

Cheating is Unacceptable, but... Teachers' Perceptions of and Reactions to Students' Cheating at Schools and Universities

Marina Štambuk, Antonija Maričić and Ivana Hanzec
Center for Croatian Studies, University of Zagreb

Abstract

The pervasive problem of academic cheating is an important issue for teachers and other educational stakeholders. Since teachers are one of the most important role models to students, their approach to academic (dis)honesty will likely have a strong influence on them. Therefore, the aim of this study was to identify teachers' perceptions of the frequency and acceptability of different kinds of cheating acts, as well as their perception of the reasons for cheating and their reactions to cheating. Additionally, this study attempted to investigate whether teachers from different levels of education differ in their perceptions of cheating and/or in strategies that they use to deal with this problem. Data was obtained from 400 teachers from Croatian universities, secondary schools and elementary schools using an on-line survey. The results show that teachers from all levels of education perceive cheating as very frequent, but unacceptable behaviour. They recognize the great importance of their role in the prevention of cheating, but their actual reactions are a cause of concern. Teachers' reactions were usually reduced to warnings and did not lead to any serious consequences. Teachers from different levels of education reacted similarly to all acts of cheating.

Key words: *academic dishonesty; acceptability of cheating; cheating frequency; elementary, secondary and higher education; reasons for cheating.*

Introduction

In recent years, Croatian media have often reported stories on academic cheating. One of the well-known examples and one that was revealed to the public refers to a politician who had plagiarized his master's thesis. However, not enough educational studies have focused on this issue.

In its most basic form, academic cheating (academic dishonesty) is a violation of academic integrity (Kitahara, Westfall, & Mankelwicz, 2011). Cizek (2004, p. 308) provided an expanded definition where academic cheating is defined as “any intentional action or behaviour that: (a) violates the established rules governing the completion of a test or assignment, (b) gives one student an unfair advantage over other students on a test or assignment, or (c) decreases the accuracy of the intended inferences arising from a student’s performance”. Academic cheating can occur at either institutional or individual level (De Lisle, Hyland-Joseph, & Bowrin-Williams, 2011). This paper focuses on individual cheating, which refers to acts performed by students in an institution. Two types of individual cheating can be differentiated, active and passive. In active cheating, a student acts for his or her own benefit, while passive cheating involves helping another student by letting him/her copy unauthorized materials (Eisenberg, 2004). Individual cheating, either the active or passive type, can take many different behavioural forms and ranges from traditional methods, such as collusion in classroom-based examination, to digital-based forms, such as using Internet resources to commit plagiarism (for more on the classification of cheating see Callahan, 2004; De Lisle et al., 2011; Petress, 2003). The present study included most of the forms of student cheating that are common in Croatian educational institutions.

Prevalence

Williams (2001) concluded that depending on the width of applied definitions of cheating, different prevalence can be found in the literature. Finn and Frone (2004) reviewed the literature and reported that a third of all elementary school students have cheated, and around 70% of secondary school and undergraduate students have been academically dishonest. Having in mind that these were self-reported frequencies, it is reasonable to assume that these cheating frequencies could be underestimated. Šimić Šašić and Klarin (2009) found that 93% of secondary school students from Croatia (Zadar) admitted to have cheated, whereas Kukolja Taradi, Taradi and Đogaš (2012) and Hrabak et al., (2004) reported that around 95% of students of the School of Medicine participated in at least one of the surveyed cheating behaviours. Higher estimates of cheating prevalence among Croatian students may not necessarily indicate actual higher prevalence, but rather readiness to admit cheating. Both explanations may be related to the level of social acceptance of cheating and dishonesty in Croatian society. Previous studies concluded that the attitude toward cheating and the prevalence of plagiarism among students depends on the country they live in as well as on the academic settings (Magnus, Polterovich, Danilov, & Savvateev, 2002; Pupovac, Bilić-Zulle, & Petrovečki, 2008).

Overall, studies in the USA suggest that cheating prevalence reaches its highest level in secondary school, and continues to decrease as the level of education increases (e.g. Davis, Grover, Becker, & McGregor, 1992). It is assumed that the

increasing importance of education, success, financial security and advanced technology has contributed to the flourishing of academic dishonesty (Eisenberg, 2004; Groark, Oblinget, & Choa, 2001; Park, 2003). Nowadays, a number of Web sites are developed for downloading student papers (e.g. Cyber Essays, Gradesaver, Killer Essays) ranging from seminars and essays to dissertations. Some of them are operations set up by students while others are for-profit ventures (Groark et al., 2001). In contrast, McCabe and Treviño (1993) reported modest stability over time in most forms of cheating by comparing the number of university students admitting dishonesty in 1963 with the data gathered three decades later. However, Cole and McCabe (1996) emphasized that it is very difficult to make confident comparisons between data that come from a variety of sources.

Teacher Involvement

An important finding is that cheating is seldom detected and even when it is, action is rarely taken (Davis et al., 1992). A survey that included more than 800 teachers from universities in the US and Canada found that 40% of faculty members admitted ignoring student cheating on one or more occasions (Coren, 2011). Similarly, McCabe's (1993) study showed that students perceive that many teachers do not treat cases of academic dishonesty severely enough.

Boysen (2007) compared lists of reasons why educators should be concerned about cheating. Among other, he pointed out that cheating circumvents learning, the most important thing students are supposed to do at school and university. Not only should teachers be aware that cheating is a complex problem, but they should also understand that they participate in creating classroom cultures. McCabe, Treviño and Butterfield (2002) concluded that the teacher is one of the most important role models, and the message about academic integrity that he or she sends will likely have a strong influence on student behaviour.

One of the reasons why teachers hesitate to react on acts of academic dishonesty can be attributed to unclear politics in the institution where the teacher works (Davis et al., 1992). Very often, the educational institution ignores such matters and the responsibility is assigned to teachers. Coren (2011) assumed that many teachers turn a blind eye in order to avoid conflict. For teachers, dealing with cheating has been characterized as one of the most stressful and negative aspects of teaching (Keith-Spiegel, Tabachnick, Whitley, & Washburn, 1998). Additionally, it may be that some teachers do not recognize cheating because they are unfamiliar with the sophisticated technology involved in new methods of cheating.

In Croatia, only a few, very recent studies have dealt with academic dishonesty. The focus of these studies has been plagiarism in higher education (e.g., Baždarić, Pupovac, Bilić-Zulle, & Petrovečki, 2009; Pupovac, Bilić-Zulle, Mavrinac, & Petrovečki, 2010), and academic dishonesty and the attitudes of Croatian medical students (Kukolja Taradi et al., 2012; Hrabak et al., 2004) and secondary school

students towards it (Šimić Šašić & Klarin, 2009). However, teachers' perceptions of student cheating have not been studied yet in Croatia and it rarely served as the focus of research in general.

Method

Research Aim

The aim of this study was to identify teachers' perceptions of the frequency and acceptability of different kinds of cheating, as well as their perception of the reasons for cheating and the way they react to these acts. This study tried to answer an additional question: do teachers from different levels of education, elementary school, secondary school and university, have different perceptions of cheating.

Participants

The participants in the study were teachers from elementary schools (5th to 8th grade, 25.3%), secondary schools (25.6%) and universities (49.1%) from Croatia, mostly from Zagreb (70%)¹. From a total of 462 teachers who filled out the questionnaire, 400 (289 female, 111 male) filled it out completely. The participants' average age was 39 years and 6 months (ranging from 23 to 74 years of age).

Measuring Instruments

Individual questions were used to assess teachers' general estimates of the frequency of student cheating in their classes and their institutions as a whole, as well as the frequency of teachers' ignoring of student cheating.

The Cheating Scale, was a modified scale constructed by Šimić Šašić and Klarin (2009). It consisted of 10 items describing behavioural manifestations of student cheating (items in Table 1). The teachers estimated the frequency of a described behaviour among students in their classes on a 5-point scale (from 1 "never" to 5 "very often"), and the acceptability of the same behaviour, also on a 5-point scale (from 1 "completely unacceptable" to 5 "completely acceptable"). Internal reliability of these scales was .84 and .87, respectively.

Additionally, for all 10 items teachers marked their most common reaction, choosing one answer from the offered list of reactions. This list was created for the purpose of the present study, based on several previous studies (e.g. Burke, 1997) and the authors' personal experiences (items in Table 3).

The Reasons for Cheating Scale, was based on the Šimić Šašić and Klarin scale (2009), but was modified to be applicable for teacher estimations. Teachers estimated

¹ Private and community schools and universities were treated together in the analyses due to a very small number of teachers in private institutions in the sample. High school teachers were also treated together in the analyses, whether they teach at a grammar school or a vocational school, because there was no statistically significant difference between them on the observed variables. A statistically significant difference was also not obtained between teachers from schools and universities in and outside Zagreb. Because of this, and the numerical imbalance, they were analysed as a whole sample, instead of separate regional subsamples.

their agreement with 22 different reasons for cheating on a 5-point scale (from 1 “disagree” to 5 “agree”).

In contrary to the Šimić Šašić and Klarin three-factor structure, our results formed two factors identified as *cheating reasons related to the exam organization and consequences of cheating* (4 items, e.g. “Students cheat when supervision during exams is poor.”; $\lambda = 4.13$, $\alpha = .60$) and *cheating reasons related to students* (12 items, e.g. “Students cheat in school because they have too many obligations.”; $\lambda = 2.42$, $\alpha = .84$). The two factors together explain 40.88% of variance and are significantly but moderately correlated ($r = .32$, $p < .001$). Although the reliability coefficient for the factor related to exam organization and consequences of cheating was below the commonly standard accepted level of .70, we decided to keep the scale due to its stable and logically interpretable factor structure. One item of student related reasons for cheating (laziness) was analysed separately because its factor load was not on the expected factor. Items related to general attitude towards cheating were also analysed as individual items because of their low reliability as a scale.

Socio-demographic data about participants’ gender, age, years of service, academic degree and level of education they work at, were also collected.

Procedure

In the period of one month (in autumn, 2012) an on-line survey was conducted. Invitations were sent via e-mail to addresses of conveniently chosen schools and universities. Participants voluntarily and anonymously completed the survey.

Results

The results of the present study were analysed using basic descriptive statistics. Differences between the teachers at different educational levels were analysed by the analyses of variance (ANOVAs) and Scheffé post hoc tests. The assumptions of ANOVA, homogeneity of variances (checked using Levene’s Test) and independence of observations were met. Normality assumption, checked with the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test, was violated only for the Acceptability of cheating in secondary school and university teachers. However, ANOVA is considered a robust test against the normality assumption (Howell, 2002), so these violations can be tolerated.

Teachers’ Perception of the Frequency and Acceptability of Cheating

The results of our study showed that there were no differences in the perception of the frequency of cheating and acceptability between teachers at different levels of education, neither in their general estimations of cheating prevalence in their classes ($\chi^2(2)=0.80$, $p=.672$) and their schools/universities ($\chi^2(2)=0.13$, $p=.937$), nor in their results on the Cheating scale ($F(2, 397)_{\text{frequency}}=0.70$, $p=.500$; $F(2, 397)_{\text{acceptability}}=0.09$, $p=.915$). Therefore, we analysed the sample as a whole. The majority of teachers

believe that students in their classes sometimes cheat (45.9%). Approximately, equal proportions of teachers consider that students cheat rarely or often (21 to 24.2%, respectively), while only 7.1% consider that students cheat very often, and even fewer think that students never cheat (1.7%). Regarding the estimations of cheating prevalence in their schools/universities as a whole, the majority of teachers believe it happens sometimes (41.6%) or often (38.1%), and a much smaller number of teachers estimate that it occurs very often (11.9%), rarely (7.4%), or never (1.1%).

Table 1

Teachers' average estimations of frequency and acceptability of cheating behaviours

Frequency	M	SD	Acceptability	M	SD
Students allowing others to copy answers from them	3.15	0.92	Students allowing others to copy answers from them	1.70	0.84
Partly plagiarized work (homework, essay, etc.)	3.11	1.02	Collusion during the test	1.52	0.67
Copying answers from others	3.06	0.92	Partly plagiarized work (homework, essay, etc.)	1.49	0.63
Collusion during the test	3.06	0.98	Copying answers from others	1.39	0.62
Using crib notes	2.99	1.05	Using crib notes	1.37	0.65
Mostly plagiarized work (homework, essay, etc.)	2.86	1.07	Mostly plagiarized work (homework, essay, etc.)	1.26	0.54
Falsifying sick notes	1.85	0.91	Falsifying sick notes	1.11	0.43
Using mobile phones	1.84	0.93	Using mobile phones	1.09	0.38
Stealing test questions	1.55	0.86	Stealing test questions	1.05	0.34
Falsifying grades	1.20	0.46	Falsifying grades	1.02	0.28
Total	2.47	0.60	Total	1.30	0.38

Estimations of acceptability of cheating behaviours correspond to their estimated frequencies – the less acceptable the behaviour, the less frequently it is observed by the teachers (Table 1). Less severe acts of cheating (e.g. students letting other students copy their answers during the test) are reported as appearing sometimes and are somewhat unacceptable. More severe acts of cheating (e.g. falsification of grades) occur almost never and are regarded as completely unacceptable. The overall results on the Cheating Scale point to the conclusion that, regardless of the educational level they work at, teachers on average estimate that all forms of cheating occur rarely ($M=2.47$, $SD=0.60$), and are on average completely unacceptable ($M = 1.30$, $SD=0.38$).

Teachers' Perception of Reasons for Cheating

Table 2

Descriptive statistics for the two Reasons for cheating subscales

	Elementary school		Secondary school		University	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Cheating reasons related to exam organization and consequences for cheating	3.27	0.82	3.35	0.81	3.53	0.87
Cheating reasons related to students	2.58	0.65	2.47	0.70	2.37	0.71

All teachers were more inclined to attribute reasons for cheating to the factor related to exam organization and consequences for cheating than to the one related to students (Table 2). ANOVA showed that the effect of the level of education was significant for both factors ($F(2, 397)_{\text{exam}} = 3.48, p = .032$; $F(2, 397)_{\text{students}} = 3.18, p = .043$). Post hoc analyses indicated statistically significant differences between university and elementary school teachers. University teachers agreed more than elementary school teachers with the reasons for cheating attributable to exam organization and consequences for cheating, but agreed less than elementary school teachers that the reasons for cheating are attributable to students (Table 2). Nevertheless, all teachers, on average, had a neutral or slightly disagreeing attitude about this reasons' factor.

Items regarding attitude towards cheating, which were also offered as reasons for cheating and analysed separately, included general statements such as ethical justification, social acceptability, lack of serious consequences, inherence of cheating in human nature, and commonness of this societal phenomena. Teachers, on average, disagreed with these statements, especially with the statement that cheating is ethically justifiable ($M = 1.12, SD = 0.42$). However, all teachers, on average, "somewhat agreed" with the lack of serious consequences for those who cheat as the reason for cheating. Differences between teachers were significant only between elementary and secondary school teachers on the item referring to acceptance due to commonness ("*Cheating is acceptable because everyone is doing it*"; $F(2, 397) = 3.92, p = .021$), with secondary school teachers agreeing less with the statement. At the same time, the results of both teacher groups indicate disagreement with this general attitude (M from 1.60 to 2.06). It is interesting to note that teachers mostly agreed with the item related to students' laziness as a reason for cheating, regardless of the level of education they work at, gender or working experience.

Teachers' Reactions to Different Cheating Acts

Around 40% of teachers reported they have never ignored cheating in their classes. Unfortunately, this shows that 60% of them have ignored it at least once, regardless of the level of educational they work at.

The results presented in Table 3 show that warning a student is the most common teacher reaction when dealing with students who are letting others copy their answers during tests, students' collusion during tests or with students copying answers from others. When students use crib notes, the majority of elementary school and university teachers take the crib notes away, while the majority of secondary school teachers grade the tests with an insufficient (non-passing) grade. Although most of the teachers, especially in elementary schools, have never encountered students using mobile phones during exams, those who have, usually react in the same manner as with crib notes - take the student's mobile phone away or grade the test with an insufficient (non-passing) grade. However, a large number

of university teachers only warn those students. Many teachers, regardless of the level of education they work at, also only warn the students who hand in partly or mostly plagiarized work (homework, essays, etc.). Lower grades, negative points, etc. are commonly used as punishment for partly plagiarized work, and insufficient grades for entirely plagiarized works, especially by university and secondary school teachers, compared to those from elementary schools.

It seems that all teachers encountered students falsifying sick notes. However, their most common reactions were not covered by the list of reactions we offered. From the available reactions, lowering the grade or reporting the student to a person in charge was the most common reaction of elementary and secondary school teachers, while university teachers only warned the students who falsified their sick notes.

The majority of teachers report they have never encountered the most serious cheating behaviours (the last two in Table 3). Those who have faced students stealing test questions or falsifying grades reported those students to the supervisors (especially in elementary schools but also at universities) or suggested pedagogical measures for such students (in secondary schools).

Discussion

The message about academic integrity that teachers send will likely have a strong influence on student behaviour (McCabe et al., 2002), therefore we set our goal in this study to further the understanding of teachers' experience with academic dishonesty and the ways they deal with it.

Teachers' Perception of the Frequency and Acceptability of Cheating

The results of the present study indicate that not only do most of the teachers encounter cheating but also that cheating is a frequent problem in classrooms. Overall, most of the teachers, at all levels of education, encountered this behaviour sometimes (45.9%) or often (24.2%) in their courses or classrooms. Teachers' perceptions of cheating as frequent is expected since previous research has indicated that a lot of students readily admit cheating, from 30% in elementary schools (Finn & Frone, 2004) to 97% at universities (Kukolja Taradi et al., 2012). Studies using students' self-report measures have shown that there is a common, though not universal finding, that cheating reaches its highest level in secondary school and decreases throughout higher levels of education (Davis et al., 1992). Conversely, this study shows that there is no difference in teachers' perceptions of cheating prevalence at different levels of education. However, this difference is somewhat expected since a number of prior studies have shown that teachers and students differently report about the same events and processes in classrooms (e.g. Craig & Evans, 1990; Roig & Ballew, 1992).

Table 3
Frequencies (and percentage) of teachers' reactions to different cheating behaviours

	I do not react (ignore)	I warn the student	I take his/her mobile phone away	I move those students to another sitting place	I take away the test, but evaluate the written part	I grade the test with an insufficient grade	I lower the grade, give negative points, etc.	I report the student ^a	I suggest pedagogical measures	Other	I have never encountered this behaviour
Students letting others copy answers from them	ES	2 (1.9)	47 (46.5)	/	10 (9.9)	5 (5.0)	9 (8.9)	0	0	2 (2.0)	0
	SS	0	55 (54.5)	/	5 (5.0)	6 (5.9)	6 (5.9)	0	0	0	1 (2.0)
	U	2	132 (70.2)	/	36 (19.2)	3 (1.6)	12 (6.4)	3 (1.6)	0	0	9 (4.6)
Students' collusion during the test	ES	0	62 (62.6)	/	6 (6.1)	7 (7.1)	10 (10.1)	0	0	1 (1.0)	0
	SS	0	71 (70.3)	/	7 (6.9)	4 (4.0)	8 (7.9)	0	0	0	1 (1.0)
	U	0	141 (73.4)	/	6 (3.1)	7 (3.7)	7 (3.7)	3 (1.6)	0	1 (0.5)	9 (4.6)
Students copying answers from others during the test	ES	0	40 (40.0)	/	19 (19.0)	13 (13.0)	17 (17.0)	2 (2.0)	0	0	1 (1.0)
	SS	0	37 (37.0)	/	11 (11.0)	25 (25.0)	17 (17.0)	0	0	0	2 (2.0)
	U	1	104 (54.5)	/	17 (8.9)	32 (16.8)	10 (5.2)	1 (0.5)	0	1 (0.5)	6 (3.0)
Students using crib notes during the test	ES	0	3 (3.2)	44 (46.3)	1 (1.1)	21 (22.1)	10 (10.5)	1 (1.1)	0	3 (3.2)	6 (5.9)
	SS	0	4 (4.0)	35 (35.4)	0	10 (10.1)	41 (41.4)	8 (8.1)	0	1 (1.0)	3 (2.9)
	U	1 (0.6)	21 (11.8)	75 (42.1)	2 (1.1)	18 (10.1)	48 (27.0)	7 (3.9)	1 (0.6)	2 (1.1)	19 (9.6)
Students using mobile phones during the test	ES	0	3 (6.3)	24 (50.0)	0	2 (4.2)	8 (16.7)	1 (2.1)	1 (2.1)	3 (6.3)	53 (52.5)
	SS	0	6 (10.2)	19 (32.2)	0	7 (11.9)	18 (30.5)	4 (6.8)	2 (3.4)	1 (1.7)	43 (42.2)
	U	0	46 (37.1)	31 (25.0)	1 (0.8)	7 (5.6)	28 (22.6)	2 (1.6)	2 (1.6)	4 (3.2)	73 (37.1)

Note. ES=elementary school; SS=secondary school; U=university; "/" reaction was not offered in questionnaires' list of reactions; the most frequent reactions are in bold; ^a(to the class master, head master, administrator etc.)

Table 3
Frequencies (and percentage) of teachers' reactions to different cheating behaviours

	I do not react (I ignore)	I warn the student	I grade the non-plagiarized part of the work	I grade the work with an insufficient grade	I lower the grade, give negative points, etc.	I report the student ^a	I suggest pedagogical measures	Other	I have never encountered this behaviour	
Partly plagiarized work (homework, essay, etc.)	ES	0	26 (26.8)	12 (12.4)	6 (6.2)	44 (45.4)	1 (1.0)	0	8 (8.3)	4 (4.0)
	SS	0	28 (28.9)	12 (12.4)	16 (16.5)	34 (35.1)	2 (2.1)	0	5 (5.2)	5 (4.9)
	U	3 (1.7)	51 (28.7)	12 (6.7)	38 (21.4)	66 (37.1)	0	0	8 (4.5)	19 (9.6)
Mostly plagiarized work (homework, essay, etc.)	ES	0	20 (21.1)	6 (6.3)	28 (29.5)	30 (31.6)	2 (2.1)	1 (1.1)	8 (8.4)	4 (4.0)
	SS	0	17 (18.1)	7 (7.5)	39 (41.5)	24 (25.5)	3 (3.2)	0	4 (4.3)	5 (4.9)
	U	2 (1.2)	31 (18.2)	5 (2.9)	84 (49.4)	35 (20.6)	2 (1.2)	1 (0.6)	10 (5.9)	19 (9.6)
Students falsifying sick notes	ES	2 (2.0)	4 (4.0)	/	/	27 (26.7)	15 (14.9)	6 (5.9)	47 (46.5)	0
	SS	0	5 (4.9)	/	/	28 (27.5)	30 (29.4)	5 (4.9)	34 (33.3)	0
	U	12 (6.1)	32 (16.2)	/	/	8 (4.1)	3 (1.5)	14 (7.1)	128 (65.0)	0
Students stealing test questions	ES	0	0	/	2 (5.0)	1 (2.5)	19 (47.5)	13 (32.5)	5 (12.5)	61 (60.4)
	SS	1 (2.7)	0	/	0	0	13 (35.1)	22 (59.5)	1 (2.7)	65 (63.7)
	U	2 (3.5)	7 (12.3)	/	14 (24.6)	1 (1.8)	12 (21.1)	9 (15.8)	12 (21.1)	140 (71.1)
Students falsifying grades	ES	0	1 (2.8)	/	/	0	18 (58.0)	16 (44.4)	1 (2.8)	65 (64.4)
	SS	0	0	/	/	0	13 (37.1)	21 (60.0)	1 (2.9)	67 (65.7)
	U	0	1 (3.2)	/	/	0	18 (56.1)	12 (38.7)	0	166 (84.3)

Note. ES=elementary school; SS=secondary school; U=university; "/" reaction was not offered in questionnaires' list of reactions; the most frequent reactions are in bold;^a(to the class master, head master, administrator etc.)

Teachers at all levels of education consider cheating more frequent when it comes to the institution they work at – 38.1% estimate it happens often, in comparison to previously mentioned 24.2% in their own courses or classrooms. The perception of self and others, especially of socially undesirable behaviour, can be influenced by a number of factors (John & Robins, 1994). In general, people are motivated to maintain and enhance their self-esteem and use illusory self-enhancement to serve this purpose (Sedikides & Gregg, 2008). Accordingly, although teachers see cheating as a pervasive problem at their work place, they may evaluate themselves as better at handling this problem in comparison to their colleagues and consequently see cheating as less frequent in their classrooms. Furthermore, the perception of more frequent cheating in schools and universities can also represent erroneous inference due to overgeneralization of experiences teachers hear from colleagues.

Teachers' perception of the frequency and acceptability of different kinds of cheating shows that the most acceptably rated behaviours are seen as the most prevalent ones (e.g. students letting others copy answers from them). In terms of Eisenberg's (2004) typology of cheating, passive cheating is more frequent and acceptable than active cheating (see Table 2). This acceptability-prevalence pattern is mostly in line with the results found in a sample of secondary school students in Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina (Šimić Šašić & Klarin, 2008). The authors argued that higher frequency and acceptability of behaviours such as students letting others copy their answers or collusion during test is due to students' perception of these behaviours as acts of helping a fellow student rather than dishonesty. Although the pattern is similar to the results of Šimić Šašić and Klarin, students in their study, on average, considered all of the listed behaviours acceptable, while teachers in our study considered all of them mostly unacceptable. Contrary to the previous findings that teachers either cannot agree on what constitutes academic dishonesty (Schmelkin, Kaufman, & Liebling, 2001), or do not see it as a serious problem (Ercegovac & Richardson, 2004) teachers in our study agreed that the presented acts of cheating are unacceptable but, as we will see later, it seems that they cannot agree on how to deal with them.

Teachers' Perception of Reasons for Cheating

All teachers in the present study, regardless of their gender and work experience, are more inclined to attribute reasons for cheating to the ones related to exam organization and consequences for cheating than to those related to students. Closer inspection of average item estimates shows that teachers mostly agree that the lack of fear of consequences and weak supervision during exams are reasons for student cheating. Estimates of items constituting reasons for cheating attributable to students are mostly neutral or reflect teachers' disagreement with these reasons for cheating. Additionally, teachers mostly disagreed with items reflecting the general attitude towards cheating, especially with the idea that cheating is ethically justified.

These teachers' attitudes are consistent with their perception of different acts of cheating as unacceptable. Teachers agreed with only one of the items within general attitudes, the statement that lack of serious consequences for cheaters is a reason for cheating, which is consistent with the importance given to the exam organization and consequences for cheating as reasons for cheating. Overall, it is evident that teachers see their behaviour and their colleagues' behaviour as the main reasons for student cheating.

Craig and Evans (1990) have found substantial teacher–student differences regarding declarative knowledge about cheating, beliefs about teacher's role in the cheating problem and effective prevention strategies. In their study, students attributed more blame for cheating to teachers than the teachers were ready to attribute to themselves. Conversely, teachers in our study and Croatian secondary school students in the study by Šimić Šašić and Klarin (2008) have shown similar beliefs considering teachers' behaviour and exam organization as more relevant for the presence of the cheating problem than the students' own behaviour. Also, Kukolja Taradi et al. (2012) found that inappropriate severity of exams and teaching materials have a significant role in students' decisions concerning academic dishonesty.

Our results show that all teachers recognize the importance of their role in prevention and dealing with student dishonesty. Taking into account the reasons for cheating which they agreed on, we can conclude that if teachers want to reinforce academic honesty, they primarily need to improve exam organization and the sanctions for cheating. Teachers' reports about their actual reactions to different acts of cheating further emphasize this conclusion.

Teachers' Reactions to Different Cheating Acts

While teachers' view of different kinds of cheating as unacceptable gives an optimistic picture for dealing with this issue, their actual reactions are cause for concern. Our results correspond with conclusions from previous studies that teachers do not treat cases of academic dishonesty severely enough (Coren, 2011; McCabe, 1993). According to Coren's (2011) review of a variety of studies, from 15% to 51% of teachers have reported ignoring cheating on one or more occasions. Similarly, in our study more than half of the teachers reported ignoring cheating on some occasions, from rarely to often. It is important to underline the discrepancy between teachers' attitudes towards acceptability of cheating and their actual behaviours. As we have seen, they considered all of the acts of cheating as mostly or absolutely unacceptable, but still, they were ready to ignore those unacceptable acts on some occasions. We assume that this discrepancy constitutes a conflicting message that ultimately increases the rates of cheating. The question that follows is where this ignorance comes from. Value expectancy theories (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1975) suggest that people are ready to go to great lengths to avoid socially

uncomfortable situations. Since teachers perceive dealing with cheating as one of the most negative parts of their job (Keith-Spiegel et al., 1998), we can assume that dealing with cheating represents a socially uncomfortable situation that teachers are prone to avoid. Furthermore, Anderson's (2003) work on decision avoidance suggests that people avoid making a choice due to a mixture of rational reasons and the motivation to avoid strong emotions such as regret and fear. Indeed, studies show that teachers use ignorance to avoid intense anxiety and stress involved in reporting cheating (Keith-Spiegel et al., 1998). Some teachers do not react because of the lack of evidence or insufficient proof (Coren, 2011; Keith-Spiegel et al., 1998; Staats, Hupp, Wallace, & Gresley, 2009), as well as denial and lack of courage (Staats et al., 2009).

Further investigation shows that many teachers have developed personal strategies in reacting to different acts of cheating (Table 3). Moreover, many of them, regardless of the severity of the cheating acts, prefer to deal with them on one basis, thus bypassing to report students. All teachers reacted similarly to acts of cheating which they encountered frequently (e.g. collusion during tests, copying homework). It is especially troublesome that, although teachers rated these acts as mostly unacceptable, their common reaction was reduced to a warning. In other words, these students' acts usually did not lead to any serious consequences. When it comes to acts that are less frequent and considered absolutely unacceptable, we observed a similar and stricter pattern of reactions of teachers in elementary and secondary schools in comparison to those of university teachers. This is especially evident in teachers' reactions to students stealing test questions, where most of the elementary and secondary school teachers would report these students or recommend pedagogical measures, while university teachers showed a range of different reactions. These differences in teachers' reactions at the university level could have occurred due to differences in teachers' knowledge about disciplinary procedures in that specific situation. Usually, in Croatian elementary and secondary schools, the rules and regulations considering students' behaviours are more straightforward than at universities. University honour codes often vaguely define cheating (or focus only on plagiarism) with no clear steps or recommendations. Davis et al. (1992) pointed that unclear policies of the educational institution is one of the main reasons why teachers hesitate to react on academic dishonesty.

At the end of the survey, a space for comments was added in routine manner. Unexpectedly, these answers provided us with additional understanding of cheating problem since almost one quarter of the respondents offered a comment. Some of the comments were very emotional, reflecting teachers' helplessness in dealing with cheating, especially pointing out the connection between students' cheating and pervasive dishonesty and corruption in Croatian society. Comments also reflected teachers' indecisions in choosing the right reaction to acts of cheating and their perception of cheating as highly situational in nature. In reporting about

their reactions to cheating, many wanted to select more than one response and to know more information before making a choice (usually they wanted to know how many times the student repeated a particular behaviour). From their comments, it is clear that a qualitative approach would be an appropriate way in furthering our knowledge about teachers' reactions to cheating and understanding reasons why they chose a certain reaction.

Methodological Considerations

Teachers' perceptions of student cheating are a sensitive area of research and plagued by self-selection and measurement problems. Because of limited resources, we conducted an on-line study with a convenient sample that raises some concerns about generalizing the findings. Although teachers in our sample were diverse considering their gender, age, work experience and scientific field, additional studies using larger and more representative samples may provide an opportunity for comparisons between groups.

Another methodological problem previously mentioned, concerns using self-report measures that are affected by social desirability response bias. It is possible that teachers either knowingly or unknowingly reported socially desirable responses rather than the ones that honestly reflect their attitudes, beliefs or behaviours. We could argue that participants actually consider cheating more acceptable, ignore it more frequently and are more tolerant in their reactions than they were willing to admit in this survey. The percentage of teachers that admitted ignoring cheating in our study is in line with previous studies. Also, teachers reported rather permissive reactions to incidents of cheating. Therefore, we believe that our results are not substantially far from everyday reality in Croatian schools and universities.

Conclusions and Practical Implications

Listed limitations notwithstanding, we believe our findings have provided meaningful insights into the ways in which teachers experience and how they deal with academic dishonesty. Given the seriousness of reasons why educators should be concerned with cheating (Boysen, 2007), ignorance and rather tolerant teachers' reactions observed in our study are especially worrisome. Evidently, there is a clear need for major changes in the way teachers treat cheating and this notion should be taken into account not only in policy making at the institutional level but also in teacher education.

From the results of this study as well as on the basis of previous research, it is evident that if an educational system wants to reinforce academic honesty, exam organization and the sanctions for cheating must be improved. Educational institutions should develop rules and regulations that are clear, straightforward, and strict when it comes to academic dishonesty at all levels of education and make sure that those rules are applied consistently. This should help teachers to avoid using

personal strategies in reacting to cheating and alleviate stress related to this socially uncomfortable situation they are prone to avoid. It should also convey to students the message about the importance of academic honesty and the consequences for academically dishonest behaviour. Finally, it is important to note that the main goal should not only be changing students' possibilities to cheat by applying stricter punishment and control mechanisms, but rather collaboration of all education system stakeholders (students, parents, teachers, administrators, etc.) at all levels of education in building sustainable academic honesty.

References

- Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1977). Attitude-behavior relations: A theoretical analysis and review of empirical research. *Psychological bulletin*, 84(5), 888-918. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.84.5.888>
- Anderson, C. (2003). The psychology of doing nothing: Forms of decision avoidance result from reason and emotion. *Psychological bulletin*, 129, 139-167. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.129.1.139>
- Baždarić, K., Pupovac, V., Bilić-Zulle, L., & Petrovečki, M. (2009). Plagiarism as a violation of scientific and academic integrity. *Medicina*, 45(2), 108-17.
- Boysen, C. J. (2007). *Teachers and cheating: The relationship between the classroom environment and high school student cheating*. Cambridge: ProQuest LLC.
- Burke, J. L. (1997). *Faculty perceptions of and attitudes toward academic dishonesty at a two-year college* (Unpublished dissertation). Athens: University of Georgia.
- Callahan, D. (2004). *The cheating culture: Why more Americans are doing wrong to get ahead*. Orlando: Harcourt, Inc.
- Cizek, G. J. (2004). Cheating in academics. In C. Spielberger (Ed.), *Encyclopaedia of applied psychology* (pp. 307-311). San Diego: Academic Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/B0-12-657410-3/00815-1>
- Cole, S., & McCabe, D. (1996). Issues in academic integrity. *New Directions for Student Services*, 73, 67-77. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ss.37119967307>
- Coren, A. (2011). Turning a blind eye: Faculty who ignore student cheating. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 9(4), 291-305. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10805-011-9147-y>
- Craig, D., & Evans, E. D. (1990). Teacher and student perceptions of academic cheating in middle and senior high schools. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 84(1) 44-52. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00220671.1990.10885989>

- 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. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15328023top1901_3
- De Lisle, J. D., Hyland-Joseph, S., & Bowrin-Williams, C. (2011). "A little leaven corrupted the whole lump": Academic cheating as a hindrance to achieving quality in higher education. *Caribbean Teaching Scholar*, 1(1), 5-19.
- Eisenberg, J. (2004). To cheat or not to cheat: Effects of moral perspective and situational variations on students' attitudes. *Journal of Moral Education*, 33(2), 163-178. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0305724042000215276>
- Ercegovic, Z., & Richardson, J. V. (2004). Academic dishonesty, plagiarism included, in the digital age: A literature review. *College & Research Libraries*, 65(4), 301-318. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5860/crl.65.4.301>
- Finn, K. V., & Frone, M. R. (2004). Academic performance and cheating: Moderating role of school identification and self-efficacy. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 97(3), 115-121. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3200/JOER.97.3.115-121>
- Groark, M., Oblinger, D., & Choa, M. (2001). Term paper mills, anti-plagiarism tools, and academic integrity. *Educause Review*, 36 (5), 40-48.
- Hrabak, M., Vujaklija, A., Vodopivec, I., Hren, D., Marušić, M., & Marušić, A. (2004). Academic misconduct among medical students in a post-communist country. *Medical Education*, 38, 276-285. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2923.2004.01766.x>
- Howell, D. C. (2002). *Statistical methods for psychology* (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Duxbury Press.
- John, O. P., & Robins, R. W. (1994). Accuracy and bias in self-perception: Individual differences in self-enhancement and the role of narcissism. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 66, 206-206. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.66.1.206>
- Keith-Spiegel, P., Tabachnick, B. G., Whitley, B. E., Jr., & Washburn, J. (1998). Why professors ignore cheating: Opinions of a national sample of psychology instructors. *Ethics & Behavior*, 8, 215-227. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327019eb0803_3
- Kitahara, R., Westfall, F., & Mankelwicz, J. (2011). New, multi-faceted hybrid approaches to ensuring academic integrity. *Journal of Academic and Business Ethics*, 3, 1-12.
- Kukolja Taradi, S., Taradi, M., & Đogaš, Z. (2012). Croatian medical students see academic dishonesty as an acceptable behaviour: a cross-sectional multicampus study. *Journal of medical ethics*, 38, 376-379. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/medethics-2011-100015>
- Magnus, J. R., Polterovich, V. M., Danilov, D. L., & Savvateev, A. V. (2002). Tolerance to cheating: an analysis across countries. *Journal of Economic Education*, 33, 125-35. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00220480209596462>
- McCabe, D. L. (1993). Faculty responses to academic dishonesty: The influence of student honor codes. *Research in Higher Education*, 34(4), 647-658. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00991924>
- McCabe, D. L., & Treviño, L. K. (1993). Academic dishonesty: Honor codes and other contextual influences. *Journal of Higher Education*, 64(5), 522-538. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2959991>

- McCabe, D. L., Treviño, L. K., & Butterfield, K. D. (2002). Honor codes and other contextual influences on academic integrity: A replication and extension to modified honor code settings. *Research in Higher Education*, 43(3), 357-378. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1014893102151>
- Park, C. (2003). In other (people's) words: Plagiarism by university students – literature and lessons. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 28(5), 471-488. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02602930301677>
- Petress, K. C. (2003). Academic dishonesty: A plague on our profession. *Education*, 123(3), 624-628.
- Pupovac, V., Bilić-Zulle L., & Petrovečki, M. (2008). On academic plagiarism in Europe. An analytical approach based on four studies. *Digithum*, 10, 13-19.
- Pupovac, V., Bilić-Zulle, L., Mavrinac, M., & Petrovečki, M. (2010). Special issue: Responsible writing in science. *Biochemia Medica*, 20(3), 307-313. <http://dx.doi.org/10.11613/BM.2010.039>
- Roig, M., & Ballew, C. (1992, April). *Attitudes toward cheating by college students and professors*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association, Boston, MA. /online/. Retrieved on 8th June 2012 from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED349895>
- Schmelkin, L. P., Kaufman, A. M., & Liebling, D. E. (2001, August). *Faculty assessments of the clarity and prevalence of academic dishonesty*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, CA. /online/. Retrieved on 20th October 2012 from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED459653>
- Sedikides, C., & Gregg, A. P. (2008). Self-enhancement: Food for thought. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 3(2), 102-116. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6916.2008.00068.x>
- Staats, S., Hupp, J. M., Wallace, H., & Gresley, J. (2009). Heroes don't cheat: An examination of academic dishonesty and students' views on why professors don't report cheating. *Ethics & Behavior*, 19(3), 171-183. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10508420802623716>
- Šimić Šašić, S., & Klarin, M. (2008). Varanje u srednjim školama u Hrvatskoj i u Bosni i Hercegovini [High School Cheating in Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina]. *Društvena istraživanja*, 6(104), 999- 1022.
- Williams, S. (2001). How do I know if they're cheating? Teacher strategies in an information age. *The Curriculum Journal*, 12(2), 225-239. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/095851701202039>

Marina Štambuk

Psychology Department, Centre for Croatian Studies
University of Zagreb

Campus Borongaj, Borongajska 83d, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia
mstambuk@hrstud.hr

Antonija Maričić

Psychology Department, Centre for Croatian Studies
University of Zagreb
Campus Borongaj, Borongajska 83d, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia
amaricic@hrstud.hr

Ivana Hanzec

Psychology Department, Centre for Croatian Studies
University of Zagreb
Campus Borongaj, Borongajska 83d, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia
ihanzec@hrstud.hr

Varanje je neprihvatljivo, ali... Percepcija varanja i reakcije nastavnika na učeničko i studentsko varanje

Sažetak

Sveprisutan problem varanja u školama i na fakultetima važna je tema za nastavnike i kreatore obrazovne politike. Budući da su nastavnici jedan od najvažnijih uzora svojim učenicima i studentima, njihov pristup akademskom (ne)poštenju zasigurno ima velik utjecaj na akademsko poštenje učenika/studenta. Zbog toga je cilj ovog istraživanja bio ispitati nastavničku percepciju učestalosti i prihvatljivosti različitih oblika varanja, njihovu percepciju razloga varanja i načine na koje reagiraju na pojavu varanja. Prema navedenom su uspoređeni nastavnici zaposleni na različitim razinama obrazovanja, a u svrhu utvrđivanja mogućih razlika među njima u odnosu na taj problem. Podaci su prikupljeni on-line anketom u kojoj je sudjelovalo 400 nastavnika zaposlenih u osnovnim i srednjim školama, i na fakultetima. Rezultati su pokazali da nastavnici svih triju razina obrazovanja percipiraju varanje kao vrlo često, ali neprihvatljivo ponašanje. Prepoznaju važnost vlastite uloge u prevenciji varanja, ali njihove su stvarne reakcije na pojavu varanja razlog za zabrinutost; obično su svedene na upozorenja i nemaju ozbiljne posljedice za učenike i studente. Nastavnici na različitim razinama obrazovanja, neovisno o obliku varanja, uglavnom reagiraju na sličan način.

Ključne riječi: akademsko nepoštenje; osnovno, srednje i visoko obrazovanje; prihvatljivost varanja; razlozi varanja; učestalost varanja

Uvod

Posljednjih godina mediji u Hrvatskoj često izvještavaju o problemu akademskog varanja. Jedan od poznatih primjera, koji je među prvima iznesen u javnost, bio je slučaj političara koji je plagirao magistarski rad. Ipak, nedovoljno se obrazovnih znanstvenih istraživanja bavilo tom temom.

U osnovi, akademsko varanje (akademsko nepoštenje) označava povredu akademskog poštenja (Kitahara, Westfall i Mankelwicz, 2011). U proširenoj definiciji koju donosi Cizek (2004, str. 308) varanje je „bilo koje namjerno ponašanje koje:

(a) krši postojeća pravila o radu na testu ili zadatku, (b) daje jednom studentu nepravednu prednost u odnosu na druge ili (c) smanjuje točnost zaključka o njegovu postignuću". Akademsko varanje može se javiti na institucijskoj ili individualnoj razini (De Lisle, Hyland-Joseph i Bowrin-Williams, 2011). U ovom radu usmjerenost je na individualnoj razini, koja se odnosi na postupke učenika i studenata u nekoj instituciji. Na individualnoj razini varanja također je moguće razlikovati aktivno i pasivno varanje. Kod aktivnog varanja učenik se koristi takvim postupcima za vlastitu korist, a kod pasivnog varanja pomaže drugom učeniku dopuštajući mu da prepisuje (Eisenberg, 2004). Individualno varanje, bilo aktivno ili pasivno, može se javljati u puno različitih oblika, od tradicionalnih metoda poput došaptavanja u razredu tijekom ispita do korištenja suvremenom tehnologijom, npr. internetom kao izvorom za plagiranje radova (za više informacija o tome vidjeti Callahan, 2004; De Lisle *i sur.*, 2011, Petress, 2003). U ovom je istraživanju razmatrana većina oblika učeničkog i studentskog varanja uobičajena u hrvatskim obrazovnim institucijama.

Prevalencija

Williams (2001) je zaključio da se podaci o prevalenciji razlikuju ovisno o širini primijenjene definicije varanja. Finn i Frone (2004) na osnovi pregleda literature zaključuju da je 1/3 svih osnovnoškolskih učenika varala, a da je među srednjoškolcima i studentima varalo njih 70%. Uzimajući u obzir da je riječ o učeničkim i studentskim samoprocjenama, moguće je pretpostaviti da su navedene procjene podcijenjene. Šimić Šašić i Klarin (2009) u svom istraživanju navode da 93% zadarskih srednjoškolaca priznaje da je varalo. Kukulja Taradi, Taradi i Đogaš (2012), Hrabak i suradnici (2004) navode da je oko 95% studenata Medicinskog fakulteta sudjelovalo u barem jednom od ispitivanih oblika varanja. Više procjene prevalencije varanja među učenicima i studentima u Hrvatskoj ne moraju ukazivati na zaista češće varanje, već mogu biti odraz njihove veće spremnosti na to da priznaju varanje. Oba objašnjenja mogu se povezati s općim stupnjem društvene prihvatljivosti varanja i nepoštenja u hrvatskom društvu. Ranija istraživanja potvrđuju kako stav prema varanju i prevalencija plagiranja među učenicima/studentima ovise o državi u kojoj žive i o akademskom okruženju (Magnus, Polterovich, Danilov i Savvateev, 2002; Pupovac, Bilić-Zulle i Petrovečki, 2008).

Američka istraživanja pokazuju da prevalencija varanja doseže najvišu razinu u srednjoj školi, nakon čega se, s porastom razine obrazovanja, ona smanjuje (npr. Davis, Grover, Becker i McGregor, 1992). Pretpostavlja se da je rast u percepciji važnosti obrazovanja, uspjeha i financijske sigurnosti, uz napredak tehnologije, doprinio procvatu akademskog nepoštenja (Eisenberg, 2004; Groark, Oblinget i Choa, 2001; Park, 2003). Primjerice, postoji velik broj internetskih stranica koje omogućuju preuzimanje gotovih radova (npr. CyberEssays, Gradesaver), od seminara do doktorskih disertacija, pri čemu nekima upravljaju učenici/studenti, a nekima je cilj zarada (Groark *i sur.*, 2001). S druge strane, McCabe i Treviño (1993) utvrdili

su umjerenu stabilnost većine oblika varanja tijekom vremena, uspoređujući broj sveučilišnih studenata koji su priznali nepoštenje 1963. s podacima prikupljenim tri desetljeća poslije. Međutim, Cole i McCabe (1996) upozoravaju na to da je teško donositi pouzdane usporedbe na osnovi podataka iz različitih izvora.

Uključenost nastavnika

Važan nalaz je da se varanje rijetko otkrije, a kada se otkrije, rijetko se poduzimaju odgovarajuće mjere (Davis *i sur.*, 1992). Istraživanje provedeno s više od 800 nastavnika američkih i kanadskih sveučilišta pokazalo je da 40% nastavnika priznaje da je ignoriralo varanje jednom ili veći broj puta (Coren, 2011). Slično tome, istraživanje McCabea (1993) pokazalo je da učenici/studenti primjećuju kako velik broj nastavnika nedovoljno strogo tretira slučajeve nepoštenja.

Boysen (2007) je usporedio razloge zbog kojih bi nastavnici trebali biti zabrinuti zbog varanja. Između ostalog, naglašava da se varanjem zaobilazi učenje, najvažnije što bi učenici i studenti trebali raditi u školama i na fakultetima. Ne samo da bi nastavnici trebali biti svjesni da je varanje ozbiljan problem nego bi trebali shvatiti i da oni sami sudjeluju u kreiranju razredne kulture. McCabe, Treviño i Butterfield (2002) zaključili su da su nastavnici jedan od najvažnijih uzora učenicima, stoga će poruka koju nastavnici šalju o akademskom poštenju vjerojatno imati snažan utjecaj na ponašanje učenika.

Jedan od razloga zbog kojeg se nastavnici ustručavaju reagirati na činove akademskog nepoštenja mogao bi se pripisati nejasnoj politici institucije u kojoj rade (Davis *i sur.*, 1992), a koje često ignoriraju tu problematiku i odgovornost prebacuju na nastavnike. Coren (2011) pretpostavlja da mnogi nastavnici ignoriraju varanje kako bi izbjegli konflikt. Naime, nošenje s problemom varanja za nastavnike je jedan od najstresnijih i negativnijih aspekata njihova posla (Keith-Spiegel, Tabachnick, Whitley i Washburn, 1998). Osim toga, moguće je da neki nastavnici ne primjećuju varanje jer nisu upoznati sa sofisticiranom tehnologijom uključenom u nove oblike i metode varanja.

U Hrvatskoj postoji tek malen broj nedavno provedenih istraživanja u kojima su se autori bavili akademskim nepoštenjem. U središtu tih istraživanja bilo je plagiranje u visokom obrazovanju (npr. Baždarić, Pupovac, Bilić-Zulle i Petrovečki, 2009; Pupovac, Bilić-Zulle, Mavrinac i Petrovečki, 2010), akademsko nepoštenje i stavovi studenata Medicinskog fakulteta (Kukolja Taradi *i sur.*, 2012; Hrabak *i sur.*, 2004), kao i stavovi srednjoškolaca prema varanju (Šimić Šašić i Klarin, 2009). Međutim, nastavnička perspektiva varanja u Hrvatskoj još nije istraživana i općenito je rijetko bila predmet istraživanja.

Metoda

Cilj istraživanja

Cilj ovog istraživanja bio je utvrditi nastavničku percepciju učestalosti i prihvatljivosti različitih oblika varanja, njihovu percepciju razloga varanja, kao

i načine na koje reagiraju na varanje. Ovo istraživanje pokušalo je odgovoriti i na dodatno pitanje – razlikuju li se nastavnici zaposleni na različitim razinama obrazovanja (u osnovnoj, srednjoj školi i na fakultetu) u svojoj percepciji varanja.

Sudionici

U istraživanju su sudjelovali nastavnici osnovnih škola (5. – 8. razreda, 25,3%), srednjih škola (25,6%) i fakulteta (49,1%), uglavnom iz Zagreba (70%).¹ Od ukupno 462 nastavnika koji su ispunjavali upitnik, njih 400 (289 žena, 111 muškaraca) ispunilo ga je u cijelosti. Prosječna dob sudionika bila je 39 godina i 6 mjeseci (rasponom dobi: 23 – 74 godina).

Instrumenti

Na pojedinačnim pitanjima nastavnici su davali opće procjene učestalosti varanja učenika i studenata u svom razredu/na svom kolegiju, u instituciji u kojoj su zaposleni, kao i procjenu učestalosti njihova ignoriranja učeničkog/studentuskog varanja. Osim toga, korištene su sljedeće skale:

Skala varanja, nastala modifikacijom skale koju su konstruirale Šimić Šašić i Klarin (2009). Sastoji se od 10 čestica koje opisuju ponašajne manifestacije učeničkog varanja (čestice u Tablici 1). Nastavnici su procjenjivali učestalost ponašanja među učenicima/studentima u svom razredu/na svom kolegiju, na skali od 5 stupnjeva (od 1 “*nikada*” do 5 “*jako često*”) i prihvatljivost tog ponašanja, također na skali od 5 stupnjeva (od 1 “*potpuno neprihvatljivo*” do 5 “*potpuno prihvatljivo*”). Unutarnja pouzdanost tih skala u provedenom istraživanju iznosi ,84, odnosno ,87.

Dodatno, za svih 10 čestica nastavnici su označavali svoju uobičajenu reakciju, odabirući odgovor s ponuđene liste reakcija. Lista je sastavljena za potrebe ovog istraživanja, na osnovi prijašnjih istraživanja (npr. Burke, 1997) i osobnog iskustva autorica (čestice u Tablici 3).

Skala razloga varanja, utemeljena je na skali koju su konstruirale Šimić Šašić i Klarin (2009), ali modificirana kako bi bila prikladna za procjene nastavnika. Nastavnici su procjenjivali stupanj slaganja s 22 različita razloga varanja na skali od 5 stupnjeva (od 1 “*ne slažem se*” do 5 “*slažem se*”).

Za razliku od trofaktorske strukture skale dobivene u istraživanju Šimić Šašić i Klarin (2009), rezultati ovog istraživanja uputili su na postojanje dva faktora, *razlozi varanja povezani s organizacijom ispita i posljedicama varanja* (4 čestice, npr. „*Studenti/učenici varaju kad je slab nadzor za vrijeme ispita.*“, $\lambda=4,13, \alpha=.60$) i *razlozi varanja povezani s učenicima/studentima* (12 čestica, npr. „*Učenici varaju u*

¹ Privatne i javne škole i fakulteti u analizama su tretirani zajedno zbog vrlo male zastupljenosti u uzorku nastavnika zaposlenih u privatnim institucijama. Srednjoškolski nastavnici također su tretirani zajedno neovisno o tome rade li u gimnaziji ili u strukovnoj školi, jer među njima nije bilo statistički značajne razlike na opažanim varijablama. Statistički značajna razlika nije dobivena ni među nastavnicima zaposlenima u Zagrebu i izvan njega. Zbog toga, i zbog brojčane neuravnoteženosti, analizirani su zajedno kao cjelovit uzorak.

školi jer imaju previše obveza.“, $\lambda=2,42$, $\alpha=.84$). Ta dva faktora zajednički objašnjavaju 40,88% varijance te su statistički značajno i umjereno povezani ($r=.32$, $p<.001$). Iako je unutarnja pouzdanost faktora povezanog s organizacijom ispita i posljedicama varanja ispod uobičajene prihvatljive razine od ,70, skala je zadržana zbog stabilne i logički interpretabilne faktorske strukture. Jedna čestica povezana s učeničkim/studentским razlozima varanja (lijenost) analizirana je zasebno zbog projekcije na neodgovarajući faktor. Čestice povezane s općim stavom prema varanju također su analizirane kao zasebne čestice zbog izrazito niske pouzdanosti skale koju bi formirale.

Socio-demografski podaci o rodu, dobi, godinama staža, stupnju obrazovanja sudionika, razini obrazovanja i instituciji na kojoj su zaposleni također su prikupljeni.

Postupak

Istraživanje je provedeno tijekom mjesec dana (u jesen 2012. godine) putem *on-line* upitnika. Pozivi za sudjelovanje poslani su e-poštom na adrese prigodno odabranih škola i fakulteta. Sudjelovanje u istraživanju bilo je dobrovoljno i anonimno.

Rezultati

Rezultati su analizirani osnovnim deskriptivnim statisticima. Razlike između nastavnika na različitim razinama obrazovanja analizirane su analizama varijance (ANOVA) i Schefféovim post hoc testovima. Preduvjeti za provođenje ANOVA-e, homogenost varijanci (testirana Levenovim testom) i nezavisnost opažanja bili su zadovoljeni. Normalnost distribucije, provjeravana Kolmogorov-Smirnovim testom, bila je narušena samo za Prihvatljivost varanja kod nastavnika srednjih škola i fakulteta. Međutim, ANOVA se smatra robusnom statističkom procedurom na koju narušavanje preduvjeta neznatno djeluje (Howell, 2002), stoga se ta odstupanja od preduvjeta mogu tolerirati.

Nastavnička percepcija učestalosti i prihvatljivosti varanja

Rezultati ovog istraživanja pokazali su da među nastavnicima zaposlenim na različitim razinama obrazovanja ne postoji razlika u percepciji učestalosti i prihvatljivosti varanja, a ni u njihovim općim procjenama prevalencije varanja u njihovim razredima/kolegijima ($\chi^2(2)=0,80$, $p=.672$) i školama/fakultetima ($\chi^2(2)=0,13$, $p=.937$), ni u njihovim rezultatima na Skali varanja ($F(2, 397)_{učestalost}=0,70$, $p=.500$; $F(2, 397)_{prihvatljivost}=0,09$, $p=.915$). Zbog toga su analize rađene na cjelovitom uzorku. Većina nastavnika smatra da učenici/studenti u njihovu razredu/na njihovom kolegiju varaju ponekad (45,9%), 21% njih vjeruje da varaju rijetko, a podjednak dio njih (24,2%) smatra da varaju često. Znatno manji dio nastavnika smatra da učenici/studenti varaju jako često (7,1%) ili nikada (1,7%). Što se tiče percepcije učestalosti varanja u školama/na fakultetima gdje su nastavnici zaposleni,

većina ih vjeruje da se varanje javlja ponekad (41,6%) ili često (38,1%), a puno manji dio njih procjenjuje da se javlja jako često (11,9%), rijetko (7,4%) ili nikada (1,1%).

Tablica 1.

Nastavničke procjene prihvatljivosti različitih oblika varanja odgovaraju procjenama njihove učestalosti – manje prihvatljiva ponašanja nastavnici procjenjuju manje učestalima (Tablica 1.). Manje ozbiljni oblici varanja (npr. dopuštanje drugim učenicima/studentima da prepisuju od njih) prema nastavničkim se procjenama javljaju ponekad i nastavnici ih smatraju uglavnom neprihvatljivima. Ozbiljniji oblici varanja (npr. krivotvorenje ocjena) javljaju se gotovo nikada i nastavnicima su potpuno neprihvatljivi. Ukupni rezultati na Skali varanja ukazuju na zaključak da, neovisno o razini obrazovanja na kojoj su zaposleni, nastavnici procjenjuju da se u prosjeku svi oblici varanja javljaju rijetko ($M=2,47$, $SD=0,60$), te su im u prosjeku potpuno neprihvatljivi ($M=1,30$, $SD=0,38$).

Nastavnička percepcija razloga varanja

Tablica 2.

Svi nastavnici skloniji su pripisati razloge varanja faktoru povezanom s organizacijom ispita i posljedicama varanja nego faktoru povezanom s učenicima/studentima (Tablica 2.). Na oba faktora ANOVA-om je ustanovljena statistički značajna razlika između nastavnika ($F(2, 397)_{organizacija}=3,48$, $p=,032$; $F(2, 397)_{studenti}=3,18$, $p=,043$), a post hoc testovi ukazali su na to da razlika postoji između nastavnika zaposlenih u osnovnim školama i nastavnika zaposlenih na fakultetima. Fakultetski nastavnici statistički se značajno više slažu s razlozima varanja povezanim s organizacijom ispita i posljedicama varanja od osnovnoškolskih nastavnika, a statistički značajno manje nego osnovnoškolski nastavnici s razlozima varanja povezanim s učenicima/studentima (Tablica 2.). Unatoč navedenim razlikama svi nastavnici u prosjeku imaju neutralan stav ili se uglavnom ne slažu s razlozima povezanim s učenicima/studentima.

Čestice koje se odnose na opći stav prema varanju, ponuđene u Skali razloga varanja, ali analizirane zasebno, uključivale su opće tvrdnje poput etičke opravdanosti, društvene prihvatljivosti, nedostatka ozbiljnih posljedica, svojstvenosti varanja ljudskoj prirodi i uobičajenosti te društvene pojave. Nastavnici se u prosjeku ne slažu s tim tvrdnjama, posebno ne s tvrdnjom da je varanje etički opravdano ($M=1,12$, $SD=0,42$). Međutim, svi se nastavnici u prosjeku uglavnom slažu s nedostatkom ozbiljnih posljedica za one koji varaju kao razlogom varanja. Jedina statistički značajna razlika između nastavnika zaposlenih na različitim razinama obrazovanja dobivena je između osnovnoškolskih i srednjoškolskih nastavnika na čestici koja se odnosi na prihvatljivost varanja zbog uobičajenosti te pojave (“*Varanje je prihvatljivo jer svi to rade.*“; $F(2, 397)=3,92$, $p=,021$), s kojom su se srednjoškolski nastavnici manje složili, iako prosječne procjene jednih i drugih nastavnika ukazuju

zapravo na neslaganje s tom tvrdnjom (M od 1.60 do 2.06). Zanimljivo je naglasiti da su se nastavnici uglavnom složili s tvrdnjom koja se odnosi na lijenost učenika/studenata kao razlog varanja, neovisno o razini obrazovanja na kojoj su zaposleni, njihovu rodu ili radnom stažu.

Nastavničke reakcije na različite oblike varanja

Približno 40% nastavnika izjavilo je da nikada nije ignoriralo varanje u svom razredu/na svom kolegiju. Nažalost, to znači da je 60% njih ignoriralo varanje barem jednom, neovisno o razini obrazovanja na kojoj su zaposleni.

Rezultati prikazani u Tablici 3. pokazuju da je upozoravanje učenika/studenata najčešća reakcija nastavnika na učenike/studente koji dopuštaju drugima da prepisuju od njih tijekom ispita, u situaciji došaptavanja i dogovaranja učenika/studenata na ispitu. Kada se učenici/studenti tijekom ispita/testa koriste šalabahterima, većina nastavnika u osnovnim školama i na fakultetima im oduzima šalabahtere, a većina srednjoškolskih nastavnika ocijeni ispit/test ocjenom nedovoljan. Iako se većina nastavnika, posebno u osnovnoj školi, nikada nije susrela s korištenjem mobitela tijekom ispita/testa, oni koji jesu obično su reagirali slično kao i na šalabahtere – oduzimanjem mobitela ili ocjenjivanjem ispita/testa ocjenom nedovoljan. Međutim, velik broj nastavnika na fakultetu samo upozori studente. Mnogi nastavnici, neovisno o razini obrazovanja, samo upozoravaju i učenike/studente koji predaju dijelom ili potpuno prepisane radove (zadace, referate/seminare i sl.) iako su za dijelom prepisane radove češće kažnjeni smanjenjem ocjene, negativnim bodovima i slično, a za potpuno prepisane radove ocjenom nedovoljan, posebno na fakultetu i u srednjoj školi.

Čini se da su se svi nastavnici susreli s krivotvorenjem ispričnica. Međutim, njihove uobičajene reakcije nisu bile pokrivena odgovorom ponuđenim u upitniku. Od ponuđenih reakcija smanjivanje ocjene ili prijavljivanje učenika/studenta nadležnoj osobi najčešće su reakcije osnovnoškolskih i srednjoškolskih nastavnika, a fakultetski nastavnici samo upozoravaju studente koji krivotvore ispričnice.

Većina nastavnika nije se susrela s najozbiljnijim oblicima varanja (posljednja dva u Tablici 3). Uobičajena reakcija onih koji su bili suočeni s učenicima/studentima koji kradu ispitna pitanja ili krivotvore ocjene je prijava tih učenika/studenata nadležnim osobama (posebno u osnovnoj školi, ali i na fakultetima) ili predlaganje pedagoških mjera za te učenike (u srednjoj školi).

Tablica 3.

Rasprava

Poruka koju nastavnici šalju o akademskom poštenju vjerojatno će imati snažan utjecaj na ponašanje učenika/studenata (McCabe *i sur.*, 2002), stoga je cilj ovog istraživanja bio produbiti razumijevanje nastavničkog iskustva i nošenja s problemom akademskog nepoštenja.

Nastavnička percepcija učestalosti i prihvatljivosti varanja

Rezultati ovog istraživanja pokazali su ne samo da se većina nastavnika susreće s varanjem nego da je varanje učestali problem u školama i na fakultetima. Općenito, većina se nastavnika na svim razinama obrazovanja suočava s učeničkim/studentским varanjem ponekad (45,9%) ili često (24,2%). Nastavnička percepcija varanja kao česte pojave je očekivana budući da su prijašnja istraživanja ustanovila da velik broj učenika/studenata spremno priznaje varanje, od 30% u osnovnim školama (Finn i Frone, 2004) do 97% na fakultetima (Kukulja Taradi *i sur.*, 2012). Istraživanja u kojima su korištene učeničke/studentске samoprocjene pokazala su da postoji uobičajen, iako ne univerzalan nalaz da je varanje na svom vrhuncu u srednjoj školi, te se smanjuje prema višim razinama obrazovanja (Davis *i sur.*, 1992). S druge strane ovo je istraživanje pokazalo da ne postoji razlika u nastavničkim procjenama prevalencije varanja na različitim razinama obrazovanja. Međutim, ta je razlika donekle i očekivana budući da niz prijašnjih istraživanja ukazuje na razlike u nastavničkom i učeničkom/studentskom izvještavanju o istim događajima i procesima u razredu (npr. Craig i Evans, 1990; Roig i Ballew, 1992).

Nastavnici na svim razinama obrazovanja smatraju da se varanje javlja češće u instituciji u kojoj su zaposleni (38,1% procjenjuje da se javlja često), nego u njihovu razredu/na njihovu kolegiju (prije navedenih 24,2%). Percepcija sebe i drugih, posebno kod društveno nepoželjnog ponašanja, može biti pod utjecajem velikog broja faktora (John i Robins, 1994). Općenito, ljudi su motivirani zadržati i jačati vlastito samopoštovanje i s tim ciljem se koristiti iluzornim samouzdanjem (Sedikides i Gregg, 2008). Dakle, iako nastavnici doživljavaju varanje kao sveprisutan problem na svom radnom mjestu, mogu procjenjivati da se bolje nose s tim problemom, nego njihovi kolege i zbog toga percipirati varanje manje učestalim u vlastitim razredima/predavaonicama. Također, percepcija češćeg varanja u školama i na fakultetima može biti i posljedica pogrešnog zaključivanja zbog pretjerane generalizacije iskustava koje nastavnici čuju od svojih kolega.

Nastavnička percepcija učestalosti i prihvatljivosti različitih oblika varanja pokazuje da su najprihvatljivijim procijenjena ona ponašanja koja su uz to procijenjena najčešćima (npr. učenici/studenti dopuštaju drugima da prepisu od njih na ispitu/testu). U terminima Eisenbergove tipologije varanja (2004) pasivno varanje procijenjeno je češćim i prihvatljivijim od aktivnog varanja (vidjeti Tablicu 2). Taj obrazac prihvatljivosti i učestalost uglavnom je u skladu s rezultatima dobivenim na uzorku srednjoškolaca u Hrvatskoj i Bosni i Hercegovini (Šimić Šašić i Klarin, 2008). Autorice pretpostavljaju kako je veća prihvatljivost i učestalost oblika varanja kao što su dopuštanje drugima da prepisu od njih ili dogovaranje tijekom ispita posljedica učeničke percepcije tih ponašanja kao oblika pomoći kolegama učenicima, a ne nepoštenja. Iako je taj obrazac sličan rezultatima Šimić Šašić i Klarin (2008), učenici u njihovu istraživanju u prosjeku su sve ispitivane oblike varanja smatrali prihvatljivima, a nastavnici ih u ovom istraživanju smatraju uglavnom neprihvatljivima. Suprotno prijašnjim nalazima da se nastavnici ili ne mogu složiti

o tome što čini akademsko nepoštenje (Schmelkin, Kaufman i Liebling, 2001) ili ga ne vide kao ozbiljan problem (Ercegovac i Richardson, 2004), nastavnici u ovom istraživanju složili su se da su ispitivani oblici varanja neprihvatljivi, no kao što će biti opisano u nastavku, čini se da se ne mogu složiti o načinu reagiranja na njih.

Nastavnička percepcija razloga varanja

Svi nastavnici u ovom istraživanju, neovisno o rodu i radnom stažu, skloniji su razloge varanja pripisivati faktorima povezanim s organizacijom ispita i posljedicama varanja nego onima povezanim s učenicima/studentima. Detaljnija analiza prosječnih procjena na pojedinim česticama pokazala je da se nastavnici uglavnom slažu da su nedostatak straha od posljedica, kao i slab nadzor za vrijeme testa/ispita, razlozi učeničkog/studentskog varanja. Prosječne procjene na česticama koje čine faktor razloga varanja, a koji se pripisuje učenicima/studentima uglavnom odražavaju neutralan stav ili neslaganje nastavnika s tim razlozima varanja. Također, nastavnici se uglavnom ne slažu ni s tvrdnjama koje odražavaju opći stav prema varanju, posebno s tvrdnjom da je varanje etički opravdano. Takav stav nastavnika u skladu je s njihovom percepcijom različitih oblika varanja kao neprihvatljivih. Nastavnici se slažu samo s jednom tvrdnjom koja odražava opći stav prema varanju – da je nedostatak ozbiljnih posljedica za one koji varaju razlog varanja, što je u skladu s važnošću razloga varanja povezanih s organizacijom ispita i posljedicama varanja. Navedeno upućuje na to da nastavnici vide svoje ponašanje i ponašanje svojih kolega kao glavni razlog učeničkog/studentskog varanja.

Craig i Evans (1990) utvrdili su znatne razlike u znanju nastavnika i učenika/studenata o varanju, viđenju uloge nastavnika u problemu varanja i učinkovitim strategijama prevencije. U njihovu su istraživanju učenici/studenti pripisivali krivnju za varanje nastavnicima više nego što su je nastavnici bili spremni pripisati sebi. Suprotno tome, nastavnici u ovom istraživanju i hrvatski srednjoškolci u istraživanju Šimić Šašić i Klarin (2008) pokazali su slična uvjerenja. Odnosno smatraju relevantnijim za javljanje problema varanja ponašanje nastavnika i organizaciju ispita, nego ponašanje samih učenika. Također, Kukulja Taradi i suradnici (2012) utvrdili su da neadekvatna razina zahtjevnosti ispita i nastavnih materijala ima značajnu ulogu u odlukama studenata vezanim uz akademsko nepoštenje.

Rezultati provedenog istraživanja pokazuju da svi ispitani nastavnici prepoznaju važnost vlastite uloge u prevenciji i nošenju s nepoštenjem učenika i studenata. Uzimajući u obzir razloge varanja s kojima su se složili, možemo zaključiti da nastavnici, ako žele poduprijeti i učvrstiti akademsko poštenje, ponajprije trebaju poboljšati organizaciju ispita/testova i sankcioniranje varanja. Uobičajene reakcije nastavnika na različite oblike varanja, o kojima su izvijestili u ovom istraživanju, daju dodatnu potvrdu za taj zaključak.

Nastavničke reakcije na različite oblike varanja

Nastavnička percepcija različitih oblika varanja kao neprihvatljivih daje optimističnu sliku za nošenje s tim problemom, no njihove stvarne reakcije razlog

su za zabrinutost. Rezultati ovog istraživanja u skladu su sa zaključcima prijašnjih istraživanja koji govore o tome da nastavnici dovoljno ozbiljno ne tretiraju slučajeve akademskog nepoštenja (Coren, 2011; McCabe, 1993). Prema Corenovu (2011) pregledu različitih istraživanja 15% do 51% nastavnika ignoriralo je varanje jednom ili više puta. Slično tome, u ovom je istraživanju više od polovine nastavnika priznalo da nekada ignorira varanje, od rijetko do često. Ovdje je važno uočiti nekongruentnost između stavova nastavnika prema prihvatljivosti varanja i njihovih stvarnih ponašanja u situacijama varanja. Kao što je prije navedeno nastavnici sve ispitivane oblike varanja smatraju uglavnom ili potpuno neprihvatljivima, ali su u nekim prilikama ta ponašanja ipak spremni ignorirati. Pretpostavljamo kako ta nedosljednost vjerojatno stvara konfliktnu poruku, što u konačnici povećava učestalost varanja. U tom kontekstu postavlja se pitanje iz čega proizlazi ignoriranje varanja. Prema teorijama očekivanja i vrijednosti (Ajzen i Fishbein, 1975) ljudi su spremni ići prilično daleko kako bi izbjegli neugodne socijalne situacije. Budući da nastavnici nošenje s problemom varanja doživljavaju kao jedan od najnegativnijih aspekata svog posla (Keith-Spiegel *i sur.*, 1998), možemo pretpostaviti da im to predstavlja neugodnu socijalnu situaciju koju su skloni izbjegavati. Nadalje, Andersonov (2003) rad na izbjegavanju odlučivanja sugerira da ljudi izbjegavaju donošenje odluka zbog kombinacije racionalnih razloga i motivacije za izbjegavanjem snažnih emocija poput žaljenja i straha. Istraživanja pokazuju da nastavnici zaista ignoriranjem izbjegavaju intenzivnu anksioznost i stres povezan s prijavljivanjem varanja (Keith-Spiegel *i sur.*, 1998). Neki nastavnici ne reagiraju zbog nedostatka ili nedovoljno dokaza (Coren, 2011; Keith-Spiegel *i sur.*, 1998; Staats, Hupp, Wallace i Gresley, 2009), kao i zbog poricanja i nedostatka hrabrosti (Staats *i sur.*, 2009).

Mnogi nastavnici razvili su osobne strategije reagiranja na različite oblike varanja (Tablica 3). Neovisno o ozbiljnosti varanja mnogi preferiraju nositi se s tim problemom jedan na jedan, zaobilazeći tako prijavljivanje učenika/studentata. Svi nastavnici reagiraju slično na oblike varanja s kojima se često susreću (npr. došaptavanje za vrijeme ispita, prepisivanje zadaća i sl.). Posebno je zabrinjavajuće to što je, iako procjenjuju takva ponašanja uglavnom neprihvatljivima, uobičajena reakcija nastavnika svedena samo na upozoravanje. Drugim riječima, takva ponašanja učenika/studentata uglavnom ne vode ozbiljnijim posljedicama. Kada su u pitanju manje česti oblici varanja koje smatraju potpuno neprihvatljivima, uočen je sličan obrazac strožih reakcija nastavnika u osnovnim i srednjim školama, za razliku od nastavnika na fakultetima. To je najizraženije u reakcijama nastavnika na učeničku/studentSKU krađu ispitnih/testnih pitanja, pri čemu većina osnovnoškolskih i srednjoškolskih nastavnika kao uobičajenu reakciju navodi prijavljivanje učenika i predlaganje pedagoških mjera, a fakultetski nastavnici pokazuju širi raspon reakcija. Te razlike u reakcijama nastavnika na fakultetima mogu biti posljedica razlika u znanju nastavnika o disciplinskim/stegovnim

postupcima u toj specifičnoj situaciji. U osnovnim i srednjim školama u Hrvatskoj pravila i propisi koji se tiču ponašanja učenika jasniji su nego na fakultetskoj razini. Etički kodeksi fakulteta često nejasno definiraju varanje (ili se usmjeravaju samo na plagiranje), bez jasnih koraka i preporuka o tome kako reagirati u određenoj situaciji. Davis i suradnici (1992) naglasili su da je nedovoljno definirana politika obrazovne institucije jedan od glavnih razloga zbog kojih se nastavnici ustručavaju reagirati na akademsko nepoštenje.

Na kraju upitnika rutinski je ostavljen prostor za komentare. Neočekivano, dobiveni odgovori omogućili su dodatno razumijevanje problema varanja jer je gotovo četvrtina nastavnika ostavila svoj komentar. Neki su komentari bili vrlo emocionalni, odražavajući bespomoćnost nastavnika u nošenju s problemom varanja, posebno naglašavajući povezanost učeničkog/studentuskog varanja sa sveprisutnim nepoštenjem i korupcijom u hrvatskom društvu. Komentari su također ukazivali na neodlučnost nastavnika u odabiru prave reakcije za varanje te na njihov doživljaj varanja kao situacijski uvjetovanog. Mnogima je nedostajala mogućnost da u odabiru svojih reakcija na varanje odaberu više od jednog odgovora ili da znaju više informacija prije donošenja odluke (obično o broju učenikova/studentova ponavljanja opisanog ponašanja). Iz nastavnčkih je komentara jasno da bi kvalitativni pristup bio odgovarajući način produbljivanja znanja o nastavnčkim reakcijama na varanje i razumijevanja razloga odabira određene reakcije.

Metodološka razmatranja

Nastavnička percepcija učeničkog/studentuskog varanja osjetljivo je područje istraživanja, pod utjecajem autoselekcije i problema mjerenja. Zbog ograničenosti sredstava ovo je istraživanje provedeno *on-line*, s prigodnim uzorkom sudionika, zbog čega je upitna mogućnost generalizacije dobivenih nalaza. Iako su se nastavnici u ovom uzorku razlikovali s obzirom na rod, dob, radni staž i znanstveno polje, dodatna istraživanja s većim i reprezentativnijim uzorcima omogućila bi mogućnost usporedbe i drugih grupa.

Drugi, prije spomenut metodološki problem, odnosi se na korištenje samoprocjena koje mogu biti pristrane zbog socijalno poželjnog odgovaranja. Moguće je da nastavnici, svjesno ili nesvjesno, daju socijalno poželjne odgovore umjesto onih koji zaista odražavaju njihove stavove, vjerovanja i ponašanja. Mogli bismo pretpostaviti da sudionici varanje zapravo smatraju prihvatljivijim, češće ga ignoriraju i tolerantniji su u svojim reakcijama nego što su bili spremni priznati u ovom istraživanju. Međutim, postotak nastavnika koji priznaje da ignorira varanje u ovom istraživanju u skladu je s rezultatima prijašnjih istraživanja. Također, nastavnici su izvijestili o prilično tolerantnim reakcijama na različite oblike varanja. Zbog navedenog vjerujemo da dobiveni rezultati ne odstupaju značajno od svakodnevne realnosti hrvatskih škola i fakulteta.

Zaključak

Unatoč navedenim ograničenjima vjerujemo da nalazi ovog istraživanja pružaju značajan uvid u načine na koje nastavnici doživljavaju i nose se s akademskim nepoštenjem. S obzirom na ozbiljnost razloga zbog kojih bi nastavnici trebali biti zabrinuti zbog varanja (Boysen, 2007), ignoriranje i prilično tolerantne reakcije nastavnika zabilježene u ovom istraživanju posebno su zabrinjavajuće. Postoji jasna potreba za promjenom načina na koje nastavnici tretiraju varanje, što treba uzeti u obzir ne samo u kreiranju politike na institucionalnoj razini nego i u obrazovanju budućih nastavnika.

Na temelju rezultata ovog istraživanja, kao i rezultata dosadašnjih istraživanja, možemo zaključiti kako je s ciljem osnaživanja akademskog poštenja važno unaprijediti organizaciju testova/ispita i posljedica varanja unutar obrazovnog sustava. Obrazovne institucije na svim razinama obrazovanja trebale bi razviti jasna, neposredna i stroga pravila i propise vezane uz akademsko nepoštenje te osigurati njihovu dosljednu primjenu. Navedeno bi trebalo pomoći nastavnicima u izbjegavanju korištenja osobnih strategija pri nošenju s varanjem kao i smanjenju stresa povezanog s tom socijalno neugodnom situacijom koju su nastavnici skloni izbjegavati. Također, navedeno bi učenicima/studentima prenijelo poruku o važnosti akademskog poštenja i posljedicama varanja. Konačno, glavni cilj ne bi trebala biti samo promjena mogućnosti za varanje postrožavanjem kazni i mehanizama kontrole, već suradnja svih dionika u obrazovnom sustavu (učenika, roditelja, nastavnika itd.) na svim razinama obrazovanja u izgradnji održivog akademskog poštenja.