

*Do students view cognitive enhancement with modafinil as cheating*

# 1 Student Cognitive Enhancement with Non-Prescribed

## 2 Modafinil. Is it Cheating?

3

4 Alexia Kesta, Philip M. Newton\*

5 Swansea University Medical School, Singleton Park, Swansea, Wales. SA2 8PP.

6 United Kingdom.

7 \*To whom correspondence should be addressed [p.newton@swansea.ac.uk](mailto:p.newton@swansea.ac.uk)

8

9

*Do students view cognitive enhancement with modafinil as cheating*

10 **Abstract**

11 Modafinil, a prescription-only drug, it is mainly used to treat narcolepsy and sleep disorders,  
12 but it is also used, without a prescription, as a cognitive enhancer by ~10% of UK University  
13 students. Previous research has focused on the prevalence of, and motivations for, these  
14 behaviours. Here we focused specifically on determining whether students view this  
15 behaviour as cheating. We used a scenario-based approach to quantify, and qualitatively  
16 understand, student views on this topic. Most students did not view this behaviour as  
17 cheating, in part due to similarities with freely available stimulants such as caffeine, and a  
18 view that cognitive enhancement does not confer new knowledge or understanding.  
19 Although a minority of students did view it as cheating, they also expressed strong views,  
20 based in part on basic questions of fairness and access. Few students did not have a view  
21 either way. These views remained largely unchanged even when presented with  
22 considerations of other moderators of the ethics of cognitive enhancement with modafinil.

23 **Keywords:** modafinil, smart drugs, study aids, cheating, cognitive enhancers,  
24 neuroenhancement, academic integrity

25

26

27

28

29

30

*Do students view cognitive enhancement with modafinil as cheating*

31 **Introduction**

32 Neuroenhancement is broadly defined as the use of drugs or other interventions to “modify  
33 brain processes with the aim of enhancing memory, mood and attention in people who are  
34 not impaired by illness or disorder” (1). Cognitive enhancement falls under  
35 neuroenhancement and is a term normally used to describe the use of certain stimulant  
36 drugs, without a prescription, for the purposes of enhancing performance on cognitive tasks  
37 such as university assessments. Commonly cited cognitive enhancers include modafinil  
38 (Provigil®), methylphenidate (Ritalin®, Concerta®), and d-amphetamine (Adderall®) (2,3).  
39 Modafinil is a front-line treatment for narcolepsy, and is only available, in the UK, with a  
40 prescription (4). However, it is generally well tolerated and with a low risk of harm or abuse,  
41 and so it is often subject to less stringent regulation than other prescription stimulants. In the  
42 United Kingdom, for example, Modafinil is Schedule IV(II), meaning that *not* illegal to possess  
43 modafinil without a prescription, although it is illegal to supply it (5). Although modafinil is  
44 only currently approved for the treatment of narcolepsy, it is widely prescribed for ‘off label’  
45 uses such as the sleepiness associated with conditions such as multiple sclerosis and  
46 depression, and a 2004 report from the manufacturer estimated that 90% of prescriptions  
47 were for such uses (6).

48 There is concern about the non-prescription use of prescription stimulants as cognitive  
49 enhancers (CEs) by university students, with media coverage portraying it as being extremely  
50 common (7). Estimates vary for the number of students who take these medicines as  
51 cognitive enhancers. A recent review of the use of these medicines by university student in  
52 the UK found that only 6.9% of students have used them, although this number was higher  
53 for modafinil (9.9 %) compared to methylphenidate (3.3%) or dexamphetamine (1.9%) (8).

*Do students view cognitive enhancement with modafinil as cheating*

54 The exact mechanism of action of modafinil is not fully understood, but it seems to act  
55 through effects on catecholamine transport, and actions on orexin neurons which increase  
56 the hypothalamic release of histamine resulting in wakefulness and alertness (9). *In vitro*  
57 studies have identified that modafinil inhibits the reuptake of dopamine (10). Modafinil has  
58 a long half-life, of 12-15 hours (11). Some common or very common side effects of modafinil  
59 include; anxiety, irregular heartbeat, headache, insomnia, nausea and dizziness (10),  
60 although these are partially due to placebo/expectancy effects (12). Modafinil is cheap and  
61 widely available: current estimates are that a single dose costs approximately 1.00 GBP (1.21  
62 USD, 1.15 EUR) and it is easily available online via the black market (13).

63 It appears that modafinil is a modest cognitive enhancer, despite all the attention that has  
64 been paid to it. A 2019 meta-analysis, which included studies up to July 2016, demonstrated  
65 that modafinil has a small but significant effect ( $g = 0.1$ ) across a range of different  
66 standardised tests of attention, executive function, processing speed and memory. There  
67 was no significant difference between the cognitive functions, but when analysed  
68 individually the effect on processing speed was the largest ( $g = 0.2$ ) while the effects on  
69 attention and memory were not statistically significant.

70 The cognitive effects of modafinil overlap substantially with those of caffeine, and the effect  
71 of modafinil has been described as being similar to 'a strong cup of coffee' (5), and it seems  
72 reasonable to propose that use of caffeine fits the definition of neuroenhancement as given  
73 by Hall above. Similarly, the magnitude of modafinil's cognitive enhancing effects appears  
74 to be similar to that of acute exercise ( $g = 0.1$ ), although the effects of exercise appear to be  
75 on different cognitive processes, and perhaps masked by some negative effects of exercise  
76 on some cognitive tasks (14).

*Do students view cognitive enhancement with modafinil as cheating*

77 The use of smart drugs by university students creates an ethical question; is it cheating?  
78 Some researchers have argued that it is, and the most often expressed objections to the  
79 ethical use of CEs among academics and the general public are those relating to justice,  
80 safety, and coercion (15), rather than cheating. For example, healthy individuals who do not  
81 have any kind of disorder, but who take modafinil, give them an unfair advantage since they  
82 are able to study for longer with higher cognitive processing speed. This issue is reflected in  
83 the wider literature on public attitudes to cognitive enhancement, which are more accepting  
84 of the use of cognitive enhancers in situations where their use is 'restorative' rather than  
85 'enhancing', i.e. fixing a perceived problem rather than enhancing the normal performance  
86 of an otherwise healthy individual (16). This issue is also reflected in the status of cognitive  
87 enhancers as 'doping' agents in competitive sports. Modafinil is listed by the World Anti  
88 Doping Agency (WADA) as a banned substance and some competitive events, such as video  
89 gaming and chess, test their participants for use of cognitive enhancers (17).

90 However, it remains unclear whether the specific use of cognitive enhancers by university  
91 students constitutes a form of academic misconduct. There are various ways in which the use  
92 of prescription medications by students might be a concern to universities; health concerns,  
93 legality and crime, as well as academic integrity. A policy analysis in the USA showed that  
94 most universities considered the unauthorised use cognitive enhancers by students to be an  
95 issue of drug misuse, but almost none considered cognitive enhancers as part of their  
96 academic integrity policy (18). A similar study conducted in the UK showed that cognitive  
97 enhancers were almost entirely absent from consideration by any policy, either concerning  
98 academic integrity or drug misuse, even though the unauthorised use of cognitive enhancers  
99 could reasonably be considered to fit in the definitions of both (19). A qualitative study of

*Do students view cognitive enhancement with modafinil as cheating*

100 policymakers in Australia generated similar findings; the use of cognitive enhancers was a  
101 health issue, rather than an academic integrity issue (20).

102 On the other hand, the authorised use of stimulants, including modafinil, has a long history  
103 in the military, although there is a paucity of academic research on modafinil use in the  
104 military (21). Modafinil is used to counter the cognitive effects of sleep deprivation, rather  
105 than treat narcolepsy. There is also clearly a commercial interest in developing the use of  
106 modafinil for cognitive enhancement; in 2018 the energy drink manufacturer Red Bull filed a  
107 patent for the use of a modafinil analogue known as 'CE-123' to be used for improving  
108 motivation, cognitive functions, and 'reference memory' (22).

109 Thus the aim of this study was to determine whether university students viewed cognitive  
110 enhancement with modafinil as a form of cheating. We achieved this through the use of a  
111 scenario-based survey study. We captured an initial view on this, and then also evaluated  
112 student views on factors which have been reported to influence considerations of whether or  
113 not modafinil use is viewed as cheating, namely whether a modafinil-enhanced performance is  
114 an authentic representation of true performance, the likelihood of coercion into modafinil  
115 use, equality of access, and similarities to other enhancers such as caffeine (15). We then  
116 asked them again whether modafinil use should be considered as cheating.

117

118

*Do students view cognitive enhancement with modafinil as cheating*

## 119 **Methods**

120 **Ethical Approval** was obtained from Swansea University's Medical School Research Ethics  
121 Sub-Committee (SUMS RESC) (ethics approval number: 2022-0125).

122 **Participants and Inclusion Criteria.** Participants were recruited using the online participant  
123 pool [www.Prolific.co](http://www.Prolific.co). Inclusion criteria for participant were that they should be (1) university  
124 students in the UK, in at least in Year 2 of studies (to ensure they had some experience of  
125 undertaking assessments in Higher Education, but (3) not studying professional programmes  
126 (e.g. Medicine, Dentistry, Nursing, Law) due to the complications of the 'Fitness to Practice'  
127 principles, wherein students and graduates have to demonstrate a commitment to ethical  
128 standards which may influence their attitudes to cognitive enhancing drugs, and also places  
129 a duty of responsibility on them to act should they admit to it.

130 **Recruitment.** The Prolific advert stated that participants were being sought for an  
131 anonymous survey on their views on the use of modafinil as a cognitive enhancer by UK  
132 university students. They were warned of the attention checks, and that they would be paid  
133 at the Prolific recommended 'good' rate of £9/hour. A pilot test of 10 participants was made  
134 on February 10 2023, to test the functionality of the Qualtrics/Prolific interface and to  
135 calibrate the duration of the study for payment purposes. No changes were needed following  
136 the pilot and so a further participants were recruited and completed the study on February  
137 13 2023.

138 **Survey instrument.** This was built in Qualtrics (*Qualtrics XM - Experience Management*  
139 *Software*, 2023). We used a forced response approach wherein participants had to answer a  
140 question before proceeding to the next question. The structure of the study instrument was  
141 as follows, and a copy of the instrument is available as supplementary material S1.

*Do students view cognitive enhancement with modafinil as cheating*

142 A Participant Information Form contained all necessary information about the study,  
143 including who is undertaking the research, what happens if they took part and any risks.  
144 There was also data protection and confidentiality information. Participants were informed  
145 that, by clicking 'next' to progress to the next page, they were providing consent.

146 Section one was designed to ensure that participants fully understood the effects of  
147 modafinil, including side effects, its legality, availability and cost. For each of those issues,  
148 participants were requested to read some given information and then, on the next page, to  
149 answer questions about what they had read. Participants were required to answer correctly  
150 to proceed to the next section. This also served as an attention check and quality control test  
151 for the data; participants were informed that if they did not answer correctly then they would  
152 not be paid.

153 Section two. Participants were given the following scenario

154 *"A university student is worried that they are not going to pass their end-of-year exams. They*  
155 *have heard that modafinil, a drug prescribed for the sleep disorder narcolepsy, can also improve*  
156 *cognitive performance in people who do not have narcolepsy. The student does not have*  
157 *narcolepsy, but orders some modafinil online; it is not technically illegal to buy modafinil without*  
158 *a prescription, although it is illegal to sell it. The student takes the modafinil before the exam,*  
159 *and the modafinil makes them less tired, and improves their concentration, decision-making and*  
160 *planning".*

161 Participants were then asked to rate their agreement with the following statements on a 5  
162 point Likert scale: *"The student has cheated by taking modafinil"*. Participants were then  
163 asked to explain their response, using a free text box.



*Do students view cognitive enhancement with modafinil as cheating*

164 Participants were then asked two questions on issues which have been demonstrated to  
165 affect people's perceptions of whether non-prescribed modafinil use is cheating (15). These  
166 were (a) whether or not the academic performance of a student who has taken modafinil can  
167 be considered authentic, (b) that by making modafinil use common, it might result in the co-  
168 ercing of others to take it. In both cases the original scenario was presented and then  
169 participants were asked the aforementioned question using a Likert scale.

170 Next it was explained that, according to the UK Charity 'Drug Science' the actions of  
171 modafinil have been linked to a very high dose of caffeine (5). After this information was  
172 given, participants had to answer a question on modafinil's mechanism of action, again to  
173 check their understanding and serve as an attention check.

174 Participants were then asked if they had ever used modafinil, and then if so whether it was  
175 via prescription for a legitimate health condition.

176 The original scenario was then presented and participants were asked if they had changed  
177 their mind, and so again asked to rate their view on whether modafinil use was cheating

178 Finally participants were asked further information about why they had made their decision  
179 on whether or not modafinil use is cheating. First they were presented with four issues which  
180 have been known to affect people's view on whether modafinil is cheating, and then asked  
181 to rank those from most important to least important. The issues were (a) comparison with  
182 caffeine, (b) authenticity of student performance when taking modafinil, (c) equality of  
183 access to modafinil, (d) likelihood of coercion. They were also given a fifth option of 'other',  
184 and then asked to explain their answer in a free text box.

185 Participants were then debriefed and paid.

*Do students view cognitive enhancement with modafinil as cheating*

186 **Data Analysis.** Data were downloaded into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. Statistical  
187 analysis and figure creation was undertaken using Graphpad Prism v10 (Thousand Oaks, CA,  
188 USA). Likert scale responses were tested for agreement or disagreement by converting the  
189 responses to a 1-5 scale and then comparing the distribution of responses to the midpoint of  
190 the scale using a one-sample Wilcoxon signed rank test. Ranking data were analysed using a  
191 one-way repeated measures ANOVA for ranks (Friedman test), followed by *post hoc* Dunn's  
192 multiple comparisons tests. Qualitative data were aggregated into a Microsoft Word  
193 document and then analysed using established six-step bottom-up thematic analysis (23).  
194 Step 1 was 'familiarisation', where the transcripts were repeatedly read, with notes made.  
195 Step 2 was 'coding', where common phrases (keywords) were highlighted and then grouped  
196 into codes. In Step 3, similar keywords were grouped into themes. In Step 4 all the themes  
197 were checked and re-examined to ensure that all the data provided were found and used in  
198 the analysis. In Step 5 the themes were given names and explanations, and in Step 6 they  
199 were incorporated into the manuscript. Steps 1-3 were undertaken by one author (XXX) and  
200 then Steps 4-6 undertaken through discussion and agreement between both authors.

201

*Do students view cognitive enhancement with modafinil as cheating*

## 203 **Results**

### 204 ***Is it cheating to use modafinil for cognitive enhancement.***

205 When participants were asked the first time whether the use of modafinil represented  
206 cheating, 72.5% selected either 'somewhat disagree' or 'completely disagree', while 21.5%  
207 selected 'completely agree' or 'somewhat agree'. Only 6% were unsure. The distribution of  
208 responses was significantly different to the midpoint of the scale ( $W = -11881$ ,  $p < 0.0001$ ).  
209 After participants had been presented with all the relevant content regarding the four  
210 influencing factors, they were asked this question again. The results were similar, with 74%  
211 selecting 'somewhat disagree' or 'completely disagree', and 17.5% selecting 'completely  
212 agree' or 'somewhat agree'. This time 8.5% were unsure. Again the disagreement was  
213 significant, ( $W = -12125$ ,  $p < 0.0001$ ).

214 Despite the similarity between the distributions in the before and after questions, there was  
215 some suggestion that the difference between them was significant. A large number  
216 (159/200) of the pairs were tied (i.e. the participants picked the same option in both before  
217 and after questions). A Wilcoxon signed rank test which included these (using Pratts method)  
218 returned a P value of 0.066 ( $W = -2047$ ). However, when these ties were excluded the P value  
219 was significant ( $P = 0.036$ ,  $W = -298$ ), suggesting that those who had changed their response  
220 were even less likely to view the use of modafinil as cheating.

221 The results are shown in Fig 1.

222

223 [FIG 1 HERE]

224

*Do students view cognitive enhancement with modafinil as cheating*

225 **Fig 1. Is the student portrayed in the scenario cheating by using modafinil.** Both  
226 distributions are significantly different to the midpoint of the scale, indicating significant  
227 disagreement with the statement that the student was cheating.

228

229 When asked if “the performance of the student in the scenario, who has taken modafinil, is  
230 not an authentic reflection of the student’s true academic performance”, the distribution of  
231 responses was significantly different ( $W= -5270$  and  $P<0.0001$ ). These results clearly suggest  
232 that participants showed significant disagreement with the given proposal, i.e. that the  
233 student’s performance was considered authentic when taking modafinil. Then, participants  
234 were asked to rate their agreement with the given statement “if modafinil use became  
235 common, those who do not want to use it, might feel forced to do so (coerced) by others”.  
236 Again, the distribution of responses was significantly different ( $W= 4971$  and  $P<0.0001$ ),  
237 although this time the participants agreed with the statement. These findings are shown in  
238 fig 2.

239

240 [FIG 2 HERE]

241 **Fig 2. Distribution of answers to the Likert scale questions.** Participants disagreed that  
242 modafinil use was cheating or represented an inauthentic portrayal of student performance,  
243 but they agreed that, if modafinil use became common, it might result in students feeling co-  
244 erced into using it.

245

*Do students view cognitive enhancement with modafinil as cheating*

246 When asked to rank the reasons why they had made their decision regarding the use of  
247 modafinil was considered cheating, a Friedman test indicated a significant difference  
248 between the five items. Post hoc Dunn's multiple comparisons test showed that all items  
249 were significantly different to each other, except 'Caffeine' and 'Authenticity'. These data  
250 can be seen in fig 3. The rankings were ordinal, but a mean was calculated for the purposes  
251 of visualisation (24). The mean rank for 'caffeine' was 2.26, for 'authenticity' 2.27, for  
252 'equality of access' 2.72 and finally for 'coercion' 3.43.  
253

*Do students view cognitive enhancement with modafinil as cheating*

254

255 [FIG 3 HERE]

256 **Fig 3. Reasons proposed for considering whether or not student use of modafinil in the**  
257 **scenario was cheating.** Data are plotted as the mean ranking.

258

### 259 ***Modafinil use***

260 88% of participants reported that they had not used modafinil, while 12% (N=24) answered  
261 'Yes'. One (0.5%) participant had a prescription and so 11.5% did not obtain modafinil via  
262 prescription. Of the 24 who answered 'yes' to taking modafinil, 22 (92%) thought that it was  
263 not cheating when first asked and none of them changed their minds.

### 264 ***Data quality***

265 All who participated in the survey, answered the 'knowledge' questions correctly, and so no  
266 participants were excluded.

267

### 268 ***Thematic Analysis***

269 Participants were twice asked to explain their answers to the main question of whether  
270 modafinil is cheating, once at the beginning, and then again at the end after all the  
271 information had been presented. The results from the first question are shown in Table 1,  
272 along with representative quotes. The results and quotes from the second question are in  
273 Table 2. In both tables the keywords section are exact common words that participants used  
274 in their answers or comments, which were all mutual and categorised accordingly to their

*Do students view cognitive enhancement with modafinil as cheating*

275 meaning. In Table 2 the themes essentially reflect the four items that participants were asked  
 276 to rank, which are themselves the keywords, and so keywords/themes are collapsed into one  
 277 column. It is important to be clear that the themes are not categorised into 'positive' and  
 278 'negative', meaning that some participants used the theme to support a view that taking  
 279 modafinil is cheating whereas others used the same theme to argue the opposite.

280 **Table 1: Themes arising from free text responses to the first asking of 'is this cheating'.**

Theme	Keywords	Explanation	Example (phrase from participants)
<b>Attention</b>	Focus, concentration, awake, alertness, tiredness	The use of the drug affects cognition, improving the attention and awareness of the individual to help them study	"If they have a higher level of <b>concentration</b> usually, they would receive the same grade" "The role of the drug is to improve <b>concentration</b> and reduce <b>tiredness</b> "
<b>Intelligence</b>	Knowledge, study, performance, abilities	The use of the drug does not interact with the person's ability and how smart they are	"The drug does not help the student in any way that is unnatural or give them any extra <b>knowledge</b> to pass the exam" "It couldn't bring out any <b>knowledge</b> or <b>ability</b> which wasn't already there"

*Do students view cognitive enhancement with modafinil as cheating*

<b>Legality</b>	Rules, law, legal, illegal, regulations	The permission of students to take modafinil	<p>"If it was cheating, there would be a <b>rule</b> against it"</p> <p>"The law states it is not <b>illegal</b> to buy modafinil without a prescription and so the student has acted lawfully until this point"</p>
<b>Consuming stimulants</b>	Coffee, tea, energy drinks, steroids	Stimulant compounds which can be used to improve alertness and performance	<p>"They haven't technically cheated as it could be argued that a student <b>drinking energy</b> drinks before the exam is cheating" "It could be compared to a strong dose of <b>caffeine</b>"</p>
<b>Solution</b>	Answers	Participants explained that by taking modafinil, it doesn't mean that you have the answers to the exam's questions, so it isn't cheating	<p>"They haven't cheated by taking the drug as it does not make them have the <b>answers</b> to the exam questions"</p>
<b>Well-being</b>	Health, unhealthy, risks, dangerous, diseases, side effects	The use of modafinil might affect the health of the person taking it	<p>"The student is engaging in <b>unhealthy</b> behaviour that could end up in drug abuse or addiction"</p>



*Do students view cognitive enhancement with modafinil as cheating*

<b>Factors</b>	Coercion, advantage, authenticity, equality	Factors we gave participants to help them decide if the use of modafinil is cheating	"It <i>disadvantages</i> other students who have not used the drug" "I don't think that the student taking this particular drug has given them any significant <i>advantages</i> compared to other students"
----------------	--	--	--

281 Table 1. Students were given a scenario where a student consumed modafinil before  
282 an exam, despite not having a prescription. Participants were asked whether or not they  
283 considered this to be cheating, and then asked why, in a free text box. These free text  
284 responses were analysed using thematic analysis.

285

286

*Do students view cognitive enhancement with modafinil as cheating*

287 **Table 2: Themes arising from free text responses to the second asking of 'is this cheating'.**

Group name	Explanation	Example (phrase from participants)
<b>Caffeine</b>	Caffeine work similarly to modafinil, so it is like ingesting caffeine in a pill form, meaning that it is not cheating to do so	"They are only trying to stay awake and concentrate. The equivalent to drinking <i>coffee</i> "
<b>Coercion</b>	If modafinil becomes popular, those who do not use it, might feel pressured to do so	"The likelihood of <i>coercion</i> I see as the least important as we all have freedom to make our own decisions"  "The likelihood of <i>coercion</i> is concerning and agreeable but people are entitled to their own choices"
<b>Equality</b>	It is accessible for mostly everyone to purchase modafinil due to its low price	"As everyone has <i>access</i> to this I do not view it as cheating"  "Plus, everyone else has <i>equal access</i> to modafinil"
<b>Authenticity</b>	The use of modafinil by student does/does not reflect their performance	"How legitimate the <i>performance</i> with the modafinil is the most important one"

*Do students view cognitive enhancement with modafinil as cheating*

		“The student is essentially taking <i>performance</i> enhancing drugs to influence his work”
--	--	--

288 Table 2. Student participants were again given a scenario where a student consumed  
289 modafinil before an exam, despite not having a prescription. Prior to this they had been  
290 asked various questions about issues which have been demonstrated in the literature, to  
291 affect considerations of whether modafinil use is cheating. They were then asked if they had  
292 changed their mind on whether this was cheating, and then asked why, in a free text box.  
293 These free text responses were analysed using thematic analysis.

294

*Do students view cognitive enhancement with modafinil as cheating*

296 **Discussion**

297 The present study explores the views of university students about whether the non-  
298 prescription use of modafinil by healthy non-sleep-deprived individuals, as a study aid, is  
299 considered cheating. A substantial and significant majority of students reported that they  
300 did not consider it cheating, and this view remained largely unchanged when they were given  
301 information about concepts that are commonly regarded, in the academic literature, to  
302 affect people's views on the question. Common reasons for this finding were a comparison  
303 to legal non-prescription stimulants such as caffeine, and a related view that modafinil would  
304 not actually equip a student with new knowledge or skills. Although a minority of students  
305 viewed modafinil use as cheating, they expressed strong statements in support of their view,  
306 and only a small percentage of students (6-8%) were unsure. 11.5% of participants had used  
307 modafinil themselves, without a prescription, a figure in line with a recent review of UK  
308 university students (8). Student participants also disagreed that the performance of a  
309 student who had used modafinil was an inauthentic representation of the performance of  
310 that student. However they agreed that, if modafinil use became common, other students  
311 might be co-erced into taking modafinil even if they do not want to.

312 Our qualitative analysis gave us considerable insight into these findings. When participants  
313 were first asked to explain their views on whether the use of modafinil was cheating, our  
314 thematic analysis returned 7 different themes. The first dominant theme, 'attention', linked  
315 with the keywords 'focus, concentration, awake, alertness and tiredness' demonstrated that  
316 students had a good understanding of the effects of modafinil. The second theme  
317 'intelligence', linked with the keywords 'knowledge, study, performance and abilities', along  
318 with the sixth theme of 'solution' showed that participants view that modafinil was *not*

*Do students view cognitive enhancement with modafinil as cheating*

319 cheating was explained partly by a thought that the use of the drug does not interact with a  
320 person's ability, intelligence or knowledge (although some took the opposite view). This is a  
321 logical view and is supported by the literature; although modafinil can produce a modest  
322 increase in cognitive functions such as processing speed, it does not 'implant' knowledge or  
323 skills and does not actually appear to significantly improve memory either (25,26).

324 It remains an open question as to whether modafinil works as a cognitive enhancer under  
325 academic assessment conditions, and if so, how it might work. For example, a student could,  
326 as represented in the study, take modafinil before a test. This would be expected to produce  
327 the improvement in cognitive functions described in the study scenario, but it is unclear  
328 whether this translates to improved grades on an assessment. To truly answer this question  
329 would require a randomised controlled trial of a modafinil vs placebo vs untreated control,  
330 with performance of university students measured on a range of different assignment  
331 formats and lengths. Alternately, or in addition, modafinil might simply extend the time  
332 available for students to study by increasing wakefulness. This is the common use in military  
333 circumstances (21). This seems unlikely to be an effective strategy long-term, as eventually  
334 the 'sleep debt' would need to be repaid, but in the days before, and during, an assessment  
335 it is possible that a student could benefit from the short-term use of modafinil. To truly  
336 answer this question would again require a much stronger and authentic experimental design  
337 than the laboratory studies currently available.

338 Specifically relating to cheating, it was clear from the qualitative findings that part of a  
339 consideration of cheating is simply whether the use of modafinil is allowed by the university,  
340 or by the law, perhaps independent of any broader moral or ethical concerns. This was  
341 reflected in the theme of 'legality', where participants focused on what the law states and

*Do students view cognitive enhancement with modafinil as cheating*

342 how important the law and rules are to this subject. A characteristic quote was that "*the law*  
343 *states it is not **illegal** to buy modafinil without a prescription and so the student has acted*  
344 *lawfully until this point*". This suggests that, for some participants, increasing the scheduling  
345 of modafinil, so that it becomes illegal to possess it without a prescription, would be  
346 sufficient to change their view of whether it is cheating and so might deter cheating. This  
347 might also explain why modafinil use is currently more common amongst university students  
348 than other cognitive enhancers such as methylphenidate and amphetamine since both those  
349 drugs are Schedule II in the UK, meaning it is currently illegal to possess them without a  
350 prescription. Conversely, the efforts by the company Red Bull to patent an analogue of  
351 modafinil for cognitive enhancement (22) suggest that, should they be successful and so a  
352 modafinil analogue becomes more widely and legally available, the use of it would be  
353 expected to increase considerably. This then relates to the fourth theme of the qualitative  
354 analysis, consuming stimulants, where participants drew parallels to legal stimulants such as  
355 coffee, tea, energy drinks, as well as to doping with steroids.

356 The final two qualitative themes both related more to a negative view of modafinil, in  
357 particular that there may be an imbalance of harm vs benefits, as in previous work (9) or even  
358 that this may lead to addiction or pathological long-term use, although this does not seem  
359 to be a significant risk currently (3). There was a related view that the perceived risk taken by  
360 students who engage in modafinil use in the short term creates a disadvantage for those  
361 students who are not engaged in modafinil use, reflecting earlier research (27).

362 These views did not really change, from a qualitative perspective, once all the information  
363 had been presented to the participants, and the qualitative analysis of the second set of data  
364 suggested that, if anything views had reinforced and coalesced around the similarities with

*Do students view cognitive enhancement with modafinil as cheating*

365 caffeine and also the inability of modafinil to confer knowledge and skills to a student who  
366 did not already have them.

367 Our participants were drawn from the online participant pool Prolific, which appears to be a  
368 first for studies of this kind. Although the data quality checks were stringent, no participants  
369 had to be withdrawn, giving us confidence in the data and suggesting that this may be a  
370 valuable avenue for further research in this area. However there are some limitations to these  
371 findings; our participant pool was a modest size, although many other studies of cognitive  
372 enhancer use by UK university students use smaller samples than ours and still generate  
373 important findings (e.g. (28–31)).

374 Another potential limitation is that there are potentially other modifying factors which may  
375 affect whether a student views the use of modafinil as cheating. For example, modafinil is  
376 currently on the World Anti-Doping Agency list of banned substances and is therefore  
377 prohibited for competitors (32), including for situations such as chess where increased  
378 modafinil might reasonably be expected to provide an advantage. Indeed the evidence  
379 suggest that modafinil does produce a modest improvement in the performance of amateur  
380 chess players, equivalent to that of caffeine, and in both cases correlated with players taking  
381 longer time on each move (33), although even this improvement prompted some to argue  
382 that modafinil should *not* be banned from professional chess, in part due to the culture of  
383 suspicion that it might create (34) and older studies from 2012/13 indicate that very few  
384 players take it (0.2%), or believe that it can improve their performance (1.5%) (35). In addition,  
385 some older literature suggests that modafinil may be more effective at cognitive  
386 enhancement in individuals with a lower IQ, although still within the normal range (106 vs  
387 115) (36) and this has been argued as an ethical reason to promote access to, and use of

*Do students view cognitive enhancement with modafinil as cheating*

388 cognitive enhancers (37). Finally some very recent research suggests that people who use  
389 modafinil for cognitive enhancement score more highly on measures of inattention and  
390 procrastination, suggesting that they may have symptoms of Attention-Deficit Hyperactivity  
391 Disorder (ADHD), and be self-medicating, although odafinil is not currently recommended  
392 as a treatment for ADHD in the United Kingdom.

393 The complexity of these issues is an avenue for further study in this area, in both quantitative  
394 and qualitative domains, to fully understand the depth and breadth of the ethical issues  
395 surrounding the potential use of cognitive enhancers in education. This need has become  
396 more pressing given the recent efforts of Red Bull, to patent a modafinil analogue for  
397 cognitive enhancement (22).

398 There is also a need to undertake research with other stakeholder groups. The current legal  
399 position of modafinil is unusual amongst stimulant drugs; most of the banned stimulants on  
400 the WADA list are in schedule II according to UK drugs legislation and so their legal status re  
401 cognitive enhancement is very clear; it is illegal to have them without a prescription. The  
402 opposite is true for caffeine, which is legal and freely available, but it is equally clear what the  
403 legal and ethical position is. Modafinil is in something of a limbo as it is not illegal to possess  
404 without a prescription, yet it is not available over the counter. It would be helpful to have the  
405 views of policymakers, lawmakers, parents, academics and other stakeholders in order to  
406 consider whether the scheduling should be relaxed, and so students can take it without  
407 having to obtain it from the black market, and can be supported to do so, or else the  
408 scheduling should be increased, so making it harder to obtain and forcing students to obtain  
409 legitimate sources of help for any undiagnosed ADHD or other study struggles.



*Do students view cognitive enhancement with modafinil as cheating*

410 The current legal and regulatory position also creates challenges for academic policymakers.  
411 In the US, cognitive enhancement is prohibited by university drug and alcohol misuse  
412 policies, although it is largely absent from academic integrity policies (18). A similar view is  
413 help by academics in Australia (20). In the UK, university policies are almost completely silent  
414 on the issue, with cognitive enhancement not featuring in either drug misuse, or academic  
415 integrity policies (19). This is despite the fact that ~10% of UK university students are using  
416 modafinil to support their studies, and the lack of any policy position from UK universities  
417 seems likely to add to any confusion facing students when deciding whether or not is it  
418 acceptable to use modafinil for cognitive enhancement.

419 University teachers have been surveyed regarding their views on cognitive enhancement,  
420 and this research has shown that academics tend to have a less favourable view of cognitive  
421 enhancement than students although this research has focused on the university teachers  
422 using the drugs themselves, and also did not specifically focus on whether or not the use of  
423 modafinil by students is considered cheating (27). Similarly A survey study of health  
424 professionals in New Zealand found that most did *not* agree that it was ethical for university  
425 students to use cognitive enhancers (38).

426 In summary, a sample of UK university students showed a large majority who believed that  
427 the use of modafinil for cognitive enhancement was not cheating, in large part due to  
428 perceived similarities with caffeine and the perception that modafinil use could not give a  
429 student knew knowledge or skills. However minority of students strongly believed that it is  
430 cheating, on the basis of basic questions over fairness, equality of access and harm.

431 **Acknowledgements.** N/A

*Do students view cognitive enhancement with modafinil as cheating*

432 **Supporting Information Captions**

433 **Supporting Information S1. An anonymised version of the full survey.**

*Do students view cognitive enhancement with modafinil as cheating*

434 **References**

- 435 1. Hall W. Feeling 'better than well': Can our experiences with psychoactive drugs help us  
436 to meet the challenges of novel neuroenhancement methods?: EMBO Rep.  
437 2004;5(12):1105–9.
- 438 2. Esposito M, Cocimano G, Ministrieri F, Rosi GL, Nunno ND, Messina G, et al. Smart drugs  
439 and neuroenhancement: what do we know? Front Biosci-Landmark. 2021 Aug  
440 30;26(8):347–59.
- 441 3. Sharif S, Guirguis A, Fergus S, Schifano F. The Use and Impact of Cognitive Enhancers  
442 among University Students: A Systematic Review. Brain Sci. 2021 Mar;11(3):355.
- 443 4. Barateau L, Lopez R, Dauvilliers Y. Treatment Options for Narcolepsy. CNS Drugs. 2016  
444 May 1;30(5):369–79.
- 445 5. DrugScience UK. drugscience.org.uk. 2023 [cited 2023 Jun 22]. What is Modafinil and  
446 what are the effects, dose, and risks? - Drug Science. Available from:  
447 <https://www.drugscience.org.uk/drug-information/modafinil/>
- 448 6. Vastag B. Poised to Challenge Need for Sleep, "Wakefulness Enhancer" Rouses  
449 Concerns. JAMA. 2004 Jan 14;291(2):167–70.
- 450 7. Partridge BJ, Bell SK, Lucke JC, Yeates S, Hall WD. Smart Drugs "As Common As  
451 Coffee": Media Hype about Neuroenhancement. PLOS ONE. 2011 Nov 30;6(11):e28416.
- 452 8. Jones F, Newton PM. Prevalence of the use of prescription stimulants as "study drugs"  
453 by UK university students: A brief report. Brain Behav. 2024;14(2):e3419.
- 454 9. Teodorini RD, Rycroft N, Smith-Spark JH. The off-prescription use of modafinil: An  
455 online survey of perceived risks and benefits. PLOS ONE. 2020 Feb 5;15(2):e0227818.
- 456 10. Hashemian SM, Farhadi T. A review on modafinil: the characteristics, function, and use  
457 in critical care. J Drug Assess. 2020;9(1):82–6.
- 458 11. Robertson P, Hellriegel ET. Clinical Pharmacokinetic Profile of Modafinil. Clin  
459 Pharmacokinet. 2003 Feb 1;42(2):123–37.
- 460 12. Heller MK, Chapman SCE, Horne R. Beliefs About Medicines Predict Side-Effects of  
461 Placebo Modafinil. Ann Behav Med. 2022 Oct 1;56(10):989–1001.
- 462 13. Hockenull J, Wood DM, Dargan PI. The Availability of Modafinil and Methylphenidate  
463 Purchased from the Internet in the United Kingdom Without a Prescription. Subst Use  
464 Misuse. 2020 Jan 1;55(1):56–65.
- 465 14. Chang YK, Labban JD, Gapin JI, Etnier JL. The effects of acute exercise on cognitive  
466 performance: A meta-analysis. Brain Res. 2012 May 9;1453:87–101.

*Do students view cognitive enhancement with modafinil as cheating*

- 467 15. Porsdam Mann S, de Lora Deltoro P, Cochrane T, Mitchell C. Is the use of modafinil, a  
468 pharmacological cognitive enhancer, cheating? *Ethics Educ.* 2018 May 4;13(2):251–67.
- 469 16. Fitz NS, Nadler R, Manogaran P, Chong EWJ, Reiner PB. Public Attitudes Toward  
470 Cognitive Enhancement. *Neuroethics.* 2014 Aug 1;7(2):173–88.
- 471 17. Dance A. Smart drugs: A dose of intelligence. *Nature.* 2016 Mar;531(7592):S2–3.
- 472 18. Aikins R, Zhang X, McCabe SE. Academic Doping: Institutional Policies Regarding  
473 Nonmedical use of Prescription Stimulants in U.S. Higher Education. *J Acad Ethics.* 2017  
474 Sep 1;15(3):229–43.
- 475 19. Heyes AR. Psychosocial factors facilitating use of performance and cognitive enhancing  
476 drugs in sport and education [Internet] [d\_ph]. University of Birmingham; 2022 [cited  
477 2023 Jun 22]. Available from: <https://etheses.bham.ac.uk/id/eprint/12515/>
- 478 20. Dunn M, Dawson P, Bearman M, Tai J. 'I'd struggle to see it as cheating': the policy and  
479 regulatory environments of study drug use at universities. *High Educ Res Dev.* 2021 Feb  
480 23;40(2):234–46.
- 481 21. Van Puyvelde M, Van Cutsem J, Lacroix E, Pattyn N. A State-of-the-Art Review on the  
482 Use of Modafinil as A Performance-enhancing Drug in the Context of Military  
483 Operability. *Mil Med.* 2022 Nov 1;187(11–12):1286–98.
- 484 22. Lubec G. (s)-enantiomeric form of a heterocyclic compound having motivation  
485 improving and/or reference memory enhancing activity [Internet]. EP3553053A1, 2019  
486 [cited 2024 Jan 13]. Available from: <https://patents.google.com/patent/EP3553053A1/en>
- 487 23. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qual Res Psychol.* 2006 Jan  
488 1;3(2):77–101.
- 489 24. Norman G. Likert scales, levels of measurement and the "laws" of statistics. *Adv Health  
490 Sci Educ.* 2010 Dec 1;15(5):625–32.
- 491 25. Kredlow MA, Keshishian A, Oppenheimer S, Otto MW. The Efficacy of Modafinil as a  
492 Cognitive Enhancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *J Clin Psychopharmacol.*  
493 2019 Oct;39(5):455.
- 494 26. Battleday RM, Brem AK. Modafinil for cognitive neuroenhancement in healthy non-  
495 sleep-deprived subjects: A systematic review. *Eur Neuropsychopharmacol.* 2015 Nov  
496 1;25(11):1865–81.
- 497 27. Sattler S, Sauer C, Mehlkop G, Graeff P. The Rationale for Consuming Cognitive  
498 Enhancement Drugs in University Students and Teachers. *PLOS ONE.* 2013 Jul  
499 17;8(7):e68821.
- 500 28. Helmer SM, Pischke CR, Van Hal G, Vriesacker B, Dempsey RC, Akvardar Y, et al.  
501 Personal and perceived peer use and attitudes towards the use of nonmedical

*Do students view cognitive enhancement with modafinil as cheating*

- 502 prescription stimulants to improve academic performance among university students in  
503 seven European countries. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 2016 Nov 1;168:128–34.
- 504 29. Pennington K. University students use, awareness and prevalence of prescription  
505 stimulants in a UK student population and the influence of personality. *J*  
506 *Psychopharmacol (Oxf)*. 2014 Aug;28(8):A75–A75.
- 507 30. Nguyen NT, Rakow T, Gardner B, Dommett EJ. Understanding the relationship between  
508 safety beliefs and knowledge for cognitive enhancers in UK university students. *PLOS*  
509 *ONE*. 2021 Jan 28;16(1):e0244865.
- 510 31. Hanna LA, Rainey J, Hall M. A questionnaire study investigating future pharmacists' use  
511 of, and views on cognitive enhancers. *Pharm Educ.* 2018 Feb 14;18:76–84.
- 512 32. World Anti Doping Agency. World Anti Doping Agency Prohibited List. 2024 [cited 2024  
513 Feb 5]. The Prohibited List. Available from: [https://www.wada-ama.org/en/prohibited-](https://www.wada-ama.org/en/prohibited-list)  
514 [list](https://www.wada-ama.org/en/prohibited-list)
- 515 33. Franke AG, Gränsmark P, Agricola A, Schühle K, Rommel T, Sebastian A, et al.  
516 Methylphenidate, modafinil, and caffeine for cognitive enhancement in chess: A double-  
517 blind, randomised controlled trial. *Eur Neuropsychopharmacol.* 2017 Mar 1;27(3):248–  
518 60.
- 519 34. Mihailov E, Savulescu J. Social Policy and Cognitive Enhancement: Lessons from Chess.  
520 *Neuroethics.* 2018 Jul 1;11(2):115–27.
- 521 35. Franke AG, Dietz P, Ranft K, Balló H, Simon P, Lieb K. The Use of Pharmacologic  
522 Cognitive Enhancers in Competitive Chess. *Epidemiology.* 2017 Nov;28(6):e57.
- 523 36. Randall DC, Shneerson JM, File SE. Cognitive effects of modafinil in student volunteers  
524 may depend on IQ. *Pharmacol Biochem Behav.* 2005 Sep 1;82(1):133–9.
- 525 37. Dunlop M, Savulescu J. Distributive justice and cognitive enhancement in lower, normal  
526 intelligence. *Monash Bioeth Rev.* 2014;32(3–4):189–204.
- 527 38. Ram S (Sanya), Russell B, Kirkpatrick C, Stewart K, Scahill S, Henning M, et al.  
528 Professionals' attitudes towards the use of cognitive enhancers in academic settings.  
529 *PLOS ONE.* 2020 Nov 20;15(11):e0241968.

530

531

532




Fig 1




Fig 2




Fig 3