

Academic Misconduct in Higher Education

Mrs. Hanan Hassan Al-Sarraf

The Public Authority for Applied Education and Training (PAAET)

Abstract: This paper discussed the academic misconduct upon previous research papers. A descriptive design used to collect data from studies done in regions all over the world, including Europe, East Asia, and Sub-Saharan Africa. Prevalence of academic misconduct and how students engage in misconduct in universities and colleges, and strategies to overcome academic misconduct were discussed. In the future direction section, an emphasis is made on the unique challenge academic misconduct presents in the online environment. Lastly, it is recommended to apply a multi-faceted approach in addressing academic misconduct since no single strategy has been found to be effective.

Keywords: Academic, Misconduct, Higher education

Introduction

Education sectors are increasingly being challenged by academic misconduct, an issue involving inappropriate online comments, cheating in assignments, and plagiarism; all which can impact a student negatively (Qaderi, Alexandre & Thomson, 2016). Academic misconduct is especially critical because there has been an increase witnessed in institutions all over the world in recent times. Academic cheating behavior can include enabling others to cheat, copying from another student during an exam, collaborating on an assignment with others without authorization, using cheat sheets, or plagiarism (Fida et al., 2016). Academic misconduct is often something such as collusion or plagiarism, the latter described by Newton (2015) as using work that belongs to another person as though it belongs to you.

Plagiarism usually occurs when work belonging to the original owner is not referenced correctly (Newton, 2015). Collusion, on the other hand, occurs when an attempt is made by two or more individuals to take credit for the same work (Newton, 2015). However, Newton (2015) makes the observation that there is a fine line between productive collaboration and collusion, where the latter seeks to give credit to others for the effort of one individual. In many cases, collusion and plagiarism are considered to be similar. An institutional approach is required to address modern issues of academic integrity, ensuring that a culture of fairness and integrity is in the hands of students and teachers, whilst not ignoring penalizing issues of academic misconduct when they take place (Newton, 2015). This paper argues that academic misconduct is a complex issue which can only be addressed through a multi-faceted approach since no single strategy in isolation has been found to be effective.

Problem Statement

1. It is not easy to know the prevalence of fraud in universities, especially since institutions tend to be separate when such incidents occur (Singh & Rimini, 2016).
2. Fraud also occurs when exam questions are given to students in advance, but even more troubling is when the students take exams for other students in exchange for fees (Singh & Rimini, 2016).
- 3 - Cheating can occur in written work through fictitious writing and plagiarism. Singh and Rimini (2016)
4. It is possible for a person who participates in future plagiarism to be questioned for their performance or even integrity. As such, higher education institutions provide in their regulations a crime that can lead to disciplinary measures. However, it was always difficult to determine the levels of punishment imposed on offenders in cases of plagiarism (Singh & Rimini, 2016).

Previous Research

The propensity to cheat has been researched in numerous programmes of higher education, especially among nursing, medical, and business students due to the effect the role of such students in the future may have if such misconduct is habitual in nature (Fida et al., 2016). Among nursing students, for example, students who have cheated previously may be perceived by their supervisors to be just as honest as the others, a situation that may cause future threat to the quality of care and patients' health (Fida et al., 2016). In a review of forty-six empirical studies, cheating was found to have a prevalence ranging from 9 to 95 percent; in these studies, the mean was 70.4 percent (Fida et al., 2016). Furthermore, the International Center for Academic Ethics found that 39 percent of students at undergraduate level and 62 percent of the same cohort of 71,300 undergraduate students admitted to cheating in exams and written assignments respectively (as cited in Fida et al., 2016, p.4). A common reason why students engage in academic misconduct is pressure to get high grades so that prospects for jobs can improve (Saana et al., 2016). However, a student's gender and age has also been linked to academic misconduct, those who are male and younger more likely to engage in the vice compared to students who are female and older (Saana et al., 2016).

Results of previous research

Over the last decade in Europe and Canada, new models have been crafted as a means to detect, penalize, and mitigate against plagiarism (Glendinning, 2014). Most of these models have thus emerged based on better understanding why plagiarism among students occurs. According to Glendinning (2014), the majority of research has been conducted by academics residing in countries which speak English, especially Australia, North America, and the UK. However, before the *Impact of Policies for Plagiarism in Higher Education across Europe (IPPHEAE) project* was conducted in late 2000's, little research was available on policies which had been endorsed in institutions across Europe (Glendinning, 2014).

IPPHEAE was designed to compare procedures and policies in 27 countries of the European Union, especially on how such countries addressed academic integrity at the master and bachelor's levels (Glendinning, 2014). The survey captured five thousand responses in fourteen languages, the questions mainly focused on level of understanding of policies and procedures, and whether such policies and procedures were effective. Most of the responses from students included a majority from those residing in such countries and a minority from international students in such countries for study (Glendinning, 2014). Among teachers, there were 18 percent who agreed and 4 percent who were in strong agreement that academic dishonesty and plagiarism in institutions of higher learning was monitored by national quality and standards agencies (Glendinning, 2014). This compares to 14 percent disagreement and 9 percent strong disagreement on the same subject. In addition, 52 percent of respondents were not sure if any monitoring occurred. It was also found among senior management and teachers that very few countries in the EU implemented procedures and policies aimed at monitoring academic integrity at master and bachelor's levels. In a country such as Sweden, however, institutions of higher education were expected by the government to forward annual statistics on misconduct cases. Nevertheless, survey participants were pessimistic on the comparability and accuracy of these reports despite their intention to show progress and trends on academic integrity (Glendinning, 2014).

Among Austrian teachers, only 11 percent were of the view that monitoring of academic dishonesty and plagiarism was conducted by national agencies in institutions of higher learning, while 22 percent disagreed and 56 percent unsure if any monitoring occurred (Glendinning, 2014). In this same cohort, 47 percent did not know who monitored procedures and policies on plagiarism, while 5 percent, 17 percent, and 34 percent responded that monitoring was conducted by a national agency, institutional quality manager, and at faculty level respectively. In essence, these results showed policies at national level were not communicated effectively (Glendinning, 2014).

In the Republic of Ireland and the UK, higher percentages of teachers indicated responsibility for monitoring was by institutional quality managers and faculties (Glendinning, 2014). These findings along with other evidence obtained at the institutional and national level showed that the majority of institutions in the Republic of Ireland and the UK had policies in place to address academic integrity and that there was recording of plagiarism and academic misconduct at some level. Table 1 below illustrates what both teachers and students thought would happen if plagiarism occurred. It is notable that over 50 percent of both teachers and students felt a re-write of an assignment would be requested while more teachers than students were of the view that a re-write would be required of a project or dissertation (Glendinning, 2014). Interestingly, those who took the view that no action would be taken, or there would be a suspension or expulsion was in the minority. These findings illustrate the diversity and/or effect of policies and procedures put in place to address academic misconduct (Glendinning, 2014).

Table 1: E-U Wide Responses on Sanctions for plagiarism

Assignment		Project or Dissertation		Students n=3906 Teachers n=687
Student	Teacher	Student	Teacher	
21%	16%	5%	5%	No action would be taken
50%	48%	15%	20%	Verbal warning
27%	17%	27%	20%	Formal warning letter
52%	54%	35%	49%	Request to re write it properly
54%	52%	42%	42%	Zero mark for the work
38%	33%	26%	25%	Repeat the module or subject
38%	30%	28%	24%	Fail the module or subject
11%	6%	19%	10%	Repeat the whole year of study
13%	9%	33%	21%	Fail the whole programme or degree
14%	5%	19%	9%	Expose the student to school community
14%	8%	29%	18%	Suspended from the institution
12%	2%	30%	4%	Expelled from the institution
13%	1%	20%	2%	Suspend payment of student grant
11%	8%	10%	8%	Other

Source: (Glendinning, 2014, p.12).

Despite methodological differences, demographics of participants, or region under study, there are common themes which emerge from studies about plagiarism; plagiarism is easily identifiable by most students, and most students are aware that it is wrong but they prefer lighter penalties than those that staff would suggest (Newton, 2015). For example, a study among UK undergraduates that had been newly enrolled found to perceive themselves as well understood on the subject of plagiarism, but their skills in referencing were shown to be very poor (Newton, 2015). Significantly, they were of the view that light penalties should be imposed on academic misconduct in comparison to what was being imposed by their institutions of higher learning.

However, there was a positive relationship between recommended penalties and performance with confidence, inferring that students who were confident did better on referencing and were of the opinion that penalties for misconduct should be severe (Newton, 2015). This kind of relationship has also been found among postgraduate students, who show more strictness, confidence, and awareness of fundamental referencing concepts compared to their undergraduate colleagues (Newton, 2015). Interestingly, Newton's (2015) study found that students were aware of the meaning of plagiarism, but were at the same time in the dark about referencing. This is an important observation because proper referencing is important to ensure one does not commit plagiarism. In addition, simple types of plagiarism (e.g. cutting and pasting content), as well as uncomplicated collusion was known to most students but plagiarism of ideas was not as obvious to the students (Newton, 2015).

In Canada, a study conducted in Humber College among 21 students by Quaderi et al. (2016) found that students who were tested on academic integrity policy after exposure to either the policy in audio visual form or in text form showed no difference in results. Importantly, students with incorrect

responses also showed high levels of confidence in relation to how they responded. Quaderi et al. describe this phenomenon as the fool's dilemma, one which is unfortunate since academic dishonesty can be tragic in a professional or academic career. The table below shows the difference between the levels of confidence in submissions compared to the lack of confidence.

Table 2: Confidence of Incorrect Submissions

Test Type		Frequency	Percent
Written	Not Confident	17	16.50
	Confident	86	83.50
Total		103	100
Video	Not Confident	16	23.88
	Confident	49	73.13
	Missing	2	2.99
Total		67	100

Source: (Quaderi et al. 2016, p.1168)

As Table 2 above illustrates, those who read the written academic integrity policy and gave incorrect answers were 86 in number and possessed high confidence level compared to the 17 who gave correct answers but only showed a low level of confidence. These results were closely replicated among students who watched a presentation of the audio-visual academic integrity policy. In this group, 49 students gave incorrect answers yet they were very confident of their responses compared to 16 who had little confidence but gave correct responses.

Despite availability of regulations focused on academic misconduct in Sub-Saharan Africa, issues such as little institutional support and resources, little access to scientific literature, and poor written English have been found to contribute to plagiarism (Saana et al., 2016). Students who do not have reading materials and who do not have good skills in English may find it easier to replicate text in reference materials. Unintentional plagiarism may also occur among students having little training in plagiarism. As such, many of these crucial factors should be taken into consideration when academic misconduct is examined in developing countries. As Saana et al. (2016) observe, this is an important consideration so that intentional behavior can be distinguished from unintentional behavior.

It has been shown that little understanding of what constitutes academic misconduct often leads to unethical behavior, making it vital to compare students' awareness of academic misconduct with what is contained in regulations within their institutions (Saana et al., 2016). However, little research has been conducted in sub-Saharan Africa. This lack of data causes difficulties for teaching staff, policy makers, and leaders in institutions of higher learning to know which strategies are effective in their context. In Ghana,

for example, no study has been published to analyze the link between the likelihood that students will engage in academic misconduct and their knowledge of institutional policies (Saana et al., 2016).

Therefore, Saana et al.'s (2016) study among undergraduate students in Ghana is very relevant. In the study, 92 percent of students reported an awareness of regulations about academic misconduct in their institutions, but only 31 percent fully understood such regulations. Most believed that their instructors understood the regulations better than they did. Interestingly, 40 percent of students surveyed reported witnessing academic misconduct among other students, but 94 percent had not made any reports about these cases. Most importantly, academic misconduct was found to be caused by pressure from guardians and family, high load in school, and the pursuit for high grades. Students also believed it was an offense to copy another student's work without their consent but it was alright to do so as long as there was consent (Saana et al., 2016).

In the last 35 years in East Asia, higher education in China has witnessed tremendous growth, evidence being the huge number of students who graduate and the large volume of publications (Yang, 2015). This growth in higher education has significance for the rest of the world. In fact, the development is a research priority across the world. However, Yang (2015) points out that other achievements in China are easily acknowledged but how development of higher education will be in future is questionable. Some believe Chinese universities are on a path to be world class and a challenge to supremacy of the West, while others view the concept that China is world class as imitative. Nevertheless, the model of excellence as defined in the West is not accepted by Chinese universities (Yang, 2015).

According to Yang (2015), an effective academic institution is defined by its academic culture. Universities which are world class need an academic culture that is vibrant and merit based so that their performance and productivity can be guaranteed. Academic culture is the values, beliefs and attitudes that academics hold dear in their work (Yang, 2015). Other terms which are widely used in relation to academic culture include corruption, misconduct, ethics, and integrity. There is a special place for higher education, and as such, an academic culture perceived to be corrupt damages an institution's standing in society (Yang, 2015).

Part of academic culture is the regulations and rules for faculty behavior and philosophy that defines academic work (Yang, 2015). It also includes what faculty believes about critical thinking and original research. Yang (2015) posits the view that academic culture in higher institutions of learning in East Asia is a critical barrier for being considered to be in the leading status category. As Young points out, values such as meritocracy and free inquiry, as well as competition, are not taken seriously. As Yang further observes, academic misconduct is largely present where quality assurance programmes are weak and external supervision is minimal. In addition, academic misconduct is prevalent in societies where corruption is pervasive. One of the regions of the world with these weaknesses is East Asia (Yang, 2015).

Across East Asia, academic dishonesty is pervasive and includes scientific fraud as well as cheating by students (Yang, 2015). In Taiwan and Hong Kong, there have been increasing incidents of academic dishonesty. The situation in South Korea is similarly dire; many politicians and academics have been found to have engaged in the vice. In fact, South Koreans refer to their country as the “Republic of Plagiarism” (cited in Yang, 2015, p.5). In Japan, a good social system has not prevented academic misconduct. In the 2000’s, for example, academic misconduct in the scientific community was widespread.

In China, academic culture is largely defined as academic cronyism, a culture that has become challenging and decadent all the way back from the 1990s (Yang, 2015). Academic misconduct has penetrated all institutions of higher learning, and includes cover-up of academic scandals, using bribery and reward to get access to scientific research projects, and the endemic issue of plagiarism in academic work. The people involved in this misconduct include academicians, institutional leaders, professors, and students. Yang (2015) argues that Chinese academic culture is a reflection of the larger society, where government promotions can be more rewarding than academic work. This leads Chinese scholar into the trap of administrative prestige instead of concentrating on academic research (Yang, 2015).

Many studies have examined academic dishonesty among students and differences in cheating in relation to culture, but not many have questioned academic staff on the matter (Yekta et al., 2014). According to Yekta et al. (2014), cheating and academic dishonesty in different cultures may be interpreted differently or perceived in varying ways. In different countries, students may hold differing opinions on what is considered right and wrong. In fact, past research has shown that students from different cultures hold different views on dishonest behaviors (e.g. Chapman & Lupton, 2004), and actually hold different perspectives on the concept of dishonest behavior (Yekta et al., 2014).

However, in their study in one American university and another in an Iranian university among 226 members of the academic staff, Yekta et al. (2014) found similarities and differences on perspectives among staff from USA’s Central Washington University compared to those of staff from Iran’s University of Medical Sciences. In their responses, Iranian teachers said they believed most students were dishonest during exams, and in fact knew of some students who had cheated. This is an important finding because fewer teachers from the USA held similar views. Nevertheless, the Iranian cohort pointed out that their classes were quite large, and it would be often difficult to issues related to impersonations and checking plagiarism due to the heavy workload (Yekta et al., 2014).

The most distinguishing fact was that Iranian members of staff had a markedly lower understanding of what constitutes academic dishonesty in comparison to their American counterparts. As such, they are not best placed to recognize dishonesty among their students. However, Yekta et al. argue that the difference cannot be placed on cultural factors. Rather, the higher level of academic dishonesty and little knowledge on the concept is a systematic issue. It may thus be imprudent to merely focus on

cultural differences on the subject of academic dishonesty. Interestingly, Iran has fewer cases of academic misconduct than the USA, but this may be because it is less reported in Iran; pointedly, the study showed higher numbers of teachers in Iran believing their students cheat compared to teachers in the USA (Yekta et al., 2014).

Academic dishonesty is challenging enough in traditional classrooms, but even more of a challenge in online programs where the use of technology for instruction and learning is fundamental (McGee, 2013). Since the Education Opportunity Act of 2008 (HEOA) obligates providers of online courses to minimize opportunities for students to cheat and also ensure that they verify the identity of students, all stakeholders in online delivery of courses should be acquainted with issues to do with academic misconduct, or what may be regarded as eCheating (McGee, 2013). Apart from collusion and plagiarism that have been mentioned in this paper before, online academic dishonesty also involves deception, technology manipulation, and misrepresentation (McGee, 2013).

Deception and collusion may appear to infer similar meaning but while collusion may be consensual, deception means that a student intentionally deviates from an agreement on what should be used to do an assignment (McGee, 2013). All types of academic dishonesty are deceptive, but academic dishonesty which is termed deception is unique because a student does something without permission or engages in collusion. This can include copying another student's work without permission, using peer or private instructor notes, or using assistance from someone outside of class during an assessment (McGee, 2013).

Technology can also assist students to bypass course assignments or tasks (McGee, 2013). Whether online or on campus students get to know that interruptions in technology can give opportunities deemed acceptable for not furnishing an assignment on time. In certain cases, students may interfere with an internet connection so that they are provided an opportunity to do a class assignment at a later date (McGee, 2013). In addition, students who are technically savvy may be able to access other students' work that has been forwarded in the assignment area or even access pre-set answers. These types of tactics may be minimized with more secure systems over time (McGee, 2013).

Misrepresentation of identity also occurs in online courses (McGee, 2013). While students expend huge sums to learn for a degree or certification, it is sometimes appealing to falsify identity especially when there is a demand for effort and time. Misrepresentation can include purchasing of projects or papers that have been written by a service or individual (McGee, 2013). Since students have to pay for college tuition, it seems amazing that they also afford to pay for projects or papers written by others on their behalf, but it continues to happen. In addition, misrepresentation includes paying another to go through a course on their behalf, something that is especially possible in the online environment. In this type of misrepresentation, the student is totally distanced from his/her own responsibility for learning, and as such does not gain from the course experience (McGee, 2013).

Arguing based on the fool's dilemma; it can be assumed that students who elect to engage in academic misconduct may in fact be confident they are doing the right thing (Quaderi et al., 2016). According to Penny (2010), the concept of the fool's dilemma is pervasive and in everyone. The concept posits that people in different situations may believe they are correct when in fact they are incorrect. If the fool's dilemma does not receive attention, Penny argues that it can be of major concern in later years. The fool's dilemma is also similar to what is dubbed the *Dunning-Kruger Effect* where unskilled individuals may possess an illusionary dominance which is not the case in actual reality (Quaderi et al., 2016). In that respect, therefore, a policy on academic integrity is a critical issue that should be thoroughly understood by students. Significantly, students who show no inclination to care about academic integrity only perpetuate the concern, and are at a disadvantage because they do not study the tools that can aid in their success (Quaderi et al., 2016).

Transgressive behavior can be examined from a social-cognitive perspective (Fida et al., 2016). According to Fida et al. (2016), Bandura perceived humans as active agents, individuals who have the capacity to influence their actions. Such self-regulatory actions are crucial in exercising human moral agency depending on their moral and ethical norms that have been learned through their social systems (Fida et al., 2016). According to Bandura, such self-regulatory processes could be those that engage with positive moral principles or those that cause what he termed sanctionable behavior in the social system. In essence, self-regulatory processes work to keep one within the bounds of social norms but also act to suppress actions perceived to be sanctionable. Importantly, self-regulatory processes are founded in one's belief of how much control they have over their moral behavior (Fida et al., 2016).

Fida et al. (2016) argue that workplace ethical conduct can be understood if the underlying processes that determine misbehavior are examined, and if the period of vocational education is researched. Fida et al. thus grounded their longitudinal study among 866 nursing students on social-cognitive theory, taking the self regulatory moral system and analyzing its opposite dimensions to determine how such opposite dimensions have an influence on cheating behavior in the academics. In the study, the two opposite dimensions were regulatory self-efficacy and moral disengagement. The study found that the two dimensions impact cheating behavior differently (Fida et al., 2016)

Firstly, regulatory self efficacy is able to suppress misconduct (Fida et al., 2016). Secondly, cheating behavior and moral disengagement supported each other. In other words, people who engaged in misconduct are more likely to continue with such negative behavior (Fida et al., 2016). It is critical to understand the processes which take place in vocational education if unethical conduct in the workplace can be prevented among students who graduate and thereby join employment to make decisions which may affect the lives of people; the receipt of a degree by a cheating student is not equal to the same award given to an honest student (Fida et al., 2016).

Solutions

In the UK, the penalty for plagiarism or collusion is usually denial of credit for the assignment; a method of academic penalty that is common in many institutions of higher learning, albeit policies in different countries vary as well as how collusion and plagiarism is defined (Newton, 2015). However, there are various pedagogical and institutional measures that can be taken to address violations of academic integrity among science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) undergraduates (Gilmore, Maher & Feldon, 2016). While all of these strategies are old, some are current. However, they can all be employed to instill academic integrity among STEM students and in their future professional career.

Honor codes have been developed by many institutions of higher learning to prevent violations of academic integrity; these are statements that lay out expect behavior of all persons in the institution (Gilmore et al., 2016). In institutions which apply honor codes, students sign pledges that commit them to be of good conduct during specific assessments. In addition, students are expected to report any violations of academic integrity. In institutions with honor codes, students form groups which review and decide on the consequences of violations. Gilmore et al. (2016) posit the view that honor codes can minimize incidences of academic misconduct; in some cases, there are 25 percent fewer STEM students who report misconduct when compared to students in institutions that do not have honor codes.

However, Gilmore et al. posit the view that honor codes are only effective when students report violations and also take responsibility for their learning. Unfortunately, a previous study found that only 22 percent of honor code students reported academic misconduct when they witnessed it (cited in Gilmore et al., 2016, p.737). It is therefore important to foster a culture of integrity and responsibility.

Issues of academic integrity can be addressed by offering a program on professional ethics and morality, even though it is not compulsory for STEM students to go through such programs (Gilmore et al., 2016). When such programs are offered, they will often be in engineering courses. According to Gilmore et al. (2016), these programs are nevertheless few. In the 2000's, for example, it was compulsory for only 20-27 percent of students in undergraduate engineering. Consequently, many students who take engineering programs graduate without learning ethical codes in their field of study (Gilmore et al., 2016).

Faculties have responsibility for their disciplines and are therefore critical in ensuring that their students learn academic integrity (Gilmore et al., 2016). Despite the importance of this undertaking, a discussion on academic integrity rarely occurs between them and their students nor do they give students standards of academic integrity which are clear. Clarifying integrity standards is crucial in higher leaning institutions without honor codes (Gilmore et al., 2016). Terms contained in the standards are similarly important since the concept of plagiarism, as an example, does not have a universal view. Plagiarism

should not only be defined, but also explored in practice through proper paraphrasing and referencing (Gilmore et al., 2016).

Most importantly, international STEM students should be given guidance that helps to avoid plagiarism since their textual practices of borrowing may differ (Gilmore et al., 2016). In that respect, faculty should not attempt to make the implication that Western traditions are right, but insist that scholarship practices of the West should be respected since they are attending Western institutions of higher learning (Gilmore et al., 2016). While appreciating the importance of teaching academic integrity in all courses, it is especially important in STEM courses because STEM undergraduate programs are very competitive, and its collaborative nature may be particularly prone to academic misconduct. Additionally, faculty must take a more proactive role in reporting plagiarism and cheating violations. Among other things, they often fail to do so due to lack of awareness about institutional procedures and policies, or the belief that sanctions recommended by the institution are too severe (Gilmore et al., 2016).

Efforts to reduce academic dishonesty in online settings

- Constant Reminders of Integrity

Letting students know the importance of academic honesty is a strategy that has been successful to minimize misconduct (McGee, 2013). Giving a clear definition of academic dishonesty and also issuing policy within the syllabus as well as attaching such policies to presentations or class assignments provides a message which is unambiguous about expected ethical conduct and consequences for violations. Constant reminders to students in this manner provides cognitive clues which appear just in time to be ignored, and also provide a record that policy on academic misconduct has been disseminated. In this way, no student can then plead ignorance (McGee, 2013).

- Delivering Assessments with Foresight

Effective and appropriate online assessments which minimize academic misconduct include using social media tools to administer random tests or quizzes (McGee, 2013). One example of a social media tool is text messages. In addition, test items can be designed so that a student has to rely on their text (McGee, 2013). Moreover, tests can be given and answers expected the same day, and students can be issued with different versions of an assessment to minimize collusion. Most importantly, passwords to online tests should be issued just before the release of the exam and there should be a time limit to complete the assessment (McGee, 2013).

- Making use of Technology

Providing students with laptops is another strategy through which cheating can be minimized (McGee, 2013). To confirm the identity of the student taking a test, a webcam can be used to enable easy identification of students by the instructor. Biometrics are an effective means of identification which can

be required to access assessments through the laptop; fingerprint and face recognition are two examples that can be used (McGee, 2013).

- Pedagogical Strategies

Academic dishonesty can also be minimized through pedagogical solutions (McGee, 2013). It is important at the beginning of a course for a student's moral and ethical orientation towards academic dishonesty to be assessed. When students learn about their moral development, it helps them to reduce incidences of academic dishonesty (McGee, 2013). Instruments such as *Ethical Position Questionnaire* and *Beliefs and Values Questionnaire*, among others, can aid a student and instructor to know the direction of ethical behavior. Using these instruments allows for an emphasis on ethical behavior among students when they do assignments (McGee, 2013).

McGee (2013) posits the view that responsible behavior among students is possible when they are accountable for their effort. This is important in the online environment where behavior is not easy to observe. As such, course requirements must have accountability at their core. Significantly, complacency among students can be minimized if consequences for dishonesty are clear (McGee, 2013). In addition, different types of assessments should be used so that the achievements students make can be examined in different ways so that cheating becomes even more difficult (McGee, 2013). Assessments can include classroom assessment methods, quizzes, blogs or journals, and discussions, etc. Table 3 below shows the most notable types of assessments known to instructors (Baille & Jortberg, 2009; as cited in McGee, 2013, p.20).

Table 3: Different types of Assessments for Online Learning

Responses from Instructors	Frequency	Percent
Homework assignments	665	20%
Online tests and/or quizzes	606	19%
Bulletin-board postings	547	17%
Projects/papers	494	15%
Participation in chat room	313	10%
Proctored tests and/or quizzes	234	7%
Team projects	149	5%
Reflective journal	92	3%
Student portfolio	79	2%
Other	31	1%
TOTAL	3,200	100%

Source: (McGee, 2013, p.20)

Given the different types of online assessment available, strategies for authentication of identify become especially important in online courses (McGee, 2013). In addition, many services offer doing course work or projects for students, therefore it is critical for authentication of identity to be done by

institutions. In The US, for example, the Department of Education requires identity authentication by all online course providers (McGee, 2013).

Students now have access to large amounts of pre-written material over the internet, giving institutions of higher learning all over the world challenges in relation to plagiarism, attribution, and authorship (Owens & White, 2013). The fact that there are so many types of policy responses suggests that it is still a struggle to address academic misconduct. It is undesirable that institutions have to deal with academic misconduct because it slows down the creation of useful knowledge and transforming learners into people who can think critically (Owens & White, 2013). It is therefore refreshing to know that educators and researchers are confronting the affront on academic integrity through the use of educational techniques, including online modules to more holistic interventions in the classroom (Owens & White, 2013).

There are a number of methods used to minimize plagiarism, one such method being the use of plagiarism detection software that matches what students have written in their text to external sources; thus indicating the degree of originality of student work through a percentage (Owens & White, 2013). As McGee (2013) point out, plagiarism software such as 'Turnitin' can be used to detect material which has been plagiarized (McGee, 2013).

Notably, plagiarism software works as a deterrent, but however fails to take into accounts reasons for plagiarizing (Owens & White, 2013). As such, this deterrent approach suggests that it is mainly punitive and not educative. Students can also deploy plagiarism software to test originality of their work. In this way, students can re-write their assignments (Owens & White, 2013). However, there has been criticism of using the software in this way because it allows students many chances instead of crafting an original piece of work from the beginning. As Owens and White (2013) point out, a pro-active strategy that allows students to acquire the skills and knowledge to write in an original fashion is more effective.

Academic misconduct is best addressed through a longitudinal, evidence-based, and multi-layered approach (Owens & White, 2013). In their study, Owens and White therefore discuss the results of such an approach among students in their first-year in psychology over the course of ten semesters consecutively. In the first semester of 2007, assignments were submitted by students online, and plagiarism software was used to determine originality of their work (Owens & White, 2013). During this period, students were aware that plagiarism software had been deployed and were also aware of the consequences through course manuals and lectures. This initial period was thus the phase of deterrence as the only approach (Owens & White, 2013). Over subsequent semesters with different cohorts of size ranging from 950 to 2000, in-class and interactive online exercises were introduced to teach skills in referencing, writing, and education about plagiarism.

Table 4: The Strategies and their Different Phases

Year	Semester 1 Essay (PSYC1001)	Semester 2 Report (PSYC1002)
2007	Plagiarism software introduced and students explicitly warned (deterrent only)	Plagiarism software introduced and students explicitly warned (deterrent only)
2008	Writing exercise performed in class with feedback/examples online	Online feedback (from writing exercise) reposted online and emphasised
2009–2010	Writing mastery quiz introduced for course marks (this plus all previous interventions maintained in 2010)	Writing mastery quiz repeated with some modifications (this plus all previous interventions maintained in 2010)
2011	All of the above plus a new writing tutorial with peer feedback on writing within class	All of the above

Source: (Owens & White, 2013, p.16).

Table 4 above illustrates the different phases of the intervention strategies from 2007 to 2011 among 14,338 students. To determine how effective these strategies were, serious plagiarism occurred when there was over 50 percent similarity of a student's work to other work either belonging to another student or derived from internet sources (Owens & White, 2013).

In the 5 year period of intervention running from 2007 to 2011, only 109 incidents of plagiarism occurred through direct copying of online materials or copying from one another. Decreases in plagiarism became more pronounced when other intervention strategies were introduced along with the initial plagiarism software. Owens and White (2013) acknowledge that it is difficult to know which individual strategy was most effective, but the multi-faceted approach was more successful than any single intervention could have been.

Prins, Jones and Lathrop (2014) also reported on a multi-faceted intervention strategy incorporating monitoring and detection, as well as education and collaboration implemented in 2005 at a Canadian university's Faculty of Applied Health Sciences with an undergraduate population of between 17,000 and 18,190. According to Prins et al. (2014), the strategy borrowed from recommendations found in research literature on academic integrity. These recommendations included the crafting of effective policies, giving educational opportunities, deploying effective teaching and learning methods, and utilizing standards of invigilation and penalties (Prins et al., 2014).

In the intervention, collaboration was effected through a drafted academic integrity policy that was then disseminated to staff and students, and a committee to monitor its implementation established (Prins et al., 2014). A budget to educate both staff and students was made, and all faculties were issued with standardized protocols for assessment, e.g. including integrity policy in syllabi, 5 percent late penalty for assignments, and inclusion of referencing standards across the courses. In addition, monitoring and detection was implemented through a process of investigating and reporting, and publishing annual

misconduct statistics. Prins et al. (2014) note that the use of this comprehensive strategy led to reduced cases of academic misconduct in all faculties.

Policy implementation decisions are often contained in a wider range of codes and requirements (Morris & Carroll, 2016). In the United Kingdom, for instance, academic integrity requirements are declared by the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA), an independent institution that advises and safeguards higher education standards. For decision makers in the UK, the QAA Quality Code gives sound practice indicators for a wide set of issues that have an impact on quality for learners (Morris & Carroll, 2016). On assessment, the QAA indicators recommend that providers of higher education operate procedures for investigating, identifying, preventing, and taking action against dishonest academic behavior (Morris & Carroll, 2016). In the majority of institutions of higher learning, the goals of academic integrity include exhorting of scholarly conduct among students and encouraging integrity and honesty in the wider community of the university (Morris & Carroll, 2016).

However, such goals are inconsequential if those mandated to implement are not well resources or engaged. In addition, different contexts have specific priorities and pressures (Morris & Carroll, 2016). In Sweden, for example, the number of cases related to academic dishonesty has increased significantly, but disciplinary cases have been very few (Witmer & Johansson, 2015). Despite the fact that structures for reporting and governance are in place to track and report academic misconduct, applying discipline is a subjective activity that depends on the judgment and opinions of faculty in the institution. In their study using annual reports from the Swedish National Agency for Higher Education (SNAHE), Witmer and Johansson (2015) found that only 0.23 percent of students in Swedish universities attending school on a full time basis faced disciplinary measures for academic misconduct. This is a small percentage considering that 60-70 percent of students have typically mentioned in self-reports that they engage in academic misconduct (Witmer & Johansson, 2015).

There are generally a number of issues that are barriers to implementation and assimilation of a policy for academic integrity (Morris & Carroll, 2016). Firstly, staff expected to implement policy may have different understanding on issues of academic integrity. Such different understanding may also be in addition to differences in willingness and preferences in getting committed to addressing such matters. Additionally, staff may have different views on how academic misconduct should be handled. Secondly, policies on academic integrity may remain "on the shelf", preventing such policies to be reviewed regularly (Morris & Carroll, 2016). Thirdly, stakeholders should appreciate that there are no quick solutions for academic misconduct among students. Instead, it should be understood that institutions must invest time and resources for change to take place (Morris & Carroll, 2016).

Significantly, Morris and Carroll (2016) observe that most research on academic misconduct has centered on students, their reasons for plagiarizing and if they know of institutional policy on the subject. However, achieving a holistic approach needs to take into consideration the role of staff (Morris & Carroll,

2016). These include senior managers, administrators, and teachers. The questions to ask are whether staff is engaged or even aware of the contents of the policy, and whether they are willing to get involved in resolving issues of academic misconduct. Due to the inevitable diversity of academic staff, prior conceptions and beliefs and attitudes on collusion, plagiarism, cheating, and student learning will vary (Morris & Carroll, 2016).

These types of varied beliefs affect their reaction to academic misconduct in students, some perceiving it as an issue and preferring to ignore it among new students with the assumption that such students will acquire better skills with time (Morris & Carroll, 2016). Others may disagree with penalties for academic misconduct, while many more may ignore the issue because they have little understanding of procedure or it will be time consuming to resolve. To overcome these varied concerns, it is important to empathize with their concerns, especially where they feel issues of academic misconduct are time consuming and also in situations where academic integrity policy is not well understood (Morris & Carroll, 2016). Among those staff who should be engaged include senior staff who require intelligence and data on the issues, professional staff who may be required to design procedures, academic support staff whose job is to aid students in skill acquisition, quality assurance specialists who may be mandated to monitor procedures, and teaching staff who are best placed to recognize academic misconduct since they are involved in all facets of learning and assessment (Morris & Carroll, 2016).

Governments across the world are increasingly galvanizing their citizens to earn post-secondary degrees through which they can derive benefit as individuals and to society as a whole (Becker & Toutkoushian, 2013). In many countries, education is also perceived to be a tool for economic development that can allow nations to compete with each other. Higher education has matured in some nations to the extent students have a range of choices to choose from, whereas other less mature education systems have fewer options for students that causes trans-boundary movement in search of post-secondary degrees (Becker & Toutkoushian, 2013).

There are also different philosophies in how countries manage their higher education systems. In the past, the centralized management model was common in many countries. In this model, decisions about which student could attend which institution, the distribution of students across institutions, and which universities and colleges could operate, were all made by the central government (Becker & Toutkoushian, 2013).

However, many countries are now encouraging a decentralized model in higher education through which students are able to select post-secondary institutions of their choice and which also allows institutions to freely compete for resources and students (Becker & Toutkoushian, 2013). Through such a decentralized model, it is hoped that the higher education sector will become more productive and as such create better standards of living. But as Becker and Toutkoushian (2013) point out, this specter of what

some now term academic capitalism or commercialization is raising concern because it changes the nature of academe as colleges and universities look for avenues to raise revenues.

In addition, the prestige that institutions derive from donative resources leads to a stratification and consequent "arms race in academe" among universities and colleges (Becker & Toutkoushian, 2013, p.324). In this environment of competition among elites and other post-secondary institutions, Becker and Toutkoushian wonder what it means for students' educational opportunities. As Robert Reich, the labor secretary during President Clinton's administration once noted, higher education is now similar to any other personal service industry; the market now sells higher education products in the new marketisation of higher education. Most importantly, marketization of higher education can have negative consequences including an emphasis on degree production rather than critical thinking among students (Becker & Toutkoushian, 2013).

Research Methodology:

The descriptive approach was used in the preparation of research, where it is considered the most appropriate and most widely used in the study of human and social phenomena where it is difficult to subject some phenomena to experimentation and testing. The research and descriptive studies remain the only method to study many phenomena.

Study Population: The study population consists of all departments in higher education.

The study sample: The sample of this study consists of the departments of higher education, which numbered (15) samples from all sections.

How about sampling?

Data assessment Tools:

The researcher used the Likert method to construct the current scale as one of the methods used in constructing the measurements:

- 1 - Easy construction and debugging.
2. Provides a more homogeneous measure.
- 3 - Allows the respondent to indicate the degree or intensity of his feelings.
- 4 - allows to detect the difference between individuals.
5. Compiles a large number of paragraphs relevant to the behavioral phenomenon to be measured.
6. Help us ensure that the metric is one-dimensional, that is, all of its paragraphs measure one thing.
7. Do not require when using a large number of rulers.

Study Procedures:

Based on the nature of the data to be collected, the methodology used in the study, the time allowed, and the available material resources, the researcher found that the most appropriate tool for achieving the

objectives of this study is the questionnaire. This is because it is difficult to obtain the basic information related to the subject through other tools such as interviews Personal, field visits, or personal observation.

Statistical Methods:

1. Frequency and percentage.
- Pearson correlation coefficient.
3. Test test
- 4-Alpha Kronbach.

Results and interpretation of the questionnaire:

The current research is designed to achieve a specific objective of Academic Misconduct in Higher Education from the point of view of those around it. Therefore, the search results for this goal will be presented and interpreted as follows:

Most of the students (94%) admitted cheating at least once during their studies. The most frequent type of misconduct was 'signing in an absent student on a class attendance list' (89.1%), and the least frequent 'paying for passing an examination' (0.7%). The number of committed types of misconduct out of 11 listed types increased from Year 2 (median 2) to Year 6 (median 4). Cheating behaviours could be clustered into 4 groups based on self-reported cheating, perceived prevalence of cheating, attitude towards cheating, and willingness to report cheating. The clustered behaviours that most students admitted to were perceived as the most frequent, more approved of and less likely to be reported. The strongest predictors of dishonest behaviour were attitude, perception of peer group behaviour and study year. Almost half (44%) the students said they would never report any form of cheating.

Discussion and recommendations

Students are often ill-informed or unaware of the consequences or impact of academic misconduct; in fact, students may become aware when it is very late (Quaderi et al., 2016). In a recent case at Dalhousie University, dentistry students in their fourth year were involved in hate speech over social media. Quaderi et al. (2016) point out that these types of issues bring the re-examination of academic integrity to the fore within the academic community. The authors further note that academic integrity has commonly been used to refer to cheating and plagiarism, but it has now been expanded to include behavior outside the school and also online behavior.

Past research has shown that 40-80 percent of students have engaged in academic misconduct in institutions of higher education, some of the studies indicating that students had witnessed academic misconduct occur or that they had actually been participants on one occasion at the very least (Saana, Ablordeppey, Mensah & Karikari, 2016). In one study among nursing students, 8-39 percent had engaged in academic misconduct while 61-94 percent indicated they knew their colleagues had engaged in

academic misconduct; in another, institutions of higher education in New Zealand and Australia reported 342 academic misconduct cases in one year (as cited in Saana et al., 2016, p.1).

Developing countries have also reported cases of academic misconduct, one study in Nigeria finding 54.2 percent of undergraduate students in pharmacy had engaged in academic misconduct (as cited in Saana et al., 2016, p.2). According to Saana et al. (2016), academic misconduct is often in institutions having a high ratio of students to teachers, something that is prevalent in the developing world.

Plagiarism is a complex issue, compounded by different reasons to plagiarize, and then fact that plagiarism takes many forms (Owens & White, 2013). As such, no single method can be used successfully to minimize rates of plagiarism. In essence, the one-size-fits all approach has not been found to be successful (Owens & White, 2013).

It is important to impart the tenets of academic integrity on undergraduate students, but it is even more important to teach the subject to graduate students since they teach 50 percent of courses at undergraduate level (Gilmore et al., 2016). This is critical because it has been shown that academic misconduct has a 32 percent higher chance of occurring when teaching is conducted by graduate students (Gilmore et al., 2016). In addition, faculty staff should be engaged in the institution's integrity policy since they are the ones who will first notice cases of misconduct among students.

However, McGee (2013) makes an important point when he argues that pedagogical solutions can be useful in addressing academic misconduct. McGee posits the view that the moral and ethical orientation towards academic integrity can be determined through an evaluation at the beginning of a course. When students are able to discern their moral development, they are able to reduce the rate of academic dishonesty (McGee, 2013). Finding suitable instruments to measure moral and ethical orientation can be a valuable subject for research. Most importantly, more research on the subject of academic integrity is needed, ensuring to delve deeper into why students cheat, and looking for more effective strategies to combat the negative behavior.

The following summary is clear:

Academic misconduct is widespread among students in the largest colleges and universities, and its prevalence is greater than in developed countries. This may be linked to a country's social and cultural factors in the post-communist transition to a market economy and calls for measures at the institutional level to educate against and prevent such behavior.

Conclusion

Academic misconduct is a problem which affects universities and colleges all over the world. It occurs because students are often under pressure to achieve high scores, or they do not want to make an effort to do their own work. In other cases, academic misconduct is aided by disinterest among faculty staff, some

ignorant of institutional integrity policies while others finding the exercise of reducing rates of misconduct among students too onerous and complicated. In yet other cases, staff in universities and colleges has different views on how academic misconduct should be penalized, some finding institutional policies too severe and others finding the same penalties lenient. However, academic misconduct is complex issue. As the paper has illustrated, it can only be addressed through a multi-faceted approach single no single strategy on its own has been found to be effective.

References

- Becker, W.E. & Toutkoushian (2013). On the meaning of markets in higher education. In M.B. Paulsen (Ed), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (pp. 327-376). London: Springer. doi: 10.1007/978-94-007-5836-0
- Chapman, K., & Lupton, R. A. (2004). Academic dishonesty in a global educational market: A comparison of Hong Kong and American University business students. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 18(7), 425-436.
- Fida, R., Tramontano, C., Paciello, M., Ghezzi, V. & Barbaranelli, C. (2016). Understanding the interplay among regulatory self-efficacy, moral disengagement, and academic cheating behavior during vocational education: A three-wave study. *Journal of Business Ethics*. doi: 10.1007/s10551-016-3373-6
- Gilmore, J., Maher, M. & Feldon, D. (2016). Prevalence, prevention, and pedagogical techniques: Academic integrity and ethical professional practice among STEM students. In T. Bretag (Ed.), *Handbook of academic integrity* (pp. 730-744). Singapore: Springer Nature. doi: 10.1007/978-981-287-098-8
- Glendinning, I. (2014). Responses to student plagiarism in higher education across Europe. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 10(1), 4-20. Retrieved from <http://ojs.unisa.edu.au/index.php/IJEI/article/viewFile/930/653>
- McGee, P. (2013). *Supporting academic honesty in online courses*. The University of Texas at San Antonio. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1004890.pdf>
- Morris, E.J. & Carroll, J. (2016). Developing a sustainable holistic institutional approach:

Dealing with realities “on the ground” when implementing an academic integrity policy. In T. Bretag Ed., *Handbook of academic integrity* (pp. 450-461). Singapore: Springer Nature. doi: 10.1007/978-981-287-098-8

Newton, P. (2015). Academic integrity: a quantitative study of confidence and understanding in students at the start of their higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 1-16. Retrieved from <https://cronfa.swan.ac.uk/Record/cronfa20205/Download/0020205-17042015081413.pdf>

Owens, C. & White, F.A. (2013). A 5-year systematic strategy to reduce plagiarism among first-year psychology university students. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 65, 14-21. doi: 10.1111/ajpy.12005

Penny, L. (2010). *More money than brains: Why schools suck, college is crap and idiots think they're right*. McClelland & Stewart.

Prins, S., Jones, E. & Lathrop, A.H. (2014). *Institutional strategies that foster academic integrity: A faculty-based case study*. Collected Essays on Learning and Teaching, 7(1). Retrieved from <http://ojs.uwindsor.ca/ojs/leddy/index.php/CELT/article/viewFile/3998/3254>

Qaderi, A., Alexandre, L. & Thomson, D. (2016). Academic integrity: The fool's dilemma. *International Journal of Digital Society (IJDS)*, 7(2), 1165-70. Retrieved from <http://infonomics-society.org/wp-content/uploads/ijds/published-papers/volume-7-2016/Academic-Integrity-The-Fools-Dilemma.pdf>

Saana, S., Ablordeppey, E., Mensah, N.J. & Karikari, T.K. (2016). Academic dishonesty in higher education: students' perceptions and involvement in an African institution. *BMC Research Notes*, 9(234). doi: 10.1186/s13104-016-2044-0

Singh, S. & Remenyi, D. (2016). Plagiarism and ghostwriting: The rise in academic misconduct. *South African Journal of Science*, 112(5/6). Retrieved from <http://www.scielo.org.za/pdf/sajs/v112n5-6/12.pdf>

Witmer, H. & Johansson, J. (2015). Disciplinary action for academic dishonesty: Does the student's gender matter? *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 11(6). doi: 10.1007/s40979-015-0006-2

Yang, R. (2015). Reassessing China's higher education development: a focus on academic culture. *Asia Pacific Education. Review*. doi: 10.1007/s12564-015-9397-2

Yekta, A.S., Beheshti, S., Takei, H., Mabudi, K., Beheshti, S. & Jahanfar, M. (2014). A

comparative study of attitudes of academic staffs towards academic dishonesty between USA and Iranian higher educational institutions. *International Research in Education*, 2(1).

الملخص:

سوء السلوك الأكاديمي في التعليم العالي وتناقش هذه الورقة سوء السلوك الأكاديمي، وقد بحثت الأبحاث السابقة التي تتناول هذه المسألة وتحليلها لتحديد أهمية القضية ومحاولة إيجاد حل لهذه المشكلة. تم استخدام النمط الوصفي حيث جمعت بيانات من دراسات أجريت في مناطق في جميع أنحاء العالم، بما في ذلك أوروبا وشرق آسيا وأفريقيا جنوب الصحراء الكبرى. وتنظر الورقة بعد ذلك في انتشار سوء السلوك الأكاديمي ثم تناقش كيفية إشراك الطلاب في سوء السلوك في الجامعات والكليات، واستراتيجيات للتغلب على سوء السلوك الأكاديمي. في قسم التوجيه المستقبلي، يتم التركيز على التحدي الفريد الذي يمثله سوء السلوك الأكاديمي في بيئة الإنترنت. وأخيراً، توصي الورقة بنهج متعدد الأوجه في معالجة سوء السلوك الأكاديمي لأنه لم يتم العثور على استراتيجية واحدة فعالة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: أكاديمي، سوء السلوك، التعليم العالي