



Factors of Academic Misconduct: Polish and Russian Students' Attitudes

Marina Makarova

ABSTRACT The main factors of students' cheating, such as individual and contextual factors are considered in this article. The institutional level of contextual factors exercises the most significant influence on academic misconduct and corruption in the academic field. There are factors of social microenvironment and normative backgrounds, which assume such forms of behavior as considered normal and obvious. In 2015 surveys of students from a Russian and a Polish university were conducted. Polish and Russian students have the same attitudes about cheating, which in both countries is part of the student culture. There are many similarities in the individual factors of cheating and plagiarism. In both universities, humanities students, unemployed students, and students with better academic results are less likely to engage in cheating. Students who perceive their studying as a formal way for getting a diploma and do not care about grades are more prone to cheating in both universities. However, students in Poland are less involved in all forms of misconduct. We also concluded that their attitudes about cheating and plagiarism are more honest: a smaller percentage of Polish students reported that it is sometimes difficult to study without cheating and plagiarism compared to Russian students. Contextual factors of academic honesty, such as the implementation of ethical codes and other components of an integrity system, are gradually implemented into Polish higher education.

In the past few years, questions of academic ethics have been widely discussed among scientists and educators. Different forms of academic fraud and cheating appear to increase in all countries and threaten the development of quality education. Faculty

members and researchers' misconduct includes different forms of conflict of interest, falsification of research results, plagiarism, etc. Multiple forms of academic misconduct among students include bringing notes to tests, using devices during exams, plagiarism, theft and sale of examination papers, bribery, forgery, etc. Cheating is defined generally as "any action that violates the established rules in education and research especially during test or exams and writing papers" (Eckstein 2003:105). Sometimes academic dishonesty is broadly defined as any fraudulent action or attempt by a student to use unauthorized or unacceptable means in any academic work (Pavela 2007:98). Researchers concluded that cheating is a very popular practice in modern universities around the world. Brown, Weible, and Olmosk (2010) found that 49% of students in undergraduate marketing classes admitted cheating in 1988 versus 100% of the students in an undergraduate management class in 2008; a national survey published in Education Week found that 54% of the students surveyed admitted to Internet plagiarism and 76% admitted to cheating, and the Center for Academic Integrity found almost 80% of the college students surveyed admitted to cheating at least once (Jones 2011:141). Smyth and Davis (2004) indicated that 74% of college students had observed cheating, and 45% of these students admitted to such practices.

THE MAIN APPROACHES TO THE FACTORS OF CHEATING

Our primary concern was investigating the factors leading to student cheating. Most of the reasons for cheating are connected to contemporary social processes. McCabe and Trevino (1993) found that the main factors of students' cheating are individual and contextual factors. Students' social status and their individual features such as gender, year of study, students' achievements, college characteristics, working situations, area of study, etc., determine individual factors. For instance, some researchers concluded that male students from large state universities are more prone to cheating than female students from small private colleges (Brown and Emmett 2001:531). According to Elias (2009), younger, traditional students (ages 25 or below) are more likely to engage in cheating than older, nontraditional students (ages 25 or above). Wei et al. (2014) concluded that undergraduate students are more prone to cheating because more than graduate students, they are "concerned about their performances as assessed by grades or class standings" (296). Some researchers indicated a relationship between cheating and academic performance represented by GPA (Burrus, McGoldrick and Schuhmann 2007). Harding et al. (2007) indicated that seniors reported being somewhat less likely to engage in college-level cheating than did first-year students.

Certainly, the differences in social status are relative and determined by social, cultural, and national categories, so it may vary in different countries and even in different regions of one country. Some scientists noted social-psychological features including personal characteristics like low self-control, laziness, dishonesty, irresponsibility, a tendency to conformity, and anxiety caused by external pressure can come together leading to different forms of academic misbehavior (Bolin 2004:106). Theories of goal orientation identify students' main purposes for academic tasks. For instance, Anderman (2007) identified two general groups of students based on their achievement goals: mastery-oriented students who are interested in truly mastering the task and performance-oriented students who were concerned "with how their abilities compare with other students" (92-93). They concluded that mastery-oriented students were less likely to engage in academic cheating. Vansteenkiste, Lens, and Deci (2006) and Lang (2013) also describe two types of motivation that are pertinent to our research. Intrinsic motivation is focusing on mastering skills and getting knowledge; extrinsic motivation is seeking "to pass exam in order to win an award or avoid a punishment" (Lang 2013:45-46). Students with intrinsic motivation are usually less likely to cheat than students with extrinsic motivation because of their self-determination and inherent interest in studying and obtaining new knowledge (Anderman et al. 2006:92-93).

Some researchers refer to the moral reasons for academic misconduct. Harding et al. (2007) use the theory of planned behavior for cheating analysis. They noticed that the decision of whether to cheat is an ethical one "that requires students to consider a behavior (i.e. cheating) they know to be in violation of established policies, codes, and perhaps norms" (257). They assumed that cheating is the result of a rational choice under the volitional control of the individual and that "individuals with less sense of obligation to behave unethically will be more likely to cheat" (268).

Contextual factors, in turn, include different forms of context – social, cultural, or institutional. Societal environment can influence on global, national or institutional, and even local levels (e.g., classroom). For instance, growing competition among young people on the educational and labor markets and the necessity to pay for education and establish their own economic status cause some students to bypass deeply rooted norms, laws, and ethical standards act to pass exams and achieve degrees. Shils (1984) described the global changes in higher education in recent decades as the great challenges for academic ethics. He has shown the new face of modern universities: the "mass university, the "service university," the "political university," the "governmentally dominated university," the bureaucratized university," the "financially straitened university," the "university in the eye of publicity," the "disaggregated university," and the "university with shaken morale." All these faces demonstrate the growing pressures on modern universities by the different social institutions of modern society. Multiple academic and research activities "are now being done outside the universities" and

create some complications for internal regulation and can lead to the possibility of academic misconduct. (Shils 1984:12-38). Additionally, the development of informational technologies and the Internet have essentially resulted in multiple new forms of student cheating on exams by using electronic devices and "copy – paste plagiarism" (Eckstein 2003:14) Eckstein also notes that growing pressures for achievement, selection, the increasing importance of examinations, and of credentials are the main reasons for increasing academic misconduct (Eckstein 2003).

Cultural factors include current ethical and cultural traditions in society as well as people's attitudes toward ethical and unethical behavior. Therefore, researchers emphasize the importance of the social environment including social values, cultural climates, peer pressure, and instructors' attitudes and actions (Wei et al. 2014:288). For instance, Gross (2011) emphasized the contradiction between traditional and postmodern values in their influence on cheating. "While the traditional values emphasize the 'private property/ownership requiring attribution of credit,' the postmodern values tend to 'view anything published, especially over the Internet . . . as community property not requiring attribution of credit'" (Gross 2011:436).

According to McCabe and Trevino (1993), the institutional level of contextual factors exercises the most significant influence on academic misconduct and corruption in the academic field (McCabe, Trevino, and Butterfield 2001:224). There are factors of social microenvironment and normative background, which assume such forms of behavior as normal and obvious. For example, the problem of unethical behavior in American colleges caused Callahan (2004) to characterize the contemporary academic culture as "the cheating culture" which is found throughout the world. The embeddedness of cheating and bypassing academic charges brought against students and faculty are problems of universities, its colleges and departments, and of specific actors including teachers and students that have contact in the classroom.

Contextual influences on cheating that were emphasized by students included the degree to which the code is deeply embedded in a culture of integrity; the degree to which a school has a supportive, trusting atmosphere; competitive pressures; the severity of punishments; the existence of clear rules regarding unacceptable behavior; faculty monitoring; peer pressure to cheat or not to cheat; the likelihood of being caught or reported; and class size (McCabe and Treviño 1993).

The most likely contextual factors include the recognition of peers' and colleagues' behavior, perceptions of the misconduct, and the intensity of sanctions doled out for the misconduct. All the factors are determined by formal institutional norms and the so-called "hidden curriculum," in other words, the everyday rules of direct interaction among the main actors in the educational field.

The perception of peers' behavior was the most influential contextual variable, suggesting that social learning theory may be particularly useful for understanding academic dishonesty behavior among college students. The strong influence of peers' behavior may suggest that academic dishonesty not only is learned from observing the behavior of peers, but that peers' behavior provides a kind of normative support for cheating (McCabe and Trevino 1993: 530).

Institutional social context can create the formal and informal normative background of academic behavior independently from some individual students' characteristics: "The contextual factors (peer cheating behavior, peer disapproval of cheating behavior, and perceived severity of penalties for cheating) were significantly more influential than the individual factors (age, gender, GPA, and participation in extracurricular activities)" (McCabe et al. 2001:222-223).

As a rule, students are not likely themselves to prevent peers' misconduct and inform officials about it. However, the crucial role in spreading misconduct plays a vicious circle of informal rules inside students' environment. Individual and collective practices of cheating during exams or tests are more frequently the results of some kinds of beliefs rather than students' individual or academic characteristics (McCabe and Trevino 1993:530). Such practices help students save time and lead to success on the exam.

Many researchers also emphasize educators' roles in students' disposition to cheat. Faculty's attention to issues of academic integrity and the use of deterrents to prevent cheating and plagiarism is an important contextual factor that works on different levels. Institutional levels include integrity policies, honor codes, and other regulations of student conduct, plagiarism, and cheating detection. Classroom levels demonstrate how the individual faculty members adopt or implement such systems in their own training practices. Spear and Miller (2012) believe that "Instructors hold a frontline position in the battle for academic integrity" (205). In their research, fewer students in the group receiving regular anti-cheating messages from their instructors engaged in cheating than the control group.

COMPREHENSIVE GROUNDS OF MISCONDUCT IN CROSS-CULTURAL CONTEXT

Multiple forms of academic dishonesty need to be prevented. Contemporary principles of university ethics include features of professional, organizational, and

academic ethics. This problem needs to be studied from the perspective of global, national and local values. On the international level, there are many documents which regulate academic behavior and include some principles of academic ethics (The Bucharest Declaration, the ESF/ALLEA European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity, Briefing Paper of Research Integrity, etc.).

Academic ethics include adaptation of fundamental ethical values to educational and research activity. Researchers emphasize the necessity of permanent monitoring of the impact of these measures that were meant to prevent academic cheating. Recently, honor codes and other forms of ethical regulation have been implemented in higher education around the world. McCabe and Trevino (1993) and Bowers (1964) found out that less cheating occurs in honor code environments. McCabe, Trevino, and Butterfield (1999) indicated that students from institutions with honor codes perceived fewer violations of academic integrity. However, honor codes by themselves do not alone lead to honest academic behavior. McCabe et al. admit that "honor codes are an important phenomenon," but such codes should not be "a window dressing". They noticed that the "relation between honor codes and cheating has been studied in great depth along three major themes: (a) implementation of honor codes, (b) faculty views of academic integrity policies including honor codes, and (c) honor codes' effect on students" (McCabe et al. 2001:224).

Additionally, despite passing honor codes and regulations in higher education, there are many problems with academic integrity in different countries, many of which are the countries of post-Soviet Europe and in developing countries. The group of scientists working on the project "Impact of Policies for Plagiarism in Higher Education Across Europe" have elaborated on the Academic Integrity Maturity Model (AIMM) and measured this score for each EU country (Foltýnek and Surovec 2015). They concluded that countries with higher AIMM scores have a higher Corruption Perception Index, higher GDP, lower unemployment, and attract scholars from other countries (Glendinning 2013). Some approaches to the problem come from corruption studies for cross-cultural research to factors of academic misconduct. According to some authors, corruption can be viewed as a problem of collective action, especially in a context of systemic corruption. "All the agents may well understand that they would stand to gain from erasing corruption, but because they cannot trust that most other agents will refrain from corrupt practices, they have no reason to refrain from paying or demanding bribes" (Rothstein 2011:231). Myrdal best described such a situation: "If everybody seems corrupt, why shouldn't I be corrupt?" (Myrdal 1968:409). In the case of systematic corruption, the majority of anticorruption measures appear to be ineffective because the habit to steal, bribe, not report bribery, and to be a free rider in the access to common good is strongly embedded in social behavior.

Karklins (2005) describes a paradox in that most people in post-communist regions angrily reject corruption but often participate in it themselves. Karklins cites

Miller and his coauthors: "They are both victims and accomplices" (Miller, Grødeland, and Koshechkina 2001). Karklins also writes about the ineffectiveness of anticorruption institutes in the post-communist countries: "Although institutions matter greatly, they can be a Potemkin village" (Karklins, 2005:17). The main features of post-communist attitudes include normalization of corruption (corruption helps in some situations of everyday life) and skepticism toward public institutions, which are identified as corrupt, criminal, or immoral. People do not feel they are responsible for the corruption, but instead they feel "They 'are made to participate'." Another important feature of the post-communist mentality is peoples' beliefs about the "top down" initiative in cleaning up corruption, demonstrated by the low level of civil activity in such countries. The last time this was studied, the situation in some countries of Eastern and Central Europe have changed so we can observe the multiple levels of implementing anticorruption law and different roles of civil activity in this process (Karklins, 2005:71-72).

In the case of academic ethics, we can assume that the problems of honor codes implementation can be connected with different social and cultural environments in different countries. However, McCabe et al. (2001) argued that this problem is determined also by different institutional or classroom circumstances, including peers' attitudes, student-teacher relationships, the entire system supporting academic honesty at a university on different levels, including students, teachers, researchers, administrators, etc. One example can illustrate this. Davis et al. surveyed American and Australian students. Higher rates of cheating were identified among American students. The authors hypothesized that it was the influence of the cultural differences in the extent to which the group of students value learning versus grades. They demonstrate that American students have higher grade orientation (found in Lang 2013:44).

Consequently, cross-cultural research of academic ethics can provide the opportunity to identify more comprehensive factors of misconduct, including national mentality, historical or cultural features, but also the institutional and contextual environment of the educational system in different countries. It can allow understanding on multiple levels and highlight characteristics of implementing ethical rules and their influence on student behavior.

THE OBSERVATION OF THE MAIN FACTORS OF CHEATING IN RUSSIAN AND POLISH UNIVERSITIES

In February 2015, a survey of 481 students at a Russian university and in October-December 2015 a survey of 467 students in a Polish university were conducted. Both universities are the state universities with about 15,000 students each. The main aims of the surveys were to find out students' attitudes about academic ethics and students'

misconduct and to identify the main factors of academic cheating. Second and third year students were surveyed. The main variables of the surveys were frequency of different practices of academic misconduct, some factors of students' dishonesty, and the main purposes for preventing such behavior. Some parameters such as gender, year of study, area of study (humanities, natural-science, social science), and self-reported academic performance were taken as objective individual factors. The subjective individual factors were students' attitudes toward their studying (preferring to gain knowledge or a diploma) and the importance of grades for students. Such factors, as the faculty's control of cheating and students' tolerance to academic misbehavior were considered as contextual factors in the student survey.

According to the student survey at the Russian university, most extended forms of misconduct were using crib notes or cheat notes on exams and copying from another student during a test or exam. More than half of the students reported using plagiarism. In Poland, such forms as using electronic devices and copying from another student were preferred. However, results show that the problem of academic dishonesty in its multiple features is a very timely issue in both countries.

Table 1: The comparison of answers “Never” on the question about frequency of some forms of misbehavior

Form of behavior	“Never” percentage	
	Poland	Russia
Using crib notes or cheat notes on exams	41.5	20.9
Plagiarism	40	37.1
Forbid copying tests and assignments	69.4	83.7
Copying from another student on a test or exam	27.4	23.6
Using electronic devices during exam or test	25.9	43.3

The individual factors of academic misconduct also vary. A specific connection between academic misconduct and year of study was not found. Russian male students were more active in all forms of misconduct; however, in the Polish University there was not the same gender difference. Polish female students more than male students used electronic devices during the test or exam, and male students preferred copying from another student. However, most researchers mention gender as an essentially ambiguous individual factor of cheating (De Bruin and Rudnick 2007; Kibler 1993).

Russian students of the social sciences were more prone to each form of cheating, especially using crib notes, electronic devices, and plagiarism. In Poland, students of social sciences more than other discipline were active in plagiarism and copying from the books; however, students who specialized in natural sciences were

more likely to use electronic devices. It is necessary to note that in both universities the humanities students were the most honest. Students who had a job cheated more frequently than their peers who did not have a job. Students from both countries with poor academic results were also much more involved in all forms of academic misconduct. In Poland, students with the highest grades were less involved in every form of academic misbehavior. The same situation was observed with the Russian University. Students with permanent academic failures more often responded about cheating than students that passed exams confirming the conclusions of some researchers that students in the lower ranges are more likely to have cheated (Antion and Michael 1983:470), and that maintaining a high grade point average is one of the main factors leading to academic dishonesty.

Poor academic achievement was closely related to attitudes towards studying and, in turn, to cheating behavior. Students who admitted that their main goal in the university is to gain knowledge, cheated substantially less than their colleagues who were focused on getting a diploma. It confirms the conclusion about the role of extrinsic motivation in academic cheating.

The problem of plagiarism a threat for the quality of education and science around the world. For this reason, students were asked about using whole or partial plagiarism in their works. Five percent of Russian students and 2.5% of Polish students admitted that sometimes they copy an entire paper from the Internet or from other sources. Fifty-seven percent of Russian and 60% of Polish students admitted that they sometimes partly plagiarize their works.

Less than one-third of Russian students knew that there are some kinds of software for recognizing plagiarism in their departments. It also is worth noting that 55% of students were undecided about whether there was software to recognize plagiarism. The "Antiplagiat.ru" system (anti-plagiarism software) is on its initial stage of implementation in the majority of Russian Universities, so many students do not yet know about it.

According to existing research, academic dishonesty became part of students' culture, somewhat like the hidden curriculum. More than half of Russian respondents said that sometimes cheating is unavoidable. In Poland, such answers came from about one-third of the students.

Table 2: Possibility to study without cheating (%)

In your opinion, is it possible to avoid cheating and plagiarism in what you are assigned?	Russia (cheating and plagiarism)	Poland (cheating)	Poland (plagiarism)
Yes	31.8	62.1	54.4
Yes, but not always	59.5	37.0	39.2
No	8.7	0.9	6.4
Total	100	100	100

Positive attitudes about cheating and plagiarism are more popular in Russia among students studying social sciences; however, in Poland such beliefs characterize more students of the natural sciences. In both countries, the majority of students with the lowest academic results and with an orientation towards obtaining a diploma (extrinsic motivation) believed that avoiding misconduct was not always possible. Such connections and similarities among answers about using the different forms of cheating shows the important role of students' beliefs about cheating as a necessary part of studying and its influence on students' academic behavior.

Only Polish students were asked about reasons for cheating and plagiarism. Most of them answered that the main motive for cheating was the fear to fail a test or exam (80.7%). They also complained about the great amount of material to study (66.5%). Some students said that they wanted to get a high grade for the course (42.3%), and some said that students cheat because of their job (38.4%) and because of laziness (33%). The most important institutional factor of cheating is the lack of teachers' control of students' misconduct (37.6%). However, the most popular answer is the social permission for cheating (41.7%). According to McCabe and Trevino (1993), the perception of peers' behavior appears to be the single most important contextual influence on academic dishonesty.

According to Polish students' opinions, the most popular individual reason for plagiarism is the fear that their own work will be too weak or insufficient to pass the assignment (70.7%). They also have some problems with individualized work (68.3%). These motives demonstrate students' lack of confidence in their own abilities and of their having sufficient ideas and knowledge for proper academic writing. They also believe writing on their own is too hard (41.6%) and complain that sometimes they do not have the necessary information for it (31.5%). These motives demonstrate students'

Table 3: Main reasons of cheating (Polish students)

Motives (individual reasons)	Percentage
In order to get a high grade	42.3
To not fail a test or exam	80.7
There are too many materials for exam preparation	66.5
Exams or tests are too hard	28.5
Students do not have time because of their jobs	38.4
Because of laziness	33.0
Institutional and contextual factors	
Because many other students do (social permission)	41.7
Because there is insufficient punishment for misconduct	20.6
Because teachers either don't care or can't control cheating	37.6

lack of confidence in their own ability and of sufficient ideas and knowledge for proper writing. Students often do not have sufficient abilities for comprehension of information from different sources, for proper citations and acknowledgments in their academic works. As in previous questions, we also see that the main institutional factor of plagiarism is faculty's insufficient attention to plagiarism (26.9%). Some students also are not satisfied with the system of plagiarism detection (23.7%).

Table 4: Main reasons of plagiarism (Polish students)

Motives (individual reasons)	Percentage
They are afraid that their own work will be too weak or insufficient to passing the assignment	70.7
There is the deficit of ideas for self-contained works	68.3
Writing on your own is too hard	41.6
Students don't have the ability or the information on the assignment	31.5
Students don't have time for writing because of their jobs	18.5
Because of laziness	30
Institutional and contextual factors	
Because many other students do (social permission)	31.5
Insufficient punishment for plagiarism	17.9
Because teachers cannot control or not don't care about plagiarism	26.9
Because there are insufficient systems of plagiarism detection	23.7

Generally, it is important to note that the main individual reasons for students' misbehavior comes down to students' concerns and fear about the possibility of failing; consequently, the misconduct becomes a form of avoiding risks during their studies. Such risks may be determined by insufficient knowledge about the right academic behavior or the lack of abilities for handling large amounts materials and assignments and proper academic writing. The institutional factors relate to weak teachers' concerns about cheating or plagiarism; the most important contextual factor is the popularity and even commonness of such practices among students.

What do students think about the possibility of avoiding misbehavior and in that manner enhance their quality of education? Of Russian students, 38.4% want to attend special courses for research work and academic integrity. In addition, students propose strengthening teachers' and administrators' handling of cases of academic misbehavior (32%) and using special software for recognizing and controlling plagiarism (28.9% of students and 43% of teachers). Polish students emphasized strengthening both punishments (50.9%) and teachers control and oversight for all the forms students' misconduct (59.8%).

At present, there is no efficient and comprehensive integrity system in Russian and Polish higher education, although such a system is more developed in Poland than in Russia. Our survey showed that significantly more Polish students offered to implement ethical codes for preventing misconduct because Russian students do not know anything about such codes. Polish universities are obligated to test all students' undergraduate works for plagiarism since 2014. The same act was passed in Russia just

Table 5: Ways of preventing misconduct (% of responses)

	Russia (cheating and plagiarism)	Poland (cheating)	Poland (plagiarism)
Using computer based tests	33.5	36.0	
Strengthening punishment for cheating and misconduct	9.9	47.6	50.9
Strengthening supervision by teachers and administration	32.2	62.2	59.8
Using electronic forms of control (e.g. cameras)	9.7	17.3	
Delivering special courses for students research and academic writing skills	38.4		35.2
Implementing ethical codes for students	14.7	28.4	31.2
Implementing of information and whistleblowing	17.3	30.0	41.0

in 2016. Additionally, such software was used in the majority of Polish universities. There are also some other components of the integrity system that are implemented in Poland. For instance, undergraduate, graduate, and doctoral studies must include in their curricula training for the preparation of scientific work, discussing students' papers and their parts with a supervisor during the entire academic year. Polish universities have disciplinary commissions, some of them have a position of ombudsmen, ethical codes or the ethical issues are mentioned in university statutes and rules. Despite this, problems of cheating and misconduct remain crucial. The Russian normative system in this sphere is poor and mostly directed on plagiarism detection. Other forms of misconduct are not documented in any university rules either for students or for faculty. The federal normative acts about corruption and the protection of intellectual property are not adapted for educational circumstances. Therefore, students and teachers usually do not know what to do in most of cases of misconduct.

Russian students also proposed changing forms of teaching and training through using individual assignments, practical education, and making knowledge more accessible for students. This is reflected in the answers on an open question about forms of preventing students' misconduct. The largest portion of Russian students surveyed said that there is nothing to do about the situation of cheating, and there are no measures for fighting this problem. Students believe that it is useless to do something against cheating commenting: "In general useless;" "Nobody will survive without crib notes;" "Students always will carry themselves in such way;" "We will find counter measures on your measures." Polish students also said, "Students do it always;" "It is impossible to stop," etc. Such measures show that most students believe that all the methods of fighting cheating are useless, and students cannot study without using some form of misbehavior. Another portion of students from both countries, which are more interested in the improvement of quality of education, proposed changing methods and content of teaching and training and to use new approaches to assignments for students. According to students' opinions, training should be more practical, interesting, individual, and have a clear explanation of assignments: "To have a rational approach to forming a timetable of exams," "Give real instructions for preparing for exams," "Explain more carefully," "Individual attention to every student," "To use practical assignments," "To make classes more interesting for students."

CONCLUSIONS

According to the results of our research, we drew some conclusions about some forms and factors of academic dishonesty among students from Russian and Polish universities. There are some similarities and differences in forms and incidence of misbehavior between Polish and Russian students. They have the same attitudes about cheating, which in both countries is the part of student culture. There are many similarities also in the individual factors of cheating and plagiarism: in both universities humanities students, unemployed students, and students with better academic results are less likely to engage in all forms of cheating. Additionally, the strongest individual factors are the students' attitudes toward studying. Students who perceive their studying as a formal way for getting a diploma (extrinsic motivation) are more prone to cheating in both universities. It shows that cheating has been the result of students' negligence to studying and their efforts to avoid the risks to fail in such conditions.

However, students in Poland are less involved in all forms of misconduct. We also concluded that Polish students' attitudes about cheating and plagiarism are more honest: a smaller percentage of Polish students reported that it is sometimes difficult to study without cheating and plagiarism when compared to Russian students. Such

institutional and contextual factors of academic honesty as the implementation of ethical codes and other components of the integrity system are being implemented gradually in Polish higher education. There are different components of such system in the surveyed Polish university (disciplinary commission, ethical code, patent antiplagiarism software, developed system of internal audit, special obligate courses for first-year students about intellectual property, seminars for preparing thesis, etc.) The teachers and administrators admit that they still have many problems with the implementation of this system, but they also agree that it works in most cases.

Students believe that the main measure for fighting misbehavior may be including special courses on academic ethics and writing skills in curriculum. Some forms of misconduct help students to survive in the conditions of time constraints and the necessity to work. At the same time, students note that increasing the amount of practical exercises, individualization of education processes, and the rational and flexible approach to control of knowledge can help to avoid dishonesty. The implementation of principles of academic integrity to the educational program will contribute to changing the higher education system in our countries and make academic behavior more honest.

REFERENCES

- Anderman, Eric M. 2006. "The Effects Of Personal, Classroom, And School Goal Structures On Academic Cheating" in *Psychology of academic cheating* / edited by Eric M. Anderman, Tamera B. Murdock. Amsterdam; Boston : Elsevier Academic Press.
- Antion, David L. and Michael, William. B. 1983. "Short-term predictive validity of demographic, affective, personal, and cognitive variables in relation to two criterion measures of cheating behaviors." *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 43 (2): 467-483.
- Bolin, Aaron U. 2004. "Self-Control, Perceived Opportunity, and Attitudes as Predictors of Academic Dishonesty" *The Journal of Psychology* 138(2):101–114.
- Bowers, William. J. 1964. *Student dishonesty and its control in college*. New York: Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University.
- Brown, Bob. S., and Emmett, Dennis. 2001. "Explaining variations in the level of academic dishonesty in studies of college students: some new evidence". *College Student Journal* 35(4):529–539.
- Brown, Bob S., Weible, Rick J., and Olmosk, Kurt E. 2010. "Business school deans on student academic dishonesty: a survey" *College Student Journal* 44(2):299-308.
- Burrus, Robert T., McGoldrick, Kim Marie, and Schuhmann, Peter W. 2007. "Self-Reports of Student Cheating: Does a Definition of Cheating Matter?" *The Journal of Economic Education* 48(1):3-16.

- Callahan, David. 2004. *The Cheating Culture*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Publishing Company.
- De Bruin, GP, and H Rudnick. "Examining the cheats: The role of conscientiousness and excitement seeking in academic dishonesty." *South African Journal Of Psychology* 37(1): 153-164.
- Eckstein, Max A. 2003. *Combating academic fraud towards the culture of integrity*. Paris: IIEP. UNESCO.
- Elias, Rafic Z. (2009). "The impact of anti-intellectualism attitudes and academic self-efficacy on business students' perceptions of cheating". *Journal of Business Ethics* 86(2): 199–209.
- Foltýnek, Tomáš, and Surovec, Martin. 2015. "Promoting Academic Integrity Helps National Economy" *Conference Proceedings*. 1. vyd. Brno: MENDELU Publishing Centre: 121-133.
- Glendinning, Irene. 2013. "Comparison of policies for Academic Integrity in Higher Education across the European Union." IPPHEAE Project Consortium. Retrieved September, 8, 2016 (<http://plagiarism.cz/ippheae/files/D2-3-00%20EU%20IPPHEAE%20CU%20Survey%20EU-wide%20report.pdf>)
- Gross, Emma R. 2011. "Clashing Values: Contemporary Views About Cheating And Plagiarism Compared To Traditional Beliefs And Practices." *Education* 132(2):435–440.
- Harding, Trevor S., Matthew J., Mayhew, Finelli, Cynthia J., and Carpenter, Donald D. 2007 "The theory of planned behavior as a model of academic dishonesty in humanities and engineering undergraduates." *Ethics and Behavior*, 17 (4):255-279.
- Jones, Dorothy L. R. "Academic Dishonesty: Are More Students Cheating?." *Business Communication Quarterly* 74 (2): 141-150.
- Karklins, Rasma. 2005. *The system made me do it: corruption in post-communist societies*. Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe.
- Kibler, William L. 1993. "Academic Dishonesty: A Student Development Dilemma." *NASPA Journal* 30(4): 252-67.
- Lang, James M. 2013. *Cheating Lessons: Learning from Academic Dishonesty*. Cambridge, Massachusetts : Harvard University Press.
- McCabe, Donald L., and Linda K. Trevino, 1993. "Academic Dishonesty: Honor Codes and Other Contextual Influences." *The Journal of Higher Education* 68(5):520-538.
- McCabe, Donald L., Linda K. Trevino, and Kenneth D. Butterfield, 1999. "Academic Integrity in Honor Code and Non-Honor Code Environments: A Qualitative Investigation." *The Journal of Higher Education* 70(2):211–234.
- McCabe, Donald L., Linda K. Trevino, and Kenneth D. Butterfield, 2001. "Cheating in Academic Institutions: A Decade of Research." *Ethics & Behavior* 11(3): 219-232.

- Miller, William L., Åse B. Grødeland, and Tatyana Y. Koshechkina. 2001. *A Culture of Corruption? Coping with Government in Post-Communist Europe*, Budapest & New York: Central European University Press.
- Pavela, Gary. 1997. "Applying the power of association on campus: A model code of academic integrity" *Journal of College and University Law* 24(1): 97-118.
- Rothstein, Bo. 2011. "Anti-corruption: the indirect 'big-bang' approach" *Review of International Political Economy*, 18(2):228-250.
- Shils, Edward A. 1884. *The academic ethic*. Chicago : University of Chicago Press.
- Smyth, M. Lynnette, and James R. Davis. 2004. "Perceptions of Dishonesty among Two-Year College Students: Academic versus Business Situations." *Journal of Business Ethics* 51(1):62-73.
- Spear, Jennifer, A. and Ann N. Miller 2012. "The Effects of Instructor Fear Appeals and Moral Appeals on Cheating-Related Attitudes and Behavior of University Students." *Ethics & Behavior* 22(3): 196-207.
- Vansteenkiste, Maarten, Lens, Willy, and Edward L. Deci, 2006. "Intrinsic Versus Extrinsic Goal Contents in Self-Determination Theory: Another Look at the Quality of Academic Motivation." *Educational Psychologist* 41(1):19-31.
- Wei, Tianlan, Steven Chesnut, Lucy Barnard-Brak, and Marcelo Schmidt. 2014. "University Students' Perceptions of Academic Cheating: Triangulating Quantitative and Qualitative Findings." *Journal Of Academic Ethics* 12(4): 287-298.