Annotated Bibliography-
Issues Related to Academic Integrity in Online Learning

Karen J. Price

Angell, L. R. (2005). The relationship of impulsiveness, personal efficacy, and academic motivation to college cheating. *College Student Journal, 40* (1), 118-131.

The article describes a study involving undergraduates at a small private college which sought to discover personal characteristics that would potentially correlate with cheating. The correlations that were discovered were significant at the .05 level. It was posited that the small number of items per scale impacted the strength of the correlation and that further study should include more items to measure each characteristic .The study tried to assess impulsiveness vs. self-control, the level of control people felt they had over accomplishing their goals, and students' motivation to learn. The study found that the more subjects engaged in academically dishonest behavior, the less likely they were to view the behavior as wrong. Also, students who were motivated by the joy of learning and personal internal satisfaction were less likely to engage in dishonest behavior. A lack of any motivation or concern about the future well-being of the individual was also related to plagiarism behavior.

Baron, J., & Crooks, S. (2005). Academic Integrity in Web Based Distance Education. *TechTrends, 49*(2), 40-5. **Retrieved from Education Full Text database.**

The author presents an overview of the research regarding the prevalence of cheating in both online and traditional classrooms and presents suggestions to safeguard against academic dishonesty. Some of the key features discussed include assignment modifications. For example, as a replacement to the open-ended written assignment or the traditional final examination, an instructor may wish to use an assessment in the form of a project. This allows the student to relate subject matter directly to their own life experiences via practical, meaningful application and avoids rote memorization of facts and figures likely to be forgotten shortly after a traditional test. The author also suggested that open book assessments are recommended since it is impossible for the instructor to be certain students are not using forbidden resources during a (non-proctored) examination. Additionally, the utilization of essay questions in testing rather than multiple choice formats are encouraged because they promote higher level thinking and requires more significant responses which discourage cheating and make it easier to detect.

Barrett, R., & Malcolm, J. (2006). Embedding plagiarism detection in the assessment process. *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 2*(1), 38-45.

In this study, the researchers were evaluating the use of a plagiarism detection software program as a formative evaluation and assessment to reduce the incidence of plagiarism in students' research papers. In the study, 182 master's level students wrote a research paper in a research methods course. Prior to submitting their papers, the students had attended a

workshop seminar on how to summarize outside sources and cite materials appropriately. All essays were submitted through Turnitin and Ferret to assess the originality of the essays. For cases where 15% or more of text was found to match Internet sources, students were given an opportunity to revise a second time. When students were allowed to review their report with feedback, only 3% of essays resubmitted included 15% or more unoriginal text. The authors suggest that these results indicate these software tools could serve as valuable formative assessment tools providing feedback to students.

Braumoeller, B.F., & Gaines, B.J. (2001). Actions do speak louder than words: Deterring plagiarism with the use of plagiarism detection software. *Political Science and Politics, 34*(4), 835-839.

In the spring semester of 2000, Bear Braumoeller, an assistant professor of government at Harvard University and Brian Gaines, an associate professor of political science at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC) began their plagiarism study involving UIUC students taking Political Science 100: Introduction to Political Science. This report details Braumoeller and Gaines' experience with the Essay Verification Engine, EVE, which they used to detect instances of plagiarism among the 180 students studied. The article describes an experiment where two political science classes at Urbana-Champaign were given essay tests, one professor providing stern admonitions against plagiarism. Both classes were tested with EVE, Essay Verification software, for duplication with materials on the web. About 11% of both classes showed some plagiarism, although mostly viewed as unintentional casual duplication of information. Students who were told that the papers would be checked with software (the second set of essays) were less likely to cheat. Software was useful but didn't always separate out properly cited material, and always incorrectly identified the percentage of the paper that was plagiarized.

Chiesl, N. (2007). Pragmatic methods to reduce dishonesty in web based courses. *Quarterly Review of Distance Education, 8* (3), 203- 211.

The article presents strategies to help reduce student cheating in online courses. Four practical courses of action are suggested for professors to reduce the amount of cheating by online students: (1) disseminate information to distant students; (2) change the process used by students to turn in written assignments; (3) change the process by which exams are administered; and (4) create a non-sequential chapter assortment of questions. In an effort to determine the merit of the suggested pragmatic methods, a survey of Web-based students was implemented. During a 3-year period, 149 students were asked to complete an online survey asking questions concerning their online experience in a course that had implemented these pragmatic methods intended to reduce cheating. The results indicated only 3% of the students reporting cheating more (in this Web class) than most Web classes, while a great percentage, 70%, reported that the average student can cheat (in this Web class) less than in most Web courses.

Dahl, S. (2007). Turnitin: The student perspective on using plagiarism detection software. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 8*(2), 173.

This study investigated the perceptions of postgraduate students using Turnitin plagiarism detection software. In this case study approach, students used the software for weekly assignments, viewed feedback reports on originality and performed online peer reviews of work

through the software site. Qualitative results suggested that students had a positive perception of their experiences using the Turnitin software program, that it was easy to use and a convenient platform. Additionally, almost 80% of students indicated that they preferred to get feedback through Turnitin as opposed to more traditional feedback methods and would value the software being used in future courses.

Foster, A. (2009). New Systems Keep a Close Eye on Online Students at Home. *The Education Digest, 74*(7), 45-7. Retrieved from Education Full Text database.

This article presents an overview of some new technologies that are being implemented at some selected colleges and universities as measures to combat the possibility of cheating in online educational classrooms. The measures presented are cutting edge technologies that include fingerprint identification devices to verify a user's identity, web cameras to record students taking exams and flag the presence of another person in the room nearby that might be providing assistance, software that can recognize typing speed and patterns of a user and flag potential inconsistencies, and a program called Webassessor that serves as an exam proctor matching a student's digital image in a file to one taken by a web cam at the time of the exam. The article notes that despite the availability and lure of these technologies, many college officials have decided to wait to test them on their students, noting the cost. Colleges have been reluctant to implement such overarching methods, but with the push of accreditation agencies and government legislation for accountability, there is a new push to investigate these options.

Grijalva, T., Nowell, C., & Kerkvliet, J. (2006). Academic Honesty and Online Courses. *College Student Journal, 40*(1), 180-5. Retrieved from Education Full Text database.

In order to test if the attributes of college students who cheat in online classes is similar to the attributes of college students who admit to academic dishonesty in the traditional classroom setting, researchers used a random response data methodological approach to correlate student and classroom characteristics to cheating behavior. Using a logistic regression model to estimate the probability of cheating, the results suggested that being aware of others cheating in the course is positively related to the likelihood of cheating. Additionally, they found that increases in a person's grade is negatively related to the likelihood of cheating. They then used the prediction model to estimate the overall prevalence of cheating in online versus traditional classrooms and found no significant difference between the rate of cheating in these two settings.

Harmon, O., & Lambrinos, J. (2008). Are Online Exams an Invitation to Cheat?. *The Journal of Economic Education, 39*(2), 116-25. Retrieved from Education Full Text database.

In this study, the authors used data from two online courses in economics to estimate a model that predicts exam scores from independent variables of student characteristics. In one course, the final exam was proctored, and in the other course, the final exam was not proctored. In both courses, the first three exams were unproctored. If no cheating took place, the authors expected the prediction model to have the same explanatory power for all exams, and, conversely, if cheating occurred in the unproctored exam, the explanatory power would be lower. Their findings are that both across and within class, variations in the R-squared statistic (indicating power of the prediction model) suggest that cheating was taking place when the exams were

not proctored. Results of this study suggest that online exams administered in a proctored environment might help to address the concern for the incidence of academic dishonesty in online courses.

Hudd, S, Apgar, C., Bronson, E., & Lee, R. (2009). Creating a campus culture of integrity: Comparing the perspectives of full and part-time faculty. *Journal of Higher Education, 80* (2), 146- 177.

The article examines the roles of full and part-time faculty in creating a campus culture of integrity. A survey administered to examine the perceptions of full and part time faculty at a small university focused on the following questions: a) do part-time and full time faculty define academic honesty violations in the same way? b) to what extent do they incorporate preventative practices in their classrooms? c) how often do they experience academic dishonesty in their classrooms? and d) when they do observe cheating how do they respond? To examine the relationship between the full-time faculty, part-time faculty, and students, the researchers performed an analysis of variance (ANOVA) test as well as post-hoc Chi-square analyses. Students were more likely than either full-time or part-time faculty to be lenient in their attitudes toward particular behaviors. Results from a Kruskal-Wallis test comparing the views of part-time and full-time faculty reveal that there are only two items on which the opinions of part-time and full-time faculty are substantially different. Part-time faculty are significantly more likely to see the use of unauthorized notes during an exam as a "minor" violation and are significantly more likely to view doing a take home test with another student as minor violation of ethical behavior. Part-time faculty, in general, were more lenient toward cheating behavior and definitions of what constituted cheating.

Jocoy, C., & DiBiase, D. (2006). Plagiarism by Adult Learners Online: A Case Study in Detection and Remediation. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning, 7*(1), 1-15. Retrieved from ERIC database.

The researchers examined the extent of Internet plagiarism in five offerings of an online course between July 2003 and June 2004. This paper presents the results of an investigation of plagiarism prevalence, detection, and remediation among adult learners in an online course focusing specifically on copy-and-paste plagiarism, the copying of another author's language word-for-word without proper citation. The researchers initial assumption was that the adult learners in the online course would be less likely to plagiarize and more likely to have received instruction about academic integrity through previous education. Results of the analyses showed that copying and pasting text from Internet websites was the form of plagiarism that students were most likely to engage in, given the requirements for the assignments. The use of an automated plagiarism detection service, Turnitin.com, noticeably improved the researchers' ability to find and document instances of copy-and-paste plagiarism as manual detection missed nearly 4 in 5 cases of plagiarism.

Kennedy, K., Nowak, S., Raghuraman, R., Thomas, J., & Davis, S. (2000). Academic dishonesty and distance learning: Student and faculty views. *College Student Journal, 34*(2), 309. Retrieved from Academic Search Premier database.

This study explored student and faculty views concerning the relationship between cheating and distance learning. The researchers looked at issues such as type of cheating, rate, and methodology of cheating using questionnaires administered to students and faculty. Analyses of survey responses showed that both male and female faculty members who have taught online

courses were equally divided concerning whether they thought electronic delivery of courses would promote increased academic dishonesty. Faculty and students did not differ in their perception of the ease of cheating in distance learning classes; the majority of both groups (faculty = 64%, students= 57%) felt it would be easier to cheat in the electronic classes. The student data also indicated that whether or not the student reported having cheated in high school or college does not influence the perceived ease of cheating *in* distance learning classes. Both cheaters and non-cheaters perceive cheating as being easier in distance learning classes.

Parameswaran, A. (2007). Student dishonesty and faculty responsibility. *Teaching in Higher Education, 12*(2), 263-274. doi:10.1080/13562510701192073.

The author presents an argument including four main perspectives on dishonesty including a discussion of each. The main focus of the paper is to examine the causes and mechanisms of allowing dishonesty in the classroom. These arguments range from one concerning normative expectations, an argument of doing versus allowing academic dishonesty to occur, unavoidable action, and a position of consequentialism. The author argues that taken together as a whole, these positions strongly suggest that faculty who allow dishonesty are morally responsible for their students' actions. The author of the paper does not present a detailed empirical viewpoint to support his arguments nor does he suggest a framework for testing his theoretical perspective.

Rowe, N. (2004). Cheating in online student assessment: Beyond plagiarism. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration,* 8 (2).

The prevention of plagiarism has been the subject of much attention, but insufficient attention has been given to other problems of dishonesty in online assessment. This is a survey of the types of problems that can occur and what educators can and should do about them.

Spaulding, M. (2009). Perceptions of Academic Honesty in Online vs. Face-to-Face Classrooms. *Journal of Interactive Online Learning*, *8*(3), p. 183-98. Retrieved from Education Full Text database.

This study involved two research questions: 1) Do differences exist between online vs. face-to-face students' perception of the academic integrity of their own behavior based on course type?; and 2) Do differences exist between online and face-to-face students' perceptions of other students' behavior based on course type? The sample consisted of 76 face-to-face students while the online (face to face and online) sections consisted of 27 students. While the courses are the same, the face-to-face sections completed their assignments and tests in class while the online students completed all their assignments and tests outside of a classroom without a proctor. Participants completed the Survey of Student Academic Misconduct (Hard et al., 2006) as a measure of the frequency in which students participated in academic misconduct and the instances in which students believed other students participated in academic misconduct. Results for both research questions failed to demonstrate any significant difference between students enrolled in online versus face to face courses with respect to academic dishonesty.

Sterngold, A. (2004). Confronting plagiarism: How conventional teaching invites cyber-cheating. *Change, 36* (3), 16-21.

In this article, the author discusses the need for a paradigm shift with respect to teaching and learning in the classroom in order to deter plagiarism in the modern day. He focuses on implementing a hands-on, interactive and guided process where the instructor takes on a more active role in walking students through the research process. The plagiarism-prevention strategies described in the article stem from a learning-centered model of teaching that runs counter to the prevailing instruction-based paradigm in higher education. The author mentions that the strategies, originally designed to strengthen students' research and writing skills, deter plagiarism by making it difficult for students to get away with cheating and by eliminating many of the incentives to cheat. The article also commented on the lack of training college instructors receive on developing alternate teaching methods and suggests that this lack of training and reliance on traditional lecture based methods and more traditional assessment only serves to increase the likelihood of cheating by students due to their lack of interest and engagement in the process.

Stuber-McEwen, D., Wiseley, P., & Hoggatt, S. (2009). Point, Click, and Cheat: Frequency and Type of Academic Dishonesty in the Virtual Classroom. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, *12*(3). Retrieved from Education Full Text database.

The purpose of this investigation was to explore the self-reported frequency of academic dishonesty in the virtual classroom. This study also investigated the types of cheating in online and traditional classes to see if cheating took on different forms in these two settings. The investigation took place at a private, mid-size Christian based university located in a mid-western metropolitan city. The survey, a modified academic dishonesty scale, was a 43-item self-report questionnaire designed to measure the following seven types of academic misconduct. A 2 x 2 Chi Square test revealed a significant difference in overall cheating between online and on ground students, $X^2 = 33.75$, $p < .0001$, demonstrating that students in this sample were more likely to cheat in traditional classroom settings and less likely to cheat in online courses.

Suarez, J., & Martin, A. (2001). Internet plagiarism: A teacher's combat guide. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education* [Online serial], *1* (4) . Available: http://www.citejournal.org/vol1/iss4/currentpractice/article2.htm

Defines plagiarism, identifies key signs indicating plagiarism, and provides several helpful guidelines designed to prevent or mitigate inappropriate use of Internet/Web resources. The author points out some several specific examples of things to look for when evaluating a student's work for plagiarism including recognizing writing patterns and shifts in formatting styles that might indicate a copy and paste approach to paper writing. The author also highlights some of the commercially available plagiarism detection services that are available, but fails to discuss the potential issues and problems that come from utilizing these services.

Watson, G., & Sottile, J. (2010). Cheating in the Digital Age: Do students cheat more in online courses?. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, *13*(1). Retrieved from Education Full Text database.

The study examined the level of academic dishonesty prevalent in both live and on-line courses. The data presented were collected from a student response survey given to 635 undergraduate and graduate students attending a mid-sized university in Appalachia. The

authors created and used the Academic Dishonesty Assessment (ADA), which contained a total of 44 yes/no and multiple choice statements and consisted of four parts. The instrument was designed to determine what specific dishonest behaviors students admitted to or knew of other students engaging in face-to-face and online courses. For responding students, 32.1% admitted to having cheated in a live class and 32.7% admitted to cheating in an on-line class at some point in their higher education coursework. Though slightly more students admitted to cheating in on-line courses related to the overall statements, for almost every individual survey statement, more students admitted to inappropriate behavior in face-to-face classes than in on-line courses. Also interesting was that almost twice as many students reported having been caught cheating in a traditional classroom than in an online class.

Williams, S. (2001). How do I know if they're cheating? Teacher strategies in an information age. *Curriculum Journal, 12* (2), 225- 239.

The author identifies four basic teaching mechanisms to help encourage academic honesty in the classroom: a) establishing a culture of honesty, b) continually observing students' work, c) an ongoing review of students' work and d) face-to-face discussion with students about their work. The article is an informative how-to approach that outlines pedagogical strategies that create a classroom environment where students are less likely to be able to cheat and are less likely to be motivated to do so.