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Academic Dishonesty

We regard academic dishonesty as an intentional act of fraud, in which a student seeks to claim credit for the work or efforts of another without authorization, or used unauthorized materials or fabricated information in any academic exercise. We also consider academic dishonesty to include forgery of academic documents, intentionally impeding or damaging the academic work of others, or assisting other students in acts of dishonesty.

~Gehring & Pavela, 1994, p.5
Plagiarism

“In an instructional setting, plagiarism occurs when a writer deliberately uses someone else’s language, ideas, or other original (not common-knowledge) material without acknowledging its source”

~Council of Writing Program Administrators, 2003, p. 1
The National Cheating Figures

• 70-80% of students admit to cheating in high school (Davis & Ludvingson, 1995; Harding et al, 2004)

• 70% of undergraduates admit to academic dishonesty (McCabe, 2005)
The National Cheating Figures

• 28.7% of grad students admit to “cheating,” but when asked about specific behaviors, 75.2% report engaging in academic dishonesty (Wajda-Johnson et al, 2001)
“Students who cheat at the graduate level may be compromising the degree to which they are proficient in their areas of expertise, which could have serious implications for consumers of their services” (Wajda-Johnson et al., 2001)
What about Ohio University?
### Students that Admitted to Cheating in the Past Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OU</th>
<th>Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergraduate Students</strong></td>
<td>84.1%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate Students</strong></td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Students Who Admitted to Engaging in Each Type of Behavior at Least Once in the Past Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Misconduct Type</th>
<th>Undergraduate Students</th>
<th>Graduate Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Misconduct</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copying Sentences</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Misconduct</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Faculty and GTAs Who Have Observed Cheating in Their Classes in the Past 3 Years.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Misconduct</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Misconduct</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copying Sentences</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Misconduct</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Have you ever referred a case of suspected cheating to anyone?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: These figures are based on responses from faculty and graduate students with a teaching assistantship.
# Reported and Expected Incidents of Academic Misconduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Undergrad Enrollment*</th>
<th>Undergrad Reported Cases**</th>
<th>Undergrad Expected Cases</th>
<th>Graduate Enrollment*</th>
<th>Graduate Reported Cases**</th>
<th>Graduate Expected Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>16,218</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7249</td>
<td>2,522</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>16,290</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7282</td>
<td>2,621</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>16,695</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7463</td>
<td>2,543</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>16,854</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7534</td>
<td>2,672</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>16,795</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7507</td>
<td>2,742</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>16,640</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7438</td>
<td>2,636</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>16,761</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7492</td>
<td>2,534</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Enrollment figures are from Athens Final Fall Enrollment headcount from the Office of Institutional Research, available at http://www.ohiou.edu/instres/student/quartenroll/QuartEnrollFALL.html

** Reported incident counts are taken from the University Judiciaries Precedent Report. 2005 figures are incomplete.
### Most Likely Actions of Faculty and GTAs Convinced of Cheating Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fail student on the test/assignment</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inform faculty responsible for the course*</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reprimand or warn student</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss incident with other GTAs*</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report student to University Judiciaries</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report student to a Chair/Director</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail student for the course</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower student's grade</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inform lab coordinator*</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require student to redo the test/assignment</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report student to a Dean</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do nothing</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates GTA only responses. Percentage is of GTAs who responded.
Estimated Marginal Means of Seriousness of Types of Cheating by Group

- **Type of Cheating**: Academic Misconduct, Collaboration, Copying Sentences, Library Misconduct
- **Group**: Undergraduate Student, Graduate Student, Faculty

The graph illustrates the estimated marginal means of seriousness for each type of cheating across different groups. The x-axis represents the type of cheating, while the y-axis denotes the seriousness scale ranging from 3.00 to 5.00.

- **Academic Misconduct**: Faculty > Undergraduate Student > Graduate Student > Faculty
- **Collaboration**: Undergraduate Student > Graduate Student > Faculty
- **Copying Sentences**: Undergraduate Student > Graduate Student > Faculty
- **Library Misconduct**: Undergraduate Student > Graduate Student > Faculty

The data suggests a trend where faculty students generally perceive cheating as more serious compared to graduate and undergraduate students.
Factors that may contribute to academic dishonesty
Motives
(Broeckelman & Pollock, 2006)

• Time pressure
• Cost benefits
• Knowledge
• Trust Relationship
• Culture
“It’s the last minute, you didn’t get to it, and you need to find something else. It’s three thirty in the morning and you just remembered something that’s due tomorrow at eight. It’s either pull an all-nighter or find something that somebody else has…. And sometimes you’re about to crash anyway.”  (interview quotation, Broeckelman & Pollock, 2006)
Cost Benefit

• Importance of Grades
  – Scholarships
  – Jobs
  – Social status

• Lack of incentive not to cheat
Knowledge

• Course material

• Citation techniques
  (Overbey & Guiling, 1999; Park, 2003)

• “Cryptomnesia”  (Marsh, Landau, & Hicks, 1997)
• Mastery Goal Orientation: Student wants to learn. (Midgley, 2000)

• Academic Efficacy: Student feels competent/ has skills needed.
Trust and Relationship

- Students-faculty
- Students-students
Culture

• International differences in understanding “plagiarism” (Holmes, 2004; Sutherland-Smith, 2005)

• General acceptance of dishonesty (Callahan, 2004)
Other factors (Bennett, 2005)

• Major and minor plagiarism less likely:
  – Strong moral positions against plagiarism
  – Integrated into the university
  – Good study skills
• Major plagiarism
  – Increased by fear of failure
  – Mitigated by fear of punishment
• Minor plagiarism associated with
  – Poor academic performance
  – Parental pressure
  – Financial situation in which student must work
  – Goal orientation
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Other factors

- Males and females engage in academic dishonesty at similar rates (McCabe & Trevino, 1996)
- Business and engineering students most likely to cheat (Bowers, 1964; McCabe, 1996; both cited in Harding et al, 2004)
Recommendations
Recommendations

• Short-term: Plagiarism detection software

• Mid-term: Teacher training First year curriculum

• Long-term: Honor code
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Short-Term: Plagiarism Detection Software (Turnitin.com)
Plagiarism Detection Software

1. Compares submitted documents to websites

2. Compares submitted documents to other documents
Concerns

• Citations not detected

• Ownership of material

• Assumed guilt vs trust
Mid-Term Suggestions

• Faculty
  – Instructional training for faculty and GTAs
  – Discussion about problems and issues involved in academic integrity

• Curriculum
  – Education about research and writing standards
  – Online education module
  – *Doing Honest Work in College* in University Experience course
Long Term: Honor System
Honor System

- Schools with honor systems have $\frac{1}{3}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$ less serious test cheating and $\frac{1}{4}$ to $\frac{1}{3}$ less serious cheating on written assignments (McCabe, 2005).
Honor System

• Faculty are more likely to report cases to the institution’s monitoring system (McCabe, Butterfield, & Trevino, 2003).

• Students are more likely to report cheating (McCabe, Trevino, Butterfield, 2001)
Honor Systems

- **Full honor code:** (Melendez, 1985, in McCabe, Trevino, & Butterfield, 1999)
  - Written pledge
  - Majority of judiciary that hears cases made up of students or chair is student
  - Unproctored exams
  - Requirement to report
Honor Systems

• A modified honor code is a better option for large public universities (McCabe & Pavela, 2000).
Modified Honor Code at Kansas State University

• Policy and honor pledge developed by students and faculty.

"On my honor, as a student, I have neither given nor received unauthorized aid on this academic work."

• Resources and presentations provided for student and faculty education by honor system directors and HIPE.
• All violations reported to director, who decides whether case should go to honor council hearing. Records kept in central location.

• All hearing boards composed of students and faculty.

• Course faculty recommend punishments. Students usually receive an XF on their transcript.
“You don’t need to discuss the fact that you use money in the economic sector. That’s your currency. Our currency is honesty and truth, and the way you communicate that is through the university culture.”

(interview quotation, Broeckelman & Pollock, 2006)
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