (44.3%) reported that they were grownup in rural, while the remaining participants, 155 (39.9%) and 61 (15.7%) reported they were grownup in urban and suburban, respectively.

When father's level of education is considered, most of the participants, 102 (26.3%) reported that their fathers didn't attend formal education, while 98 (25.3%), 94 (24.2%), 70 (18%), and 24 (6.2%) indicated their father's level of education was primary/junior secondary, senior secondary,

first degree and above, and certificate/diploma, respectively. Regarding mother's level of education, a greater number of students, 132 (34%) indicated that their mothers attended primary/junior secondary, and 120 (30.9%) students reported that their mothers didn't attend formal education, whereas the remaining students, 78 (20.1%), 44 (11.3%), and 14 (3.6%) reported that their mother's levels of education was senior secondary, first degree and above, and certificate/diploma, respectively.

Prevalence of exam cheating behaviours among Grade 12 students

Table 3

Prevalence of exam cheating behaviours

Exam cheating behaviours	Responses	
	Never	At least once
I have copied a few sentences from textbooks or other materials during the exam.	195 (50.3%)	193 (49.7%)
I have helped someone else to copy mine on exams	171 (44.1%)	217 (55.9%)
I have copied from another student during a test.	196 (50.5%)	192 (49.5%)
I have texted answers to friends via phones	176 (45.4%)	212 (54.6%)
I have received answers via text messages	186 (47.9%)	202 (52.1%)
Overall	47.64%	52.36%

Note: "At least once" is the sum of at least once and many times

Table 3 presented the different forms of exam cheating techniques and the frequency of students' engagement in each of the exam cheating technique rated as "never" and "at least once". The study finding revealed that most (52.36%) of the grade 12 students committed exam cheating at least once so far; and the remaining 47.64% didn't involve in any form of exam cheating. This clearly shows that the prevalence of exam cheating behaviour among grade 12 students in the study area is very high.

As can be seen from Table 3, the first item presents if the students have copied sentences from a textbook during the exam. In this regard almost half of the participant students (49.7%) confessed that they have copied sentences from a textbook during the exam. Item 2 in Table 3 investigated if students helped someone else to copy their own answers during exams and the result revealed that about 56% of grade 12 students have allowed others to copy their answers during examination. Similarly, when item 3 of the same Table is examined about half of the participants (49.5%) admitted that they have copied from a friend's exam papers. Items 4 and 5 of Table 3 dealt with the use of mobile phones to send and receive answers on exams. The result shows that most of the respondents (about 55%) and (52%) reported they sent and received answers using mobile phones, respectively.

Results of Pearson Correlations

Based on the review of empirical studies, it was expected that higher levels of perceived opportunity and attitude towards exam cheating would relate to higher level of exam cheating behaviours, while higher level of academic self-efficacy was expected to relate to lower exam cheating behaviours.

Accordingly, as can be seen from Table 4, positive attitude towards exam cheating was correlated positively and significantly with exam cheating behaviour (r =. 470; p < .05). Perceived opportunity was also correlated positively with exam cheating behaviour (r = .031; p > .05) but the relationship is non-significant. As expected, the relationship between students' academic self-efficacy and exam cheating behaviour (r= - .166; p < .05) was negative and significant.

Table 4

Matrix of Pearson Correlations between Independent Variables and Dependent Variable (N=388)

Variables	PO	ASE	ATEC	ECB
PO	1			
ASE	.138**	1		
ATEC	.056	-.228**	1	
ECB	*.031*	*- .166***	*.470***	*1*

** *Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).*

PO, Perceived Opportunity; ASE, Academic Self-Efficacy; ATEC, Attitude towards Exam Cheating; ECB, Exam Cheating Behaviours

Results of Multiple Regression Analysis

Standard multiple regression analysis was conducted to test if the psychological variables (perceived opportunity, academic self-efficacy, and attitude towards exam cheating) significantly predict grade 12 students' exam cheating behaviours. The result of the regression indicated the three predictor variables, when combined together, accounted for more than 22% of the variance in grade 12 students` exam cheating behaviours (R2 =.225, F (3, 384) = 37.063, p <.05). This implied that jointly the predictor variables significantly predicted the dependent variable. From this, it can be understood that variables other than these that were not considered in this study accounted for about 78% of the variability in involvement in exam cheating behaviours among grade 12 students.

Table 5

Relative Contributions of the Independent Variables on Exam Cheating Behaviours

Model	*B*	*SE B*	*β*	t	P
Perceived Opportunity	.028	.085	.015	.326	.745
Academic Self-Efficacy	-.054	.039	-.065	-1.385	.167
Attitude Towards Exam Cheating	1.050	.107	.454	9.799	.000

Beta weights of the independent variables were examined to determine which independent variable/s contributed uniquely to the variance in exam cheating behaviours (Table 5). Positive attitude towards exam cheating was found to be a significant contributor to the variance in exam cheating behaviours in a positive direction (t = 9.799; P<.05), while the contribution of perceived opportunity and academic self-efficacy were found to be non-significant (t = .326; P>.05) and (t = -1.385; P>.05), respectively.

Table 6

Exam Cheating Behaviours in terms of Grade 12 students` Sex

Variable	Category	N	Mean	SD	df	t	Sig. (2-tailed)
Exam Cheating Behaviours	Male	194	10.57	8.12	386	-2.01	.045
	Female	194	12.32	9.05			

Note: Significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The independent sample t-test result shown in Table 6 revealed that there is statistically significant mean difference between male (M =10.57) and female (M= 12.32), t (386) = -2.01, P =.045 < .05) grade 12 students in their exam cheating behaviours.

Discussion

The specific objectives of this study were to find out the extent of exam cheating behaviours among grade 12 students; to examine the relationship between perceived opportunity, academic self-efficacy, attitudes towards exam cheating, and grade 12 students' exam cheating behaviours; to find out to what extent perceived opportunity, academic self-efficacy, and attitudes towards exam cheating predict grade 12 students' exam cheating behaviours; and to determine whether there is statistically significant difference in exam cheating behaviours between male and female grade 12 students.

The finding of the present study revealed that the prevalence of exam cheating behaviour is high among grade 12 students. The 52.36% prevalence rate recorded in this study is in line with most previous findings (Pramadi et al., 2017; Galloway, 2012). Exam cheating techniques of "letting others to copy answers on exams"; "texting answers to friends via phones"; "receiving answers via text messages"; "coping sentences from a textbook or other materials during the exam" and "coping from another student during a test" were found to be the most common exam cheating behaviours used among grade 12 students in the study area. In accordance with the present finding, a study conducted by Stevenson-Clarke and Brimble (2007) revealed that academically better performing students were shown willingness to support their friends cheat on exams. In the same way, other researchers (Pramadi et al., 2017; McCabe et al., 2001; O'Rourke et al., 2010) reported copying answers from friends and allowing others to copy as the most commonly practiced exam cheating behaviour among secondary school students. Congruent with this finding, Debella et al. (2019) also identified and categorized techniques used in cheating as traditional (copying from other students, writing on the body and different materials in the classroom, crib notes, and exchanging exam papers) and modern techniques (mobile phones).

To determine the association of perceived opportunity, academic self-efficacy, students' attitude, and their exam cheating behaviours Pearson correlation was computed. The result revealed that positive attitude towards exam cheating is correlated positively and significantly with exam cheating behaviours, indicating that students with positive attitude towards exam cheating were engaged more in exam cheating behaviours. The present finding is also consistent with Harding et al. (2007) who stipulated that a person's attitude plays an important role in leading them to

commit deviant behaviours such as exam cheating. Congruent with the present finding, Edgren and Walters (2006) further explained that if unethical behaviours such as engaging in exam cheating become rampant, the activity becomes repeated over and over until it ceases to be unethical as students' attitude changes to a positive and hence becomes normal. Perhaps this explains why the students didn't show any negative attitude towards cheating in the exams.

The finding of this study also showed that perceived opportunity is correlated positively with exam cheating behaviour, though the relationship is non-significant. Consistent with this finding, Rae and Subramanian (2008) argue that students usually make ultimate use of weaknesses in the school administration in terms of organisation and hence cheat in the examinations. This finding is also in line with the finding of Kelly and Harley (2010), who explain that people will always make use of the available opportunity when they want to carry out a mischief. As indicated in the result section, the incidence of exam cheating among grade 12 students is high in the study area. However, when asked if there are perceived opportunities to cheat exams, the students reported their schools had strong policies to control them from cheating in the exams and that the penalties for engaging in exam cheating in their school were severe. This may mean that even if the opportunity to cheat is very minimal, some students will still cheat in the examinations. This shows how cheating in the exams has evolved since punishing the students who cheat and limiting the perceived opportunity to cheat no longer prevents the students from cheating. The students would rather create the opportunity to cheat by themselves instead of waiting for such an opportunity to make itself available, which is typical of the times we live in today.

On the other hand, the present study revealed a significant negative association between exam cheating behaviours and students` academic self-efficacy beliefs. Consistent with previous research findings stressing the importance of academic self-efficacy beliefs in exam cheating behaviours (Finn & Frone, 2004), in this research academic self-efficacy is significantly negatively correlated with grade 12 students` exam cheating behaviours. It is well documented in the work of these scholars and in other literature (Murdock et al., 2001) that exam cheating was common among students with low academic self-efficacy beliefs irrespective of their performance level.

To determine to what extent the independent variables (perceived opportunity, academic self-efficacy, and attitude towards exam cheating) predict grade 12 students' engagement in exam cheating behaviours, standard multiple regression was computed. The result showed the independent variables together contributed more than 22% to the students` involvement in exam cheating behaviours (Table 5*)*. The beta weights of the independent variables were calculated and attitude towards exam cheating was found to significantly contribute to the variance in exam cheating behaviours (more than 45%), while perceived opportunity and academic self-efficacy were insignificantly contributed to the variance in in exam cheating behaviours.

Although empirical studies showing to what extent perceived opportunity, academic self-efficacy, and attitudes towards exam cheating predict students' exam cheating behaviour is scanty, the existing literature (Bolin, 2004) revealed attitude toward

academic cheating is a variable playing a key role in explaining academic cheating. Bolin's finding revealed that about 40% of the variance in academic cheating is accounted by the students` attitude toward academic cheating.

In this study male, and female grade 12 students were analysed on their level engagement in exam cheating behaviours. This result is incongruent with previous research findings (Kobayashi & Fukushima, 2012) who reported that males are more likely to cheat on exams than females.

CONCLUSION

The present study finding has shown that exam cheating behaviours are highly prevalent among grade 12 students in the study area. Most students were engaged, at least sometimes, in some kind of exam cheating behaviours. In this study, it was found that attitude towards exam cheating positively and significantly correlated with exam cheating behaviours, while exam cheating behaviours and academic self-efficacy beliefs were associated negatively and significantly. Thus, from the findings one can infer students with favourable attitude towards exam cheating and those with low academic self-efficacy were found to involve more in exam cheating than those with negative attitude towards exam cheating and with high academic self-efficacy beliefs.

Recommendations

The following recommendations were forwarded based on the study findings:

1. *In this study, more than 45% of the variation in exam cheating behaviour is explained by the attitude toward exam cheating. Students' attitude towards exam cheating can be altered through interventions such as education. Therefore, interventions aimed at influencing students' attitudes towards exam cheating should be designed and executed by concerned bodies such as counsellors, principals, and teachers.*
2. *Working to reduce exam cheating behaviours has to go beyond framing and endorsing rules and directives that help to control cheating examinations. The school principals and other school management members are required to work in collaboration with other stakeholders, such as teachers, parents, students, and should have thorough discussions on the rules and directives; thereby enforce laws when the students violate examination rules.*
3. *Future studies should include other psychological variables that may have influence on the exam cheating behaviours other than perceived opportunity, academic self-efficacy, and attitude towards exam cheating.*

CRediT authorship contribution statement

The author confirms the sole responsibility for the conception of the study, presented results, and manuscript preparation.

Declaration of competing interest

The author declares that there is no conflict of interest.

Data availability

The data used in this research is available upon request.

Ethical standards

The author asserts that all procedures contributing to this work comply with the ethical standards of the relevant national and institutional committees on human

experimentation and the Helsinki Declaration of 1975, as revised in 2008.

Ethical approval

All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional and/or national research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards.

Acknowledgment

The author thanks Wollega University, Nekemte, Ethiopia for the financial support to conduct the study; grade 12 students in the three zonal towns who participated in the research, highlighting their significant contributions to the success of the study.

REFERENCES

Abesha, A. (2012). Effects of parenting styles, academic self-efficacy, and achievement motivation on the academic achievement of university students in Ethiopia *Edith Cowan University*. https://ro.ecu.edu.au/theses/461.

Abeshu, G., & Daksa, D. (2017). Avoidance of academic dishonesty in selected secondary schools of Jimma Town. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications, 7*(8), 617-625. https://www.ijsrp.org/research-paper-0817/ijsrp-p6876.pdf

Anderman, E. M., & Murdock, T. B. (2007). The Psychology of academic cheating. In *Elsevier eBooks* (pp. 1–5). https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-012372541-7/50002-4

Anderman, E. M., & Midgley, C. (2004). Changes in self-reported academic cheating across the transition from middle school to high school. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *29*(4), 499–517. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2004.02.002

Anderman, E. M., Cupp, P. K., & Lane, D. (2009). Impulsivity and academic cheating. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, *78*(1), 135–150. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220970903224636

Bolin, A. U. (2004). Self-Control, perceived opportunity, and attitudes as predictors of academic dishonesty. *The Journal of Psychology*, *138*(2), 101–114. https://doi.org/10.3200/jrlp.138.2.101-114

Davis, S. F., Grover, C. A., Becker, A. H., & McGregor, L. N. (1992). Academic dishonesty: prevalence, determinants, techniques, and punishments. *Teaching of Psychology*, *19*(1), 16–20. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15328023top1901_3

Debella, D., Berhanu, E., & Bezabih, A. (2019). Prevalence of cheating in secondary schools of Wolaita and Dawro Zones, South Ethiopia. *International Journal of Current Research, 11*(7), 5505-5513. https://unilibrary.z etech.ac .ke:8443/xmlui/bitstream/handle/zetech/125

Dejene, W. (2021). Academic cheating in Ethiopian secondary schools: Prevalence, perceived severity, and justifications. *Cogent Education*, *8*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186x.2020.1866803

Edgren, S., & Walters, S. (2006). Distance learning exchange: Academic dishonesty in the 21st century. *The Journal of Continuing HigherEducation, 54*(2), 56-59. https://doi.org/10.1080/07377366.2006.10400101

Finn, K. V., & Frone, M. R. (2004). Academic performance and cheating: Moderating role of school identification and self-efficacy. *Journal of Educational Research, 97*(3), 115–122. https://doi.org/10.3200/JOER.97.3.115-121

Galloway, M. K. (2012). Cheating in advantaged High Schools: Prevalence, justifications, and possibilities for change. *Ethics & Behaviour*, *22*(5), 378–399. https://doi.org/10.1080/10508422.2012.679143

Harding, T. S., Mayhew, M. J., Finelli, C. J., & Carpenter, D. D. (2007). The Theory of Planned Behaviour as a model of academic dishonesty in Engineering and Humanities undergraduates. *Ethics & Behaviour*, *17*(3),

255–279. https://doi.org/10.1080/105084 2070 1519239

Hensley, L., Kirkpatrick, K., & Burgoon, J. (2013). Relation of gender, course enrollment, and grades to distinct forms of academic dishonesty. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *18*(8), 895–907. https://doi.org/10.1080/135 62517.2013.827641

Johnson, S. A., & Martin, M. (2005). Academic dishonesty: a new twist to an old problem. *Athletic Therapy Today*, *10*(4), 48–50. https://doi.org/10.1123/att.10.4.48

Kelly, P., & Hartley, C. A. (2010). Casino gambling and workplace fraud: a cautionary tale for managers. *Management Research Review*, *33*(3), 224–239. https://doi.org/10. 1108/01409171011030381

Kobayashi, E., & Fukushima, M. (2012). Gender, social bond, and academic cheating in Japan. *Sociological Inquiry*, *82*(2), 282–304. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475682x.2011.0040

McCabe, D. L. (2009). Academic dishonesty in Nursing Schools: An Empirical investigation. *Journal of Nursing Education*, *48*(11), 614–623. https://doi.org/10.3928/01484834-20090 716-07

McCabe, D.L., & Trevino,L. K. (1997). Individual and contextual influences on academic dishonesty: A multicampus investigation. *Research in Higher Education*, *38*(3), 379-396. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:102495422 4675

McCabe, D. L., Trevino, L. K., & Butterfield, K. D. (2001). Cheating in academic institutions: A decade of research. *Ethics and Behaviour*, *11*(3), 219-232. https://doi.org/10.1207/S1532 7019EB1103_2

Murdock, T. B., Hale, N. M., & Weber, M. J. (2001). Predictors of cheating among early adolescents: Academic and social motivations. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *26*(1),96–115. https://doi.org/1 0.1006/ceps.2000.1046

Naing, L., Winn, T., & Rusli, B.N. (2006). Practical issues in calculating the sample size for prevalence studies. *Archives of Orofacial Sciences*, *1*, 9-14.https://www.academia.edu/2 3980977/

O'Rourke, J., Barnes, J., Deaton, A., Fulks, K., Ryan, K., & Rettinger, D. A. (2010). Imitation is the sincerest form of cheating: the influence of direct knowledge and attitudes on academic dishonesty. *Ethics & Behaviour*, *20*(1), 47–64. https://doi.org/10.1080/10508420903482616

Power, L. (2009). University students' perceptions of plagiarism. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *80*(6), 643-662. https://doi.org/10. 1080/00221546.2009.11779038

Pramadi, A., Pali, M., Hanurawan, F., & Atmoko, A. (2017). Academic cheating in school: a process of dissonance between knowledge and conduct. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, *8*(6), 155–162. https://doi.org/10.1 515/mjss-2017-0052

Rae, K., & Subramaniam, N. (2008). Quality of internal control procedures: Antecedents and moderating effect on organisation al justice and employee fraud. *Managerial Auditing Journal*, *23*(2), 104-124. https://doi.org/10.110 8/02686900810839820

Stevenson-Clarke, P., & Brimble, A. (2007). Academic dishonesty in accounting students: Implications for educators, the accounting profession and the business community. In P. Gupta, R. K. Jain, & J. Dhan (Eds.), *Enterprise competitiveness* (pp. 228–244). Allied Publishers. http://hdl.handle.net/100 72/17008

Taddese, T., & Getachew, K. (2009). Faculties' perception and responses to academic dishonesty of undergraduate students in education, business and economics, Addis Ababa and Jimma Universities. *Ethiopian Journal of Education and Science*, *4*(2), 57-72. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4314/ejesc.v4i2.51675

Whitley, B., & Nelly, E. (2002). *Academic dishonesty: An educator's guide*. Lawrence Publishers. https://doi.org/10.4 324/9781410604279