To Cheat or Not to Cheat:
A Study Focused on Student and Professor Perspectives About Academic Dishonesty

Sarah Brodie, Sarah Hunter, Victoria McNelly, Srah Takla, and Amanda Zirk

Abstract

Focusing on Academic Integrity at MacEwan University, our research provides an overview of the perceptions faculty and students have on this topic. With our research completed, our recommendations and conclusions may help reduce problems the Academic Integrity office at MacEwan University faces.

To execute our research, we implemented different activities, specifically we: debrief with the academic integrity office, did in-depth interviews with faculty and students at MacEwan University, and performed quantitative research. We collected 69 surveys from faculty members and 281 surveys from students of MacEwan University. We then evaluated those findings using statistical software, SPSS.

Statistical analysis showed us the variables that were significantly related to academic integrity from a student and faculty perspective. Our research showed that business students were more inclined to be academically dishonest than most faculties. Most students feel that instructors have given a sufficient amount of information on the policies. We strongly believe that this evidence can create a new adaptive culture within MacEwan, where small differences will lead to greater successes.

Problem Definition

Academic integrity is the acknowledgment and respect of university policies regarding how students complete academic work. The academic integrity policies at MacEwan University are important because they create a standard of expectations of students to complete work honestly. After interviewing Paul Sopcak, the Academic Integrity Officer at MacEwan University, we have discovered that the main management problem is how the office could promote academic integrity culture in the university. The discussion with the decision maker has led us to determine that our marketing research problem will focus on discovering why students cheat and the role that instructors have in the culture. We have developed several research questions in order to collect information to help solve the management problem. We decided to construct research questions for both students and instructors. The questions looked into what perceptions students and instructors have on cheating and what measures they take to avoid evident instances of academic dishonesty. Literature suggests that not having a clear understanding and the consequences of cheating may

contribute to the lack of awareness (Barnes, 2013; Perry, 2010). In order to have a better understanding of the problem we interviewed students and professors. Guided questions used in our qualitative research include:

How would you define cheating?
Have you ever cheated?
Have you witnessed someone cheating in the past?
How much information is given on academic integrity?
What is the best way to communicate policies?
Which faculties are more prone to cheating?

The analysis of qualitative data received from the in-depth interviews did help us to develop the quantitative stage of our research.

Analytical Framework

Literature Review and Qualitative Research

Analysis and synthesis of scholarly articles, and the conduction of in-depth interviews, with both students and faculty, were essential steps needed to define, properly, the framework for the research problem. The problem verbalized by the Academic Integrity Office was "how do we promote a culture of academic integrity?" Common themes within the articles reviewed include the importance of faculty's role in explaining and enforcing academic integrity policies, and peer influence. The following literature review discusses different topics regarding academic integrity. These topics will help further define the research problem.

The first topic analyzed focused on students' understanding of the academic integrity policies. Poor understanding of what academic integrity actually is plays a large role in academic integrity violations: "many cases of academic dishonesty arise from students' lack of awareness, such as when it is okay and not okay to collaborate on coursework" (Barnes, 2013, p. 2). When it comes to plagiarism in particular, it has been found that accidental plagiarism is a huge occurrence due to many misunderstandings and uncertainties by students (Perry, 2010, p. 103). MacEwan University defines academic integrity as "a kind of ethical code that means students are achieving academic successes (and failures) fairly. It suggests that all grades that are achieved are earned honestly. Academic Integrity is essential to the mission and vision of Grant MacEwan University. The University is committed to fostering an environment of Academic Integrity through education about Academic Integrity and compliance with Academic Integrity regulations" (MacEwan University, 2014).

It was necessary to analyze what effect other people, namely professors and peers, had on students' cheating. "It is important that faculty serve as role models for academic integrity" (Livermore, 2009, p. 68) because the professors have a relationship with the students. The student-instructor relationship can play a role in whether or not students participate in academically honest behaviour; if students' perceptions of their instructor's behaviour and the student-instructor relationship are positive, [students] are less likely to participate in academic dishonesty (Stearns, 2001, p. 282). According to Okoro's study, students are aware they are cheating and know it is unethical; 90% of students believed that instructors would not be able to identify cheating (2011). "53% of the faculty respondents to [one] survey had never or [had] rarely discussed their institution's policies or their own expectations regarding academic dishonesty with students" (Stearns, 2001, p. 276); furthermore, "Peer influence is the most significant situational influence on a student's influence to cheat" (Spear & Miller, 2012, p. 199). "If students perceive their peers to be engaging in cheating behaviors, then they are more than likely to engage in such behaviors themselves" (Thakkar & Weisfeld-Spolter, 2012); consequently, "Each college cheater creates 0.55 to 0.80 new college cheaters and the incidences of cheating is higher in close knit groups like cohorts, fraternities, and sororities" (Livermore, 2009, p. 69). Another issue with cheating is that "if students continue to see other students cheating in examinations, they might come to believe that cheating in examinations is a socially-acceptable behaviour" (Bernardi, 2012, p. 248).

Faculty members blame a "failure of institutional leadership to establish integrity standards and practices across campus" (Barnes, 2013, p. 2). Institutional leaders need to "educate students and faculty on what proper academic conduct is" (Livermore, 2009, p. 69). The communication channel the Academic Integrity Office chooses to use, such as social media, presentations, or emails, has to align with what students and faculty understand. Schein (2003) illustrated the importance of culture: "organizations are most effective in achieving results when their cultures reflect alignment between the actions, espoused beliefs, and core assumptions of leaders." Dufresne (2004) emphasized that creating an integrated and aligned culture requires the dynamic involvement of all the participants in an action-learning process.

We conducted two in-depth interviews with students at MacEwan University. Both students were enrolled in the School of Business. The interviews were conducted in private rooms on campus to ensure the privacy and comfort of the participants. The comfortable environment ensured we acquired honest answers from our participants. Major themes we discovered in our in-depth interviews with the students included the importance of instructors in promoting academic dishonesty, and information regarding to academic integrity. Instructors provide students with guidelines and expectations for completing coursework, but it is

also up to students to respect them and to follow the rules. One student stated they "would be more likely to cheat" had the instructor not been involved in the promotion of academic integrity. When asked about the consistency of instructors enforcing academic integrity throughout the semester, common responses stated, material was "just left alone after the first day of class" or "mentioned before an exam." When students were asked about cheating, responses varied from "never on exams" to "on assignments quite a bit." This range of responses shows that the current method of promoting academic integrity is not enough to refrain students from cheating.

We selected three instructors for in-depth interviews. All instructors were a part of the School of Business and taught full time. The interviews were conducted in the offices of the instructors so they felt comfortable answering sensitive questions. Ensuring the privacy of the participants allowed us to obtain honest and reliable answers. Themes from our interviews with instructors showed some similarities to the ones with students. Instructors' actions in the classroom play an important role to minimize plagiarism. It ranges from using "personal screening" and "database tools," to "proctoring own exams" and "building a relationship" with students. Instructors use many exam tactics to also reduce academic dishonesty. Regarding instructors' actions when a student is involved in academic dishonesty, our main finding suggests that they "investigate right away" and "react immediately." The actions of the instructor are watched closely by students, so when the instructor reacts immediately, it demonstrates that academic dishonesty is a serious classroom issue. The answers received in the in-depth interviews summarized that instructors expect students to "report all academic dishonesty to them," that "students be responsible for their actions," and that "they know they're not supposed to cheat."

Using extant literature review and qualitative analysis, we developed the following research questions and hypotheses from student and professor perspectives.

Research Questions and Hypotheses: Student Focus

Research Question #1

Are rates of students cheating related to the extent to which students feel that their professors have provided them with enough information on Academic Integrity?

Hypothesis: From our initial research, we believe that students who feel that their professors have successfully provided them with the information to understand Academic Integrity will be less likely to cheat. This is because they will have an understanding of how to avoid academic dishonesty, and because they know their professors are focused on preventing it (Stearns, 2001).

Research Question #2

Is students' cheating behaviour related to whether they have ever witnessed their peers cheating?

Hypothesis: From our initial research, we believe that majority of students who admit to cheating will have witnessed a peer cheating in the past; because, if they have witnessed a peer cheat and not get caught, it has shown that the student will view being academically dishonest and more acceptable (Bernardi, 2012). They will also be under the assumption they can easily get away with it.

Research Question #3

What is the best way for the Academic Integrity office to provide information on their policies and where to find resources from the perspective of students?

Hypothesis: Based on our in-depth interviews with students, we believe that the best way for Academic Integrity to provide information, according to students, is going to be through presentations in class from members of the Academic Integrity Office, followed by social media. The reason for this is because presentations would require no further effort from the students to gain information, other than just showing up to class on the day of a presentation. Students are very used to communicating via social media in their everyday lives, so it would be an easy way to connect with them.

Research Questions and Hypotheses: Faculty Focus

Research Question #4

What is the best way for the Academic Integrity office to provide information on their policies and where to find resources from professors perspective?

Hypothesis: We believe that the best way for Academic Integrity to provide their information, according to professors, is going to be through direct emails to MacEwan accounts, followed by presentations in classes by either the Academic Integrity Office or student peers such as the Student Association of MacEwan University (SAMU). The reason for this is because email is a very easy way of communicating without a lot of effort, and the presentations will provide direct learning for students in their classroom from knowledgeable sources.

Research Question #5

Does the amount professors discuss Academic Integrity with their class/section vary between faculties?

Hypothesis: Through our previous secondary research, we believe that professors in the School of Business will be shown to discuss Academic Integrity the least with their students. This is because during our qualitative research most students from the School of Business stated that their professors generally discuss it once at the beginning of the semester (Livermore, 2009).

Research Question #6

Does the amount of violations a professor deals with during an academic year vary between faculties?

Hypothesis: From our previous secondary research, we feel as though the results will reflect a trend towards the School of Business professors dealing with the most academic violations during the academic year (Caldwell, 2010). This is because our research showed that business students are more inclined to cheat/plagiarize on assignments than other faculties.

The independent variables included in our research are the students and the faculty of MacEwan University. These variables where constructed based on the needs of our client. Dependent variables for the student focus include the amount students cheat, the influence of peers and instructors, and the method of policy communication. Instructor focus dependent variables are how instructors communicate the policies to students, which faculty communicates the policies least, and the faculty that deals with the most academic violations. We constructed the dependent variables through in depth interviews, and secondary research.

Research Design

Development, Pre-test and Execution of the Questionnaires

For the development of the questionnaire, questions were based on information and themes we had developed during the literature review and qualitative research. Once each working group in the marketing research class had completed our surveys, we sent them to our professor, Fernando Angulo, so he could use all the submissions to compile two final surveys, one focused on students and the other one of professors. The reason we used omnibus surveys was that we wanted to be able to collect a wide range of data on a large sampling of both students and professors from all programs at the university.

Next, the pre-testing of the compiled surveys involved our professor taking class time to hand out surveys, to everyone, to fill out. After everyone had filled out the surveys, we went over them as a group and were able to give our professor any feedback that could help improve the overall surveys.

The actual execution of the questionnaires followed the pre-test. We targeted a total of 320 student surveys and 80 professor surveys; however, only 281 student surveys and 69 professor surveys were completed. Once the surveys were collected, we individually input the results into Excel tables and then were all responses were converted into two separate SPSS files, a student one and a professor one, so that all the groups could use them to analyze the findings.

Sampling and Field-Work Data Collection

When planning our research design for the Academic Integrity Office, one of the first things we did was to decide that focusing on male and female students and

professors at MacEwan University would be invaluable to conduct research. The sampling frame consisted of a variety of students and faculty from the Faculty of Arts & Science, Faculty of Fine Arts & Communications, School of Business, and Faculty of Health and Community Studies at MacEwan (Tables 1&2). We chose to use non-probability quota sampling because, it would provide us with the ability to select our sampling elements based on our own convenience and judgment. Our sampling size ended up being 281 student surveys and 69 professor surveys.

We collected our data from students by walking around the university and talking to students. We made sure to ask questions such as, "Are you enrolled in a four-year program at MacEwan University?" followed by, "What faculty are you a part of?" in order to make sure we were all gathering surveys from the right people. For the professor surveys, they were conducted by approaching professors at convenience, or by contacting professors we already know to see if they would participate in the survey.

Operationalization of Variables Included in the Analytical Model

Since we used omnibus surveys, where a wide variety of data on a wide variety of subjects is collected at the same time, it is important for us to specify which questions we will actually be using in our analysis. For the student data analysis, the questions we used from the survey focused on whether a student has ever cheated, plagiarized, or collaborated improperly on an assignment, ever falsified or fabricated information for use in an academic exercise, and ever cheated at MacEwan University, that we recoded into one variable. As well as questions pertaining to have had ever witnessing your friends, or other students, being academically dishonest, extent in agreement with the statement: "My professors have provided enough information to help me fully understand MacEwan's Academic Integrity Policy," and what are the best methods the Academic Integrity office could communicate policies. For the professor data analysis, the questions we used from the survey related to how often Academic Integrity policies are discussed in class, how many academic violations accrued in the previous academic year, the best method of communicating policies, and what faculty they taught in.

Table 1: Student Sample Characteristics

Variables	Number of Respondents	% of Respondents
Faculty		
Health & Community Studies	68	24.3
Fine Arts & Communications	65	23.2
Arts & Science	74	26.4
School of Business	72	25.7
Other	1	0.4
Year of Study		
First	43	15.4
Second	71	25.4
Third	108	38.7
Fourth or more	57	20.4
Cumulative GPA		
0 – 1.0	1	0.4
1.01 – 2.0	3	1.1
2.01 – 2.5	27	9.6
2.51 – 3.0	90	32.1
3.01 – 3.5	121	43.2
3.51 – 4.0	38	13.6
Post-Grad Interest		
Not interested	22	8.0
Minimal interest	56	20.3
Somewhat interested	82	29.7
Interested	72	26.1
Very interested	44	15.9
Age		
18 or less	14	5.0
19 – 21	151	54.1
22 – 24	94	33.7
25 – 27	10	3.6
28 or older	10	3.6
Gender		
Male	105	37.6
Female	174	61.4

International Student		
Yes	8	2.9
No	271	97.1
Total Sample Size	281	-

Table 2: Professor Sample Characteristics

Variable	Number of Respondents	% of Respondents
Faculty		
Health & Community Studies	15	21.7
Fine Arts & Communications	18	26.1
Arts & Science	16	23.2
School of Business	20	29.0
Years Teaching at MacEwan	2	2.9
1 year or less	32	46.4
2 – 5 years	21	30.4
6 – 10 years	14	20.3
More than 10 years		
Level of Education		
Bachelor Degree	4	5.9
Master	37	54.4
PhD or related	27	39.7
Age		
35 or less	8	12.1
36 – 45	25	37.9
46 – 55	21	31.8
56 – 65	12	18.2
Gender		
Male	39	57.4
Female	29	42.6
Born in Canada		
Yes	55	79.7
No	14	20.3
Total Sample Size	69	-

Ethical Issues

There are a few ethical issues that may have arisen during the data collection for our marketing research project. One of the issues is that some researchers may not have taken the time to do accurate data collection, and instead just made up results on their own, since going around the school and collecting data could have been time consuming. Another issue that could have arisen was if some researchers just had their friends complete the survey, even if they didn't meet the correct criteria. This wouldn't give us accurate results for MacEwan as a whole. Because there were students collecting data for this project that are not involved directly in it, there also may have been the temptation for some of them to commit the ethical violations mentioned here.

Data Analysis and Results: Plan of Data Analysis

Student Focus

For our student-focused sample, we conducted two cross-tabulations, one descriptive statistics and one Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). We chose the bivariate technique to find relationship to number of instances of cheating, witnessing of cheating and extent of information given by instructors. A univariate technique was used to determine the means of the quantitative data regarding to which method of communication of academic integrity policies was most preferred, by students. Cross-tabulations were selected in order to find a relationship in the number of instances of cheating with the extent students agreed with whether professors were able to offer information on policies, and if they had witnessed academic dishonesty in peers. The ANOVA test was helpful in distinguishing a relation with the amount of academically dishonest instances with the extent students felt that they were given adequate information on policies. We also ran descriptive statistics to discover which methods of communication of Academic Integrity policies would be most effective with students in all faculties.

To begin, we combined and recoded cheating behaviour questions five, six, and seven to determine how many instances of cheating a student had performed overall. Question fived asked if a student has ever cheated, plagiarized, or collaborated on an assignment; question six asked if they had ever falsified or fabricated information on an assignment; and question seven asked if they had ever cheated on a test. We decided to recode these questions into one data result because it would give us data about what students had ever been academically dishonest using any of the ways asked about in these three questions. We cross tabulated the new recoded questions with number eleven, which asked to what extent they agreed with the statement: "my professors have provided enough information to help me fully understand MacEwan's Academic Integrity Policy?", to find any relation with the instances of cheating to the role

professor's play in providing information. The ANOVA test was used to test our hypothesis and determine any relation.

Our second cross-tabulation was done by comparing the new recoded question with question number nine. Question nine asked if a student had ever witnessed a friend or other student be academically dishonest. The goal was to determine if there is a relationship with the number of instances of academic dishonesty to the witnessing of peers being academically dishonest.

The final test we conducted was a univariate analysis. This test was done to discover the most popular method the Academic Integrity Office could use to communicate the policies to students.

Professor Focus

The professor focused research consisted of two cross-tabulations, two descriptive statistics, and one ANOVA test. We used a bivariate technique to find significance in the amount of times Academic Integrity policies are discussed in class, the faculty of the instructor, and what methods instructors felt would be best to communicate policies to students. Univariate analyses were done for the descriptive statistics tests before we conducted the cross-tabulations. The cross-tabulations were helpful in determining if there is a relationship between the faculty and how many instances of academic dishonesty and the number of times they discuss the topic. ANOVA tests were used to compare the quantitative data from the question regarding to the method of communication of academic integrity policies to the different faculties.

We did a descriptive statistics for question five to view the means for each variable. Before we conducted the cross-tabulation, we recoded question five into two variables to create a balance in values. The cross-tabulation was done with question sixteen to determine a relationship between faculty and amount of discussions of policies. Question five asked if in a given section, how often the instructor does discusses Academic Integrity with the class, and question sixteen asked the faculty of the instructor. A chi-squared test was used to test our hypothesis.

Similar to the process with question five, we did a descriptive statistic of question six and recoded the question to only consist of two variables to eliminate the large gap between means. We crosstabulated the recoded question six to sixteen to discover if a relation between number of violations in an academic year, and the faculty existed. Question six asked in the past year, how many instances of academic dishonesty the instructor had dealt with. A chi-squared test was used again to prove out hypothesis.

Finally, we conducted an ANOVA test to find out which method of communicating polices instructors found most effective. The test was done on

question fifteen that asked, which of the following points are the best way the AI Office could communicate policies to students.

Univariate Analysis of Key Variables

In order to have an initial understand of the key variables from our analytical model, we present univariate descriptive statistics in tables 3 to 7.

Student Focused Variables

Table 3: Instances of Cheating Combined analysis based on questions 5, 6, & 7

	Number of Respondents	% of Respondents
No instances of cheating	167	59.6
At least one instance of cheating	113	40.4
Total	280	

Table 4: Witnessed friends or peers being academically dishonest (Question 9)

	Number of Respondents	% of Respondents
Yes	181	64.4
No	100	35.6
Total	281	

Table 5: Extent to which students agree that their professors have provided enough information (Question 11)

	Number of Respondents	% of Respondents
Strongly Disagree	20	7.1
Disagree	50	17.8
Neither agree or disagree	51	18.1
Agree	123	43.8
Strongly Agree	37	13.2
Total	281	

Professor Focused Variables

Table 6: How often Academic Integrity policies are discussed in class during the term

	Number of Respondents	*% of Respondents*
Once or less	*29*	*42.0*
2 or more	*40*	*58.0*
Total	*69*	*100.0*

Table 7: How often academic violations have been dealt with in the last year

	Number of Respondents	*% of Respondents*
Never	*22*	*31.9*
Once	*23*	*33.3*
2 or more	*24*	*34.8*
Total	*69*	*100*

Results by Research Question and Hypothesis

Student Focus

Research Question #1

Are rates of students cheating related to the extent to which students feel that their professors have provided them with enough information on Academic Integrity?

For this question, we used a cross-tabulation to explore the relationship of student cheating and professor involvement in the classroom. All responses showed a response rate high enough to continue the analysis. The descriptive statistics showed that there were 167/280 responses with no instances of cheating, and 113/280 responses with at least one instance of cheating. This shows that out of all students surveyed, approximately 59.6% of students never cheat.

Next, ANOVA was used to compare if there are differences between those who cheat and those who don't (see Tables 8 and 9). Given that the p-value of (0.001) this test is less than 0.05, we reject the null hypothesis of equality of means. When comparing the means from descriptive statistics, we find that students, who have no instances of cheating, have a higher satisfaction with how their professor is doing with regards to academic integrity. The mean for this was 3.56 and the mean for at least one instance was 3.12. Students, who have at least one instance of cheating, are less satisfied with the efforts by professors in discussing academic integrity. This aligns with our hypothesis that states students who are more satisfied with their professor's efforts would be less likely to cheat. So we can reject our null hypothesis because those who do not have any instances of cheating tend to agree more that their professor provides enough information.

Table 8: ANOVA

To what extent do you agree that "My professors have provided enough information to help me fully understand MacEwan's Academic Integrity Policy"?

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
No instances of cheating	167	3.56	1.084	.084	3.40	3.73	1	5
At least one instance of cheating	113	3.12	1.158	.109	2.91	3.34	1	5
Total	280	3.39	1.133	.068	3.25	3.52	1	5

Table 9: ANOVA

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	12.988	1	12.988	10.455	.001
Within Groups	345.355	278	1.242		
Total	358.343	279			

Research Question #2

Are students' cheating behaviour related to whether they have ever witnessed their peers cheating?

We performed a chi-squared test to analyze the relationship of students cheating and if they have witnessed others cheating (see Tables 10 and 11). We can reject the null hypothesis at alpha 0.05, the Chi-Square test was conducted and results are shown in table 10. The likelihood that a student has at least one instance of cheating is 40%, and this increases to 54% given that a student has witnessed a friend other students being academically dishonest, and that probability decreases to 15% given that a student has not witnessed a friend or other student cheating. The other way is also significant because the probability that a student has not had an instance of cheating is 60%, which increases to 85% when a student has not witnessed a friend or other student being academically dishonest. This shows us there is in fact a positive relationship between the student number of academic dishonesty instances, and the fact that those students have witnessed others cheating.

Table 10: Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	41.553[a]	1	.000		
Continuity Correction[b]	39.931	1	.000		
Likelihood Ratio	45.032	1	.000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.000	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	41.405	1	.000		
N of Valid Cases	280				

Table 11: Cross-Tabulation

			Have you ever witnessed your friends or other students being academically dishonest?		
			yes	no	Total
Instances of cheating	No instances of cheating	Count	82	85	167
		Expected Count	107.4	59.6	167.0
		% within rows	49.1%	50.9%	100.0%
		% within columns	45.6%	85.0%	59.6%
		% of Total	29.3%	30.4%	59.6%
	At least one instance of cheating	Count	98	15	113
		Expected Count	72.6	40.4	113.0
		% within rows	86.7%	13.3%	100.0%
		% within columns	54.4%	15.0%	40.4%
		% of Total	35.0%	5.4%	40.4%
Total		Count	180	100	280
		Expected Count	180.0	100.0	280.0
		% within rows	64.3%	35.7%	100.0%
		% within columns	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	64.3%	35.7%	100.0%

Research Question #3

What is the best way for the Academic Integrity office to provide information on their policies and where to find resources from a student perspective?

In this analysis, we used descriptive statistics to determine what students thought was the best way the Academic Integrity Office should provide information on their policies and where to find resources (see Table 12). Looking at the means, students think that "teachers putting more resource/time towards discussing the importance of academic integrity" is most beneficial with a mean of 4.73, then "direct emails to MacEwan accounts," with a mean of 4.55, and then "presentations in classes from members of the Academic Integrity office," with a mean of 4.54. These means are based on the semantic differential scale used to answer the question, where 1 meant it was the worst option and 7 meant it was the best option. The average student picked "4.73" out of 7 for teachers providing more resources. The entire student sample was studied without classifying them into the faculty that they belong. This provides Academic Integrity with a general view of what students are interested in more, and allows us to say that text messaging should be removed from the options available, because with a mean of 2.31 out of 7, students thought it was close to the worst option.

Our hypothesis stated that, presentations in class, from members of the Academic Integrity Office, followed by social media would most likely be the top choices. However, after analyzing the survey data we can say that we were wrong. The students feel there is a need for professors to do more regarding the academic integrity issue. The direct emails to MacEwan student accounts is the second option for students which would be an easier implementation for the Academic Integrity office, as emails are a lot easier to set up versus a presentation by Academic Integrity workers. Social media was actually the 5th best option for students.

Table 12: Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Lower Bound (95% confidence)	Upper Bound (95% confidence)
Teachers putting more resource/time towards discussing the importance of academic integrity	278	4.73	1.707	4.55	4.96
Direct emails to MacEwan accounts	279	4.55	1.702	4.35	4.76
Presentations in classes from members of Academic Integrity office	278	4.54	1.728	4.35	4.76
Presentations by peers, such as SAMU	277	4.43	1.635	4.24	4.63
Social media	279	4.33	1.759	4.09	4.52
Program counsellors providing more information	279	4.08	1.473	3.90	4.24
The Deans of MacEwan presenting information at new student orientations	279	4.06	1.719	3.86	4.27
Text messages	275	2.31	1.655	2.11	2.50
Valid N (listwise)	271				

Faculty Focus

Research Question #4

What is the best way for the Academic Integrity office to provide information on their policies and where to find resources from the professors perspective?

Descriptive statistics were used to determine what professors' think was the best option for providing information on academic integrity and where to find it. The statistics show that the best choice provided was "Presentations in classes from members of the Academic Integrity office" with a mean of 5.28, followed by "Presentations by peers, such as SAMU is the best way the Academic Integrity office" with a mean of 5.01, and "Direct emails to MacEwan accounts" with a mean of 4.84. This is interesting to see because two of the three top choices involve presentations by others but not the

Table 13: Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Lower Level (95% Confidence)	Upper Level (95% Confidence)
Presentations in classes from members of the Academic Integrity office	68	5.28	1.544	4.91	5.65
Presentations by peers, such as SAMU	68	5.01	1.344	4.69	5.34
Direct emails to MacEwan	69	4.84	1.746	4.41	5.26
Program counsellors providing more information	69	4.65	1.148	4.37	4.93
Teachers putting more resources/time toward discussing the importance of academic integrity and the related policies	69	4.61	1.406	4.25	4.93
Social media	69	4.59	1.785	4.15	5.02
The Deans of MacEwan presenting information at new student orientation	69	4.54	1.539	4.15	4.90
Text messages	69	2.88	1.787	2.88	0.218
Valid N (listwise)	68				

professors themselves. Text messaging was again the lowest choice (mean of 2.88), so professors and students both agree that text messages would be close to the worst choice for promoting information on academic integrity. There are better options available, which will help MacEwan in their promoting efforts.

The results show the topic is important enough for professors to let Academic Integrity come into their classrooms and present. This can also be useful for Academic Integrity. The effort by professors themselves does not seem to be, of similar importance, to help promote academic integrity policies and location of resources.

In our hypothesis we thought that direct mail would be the best option chosen by professors, but it is the third best option out of eight. However, there was not any visible option that had a mean of 6 or 7, to show that, it was the definite best option for promoting academic integrity, as the top seven choices ranged from a mean of 4.54-5.28. This shows that a lot of professors think the options available are good ideas to promote academic integrity, versus options that are not good ideas.

Research Question #5

Does the amount professors discuss Academic Integrity with their class/section vary between faculties?

This question allows us to address how the professors, from each faculty, studied and engaged in academic topics during a term. The cross-tabulation provided very interesting results (see Tables 14 and 15). The Chi-Square Test was then used with a p-value of 0.05 and provided an answer of 0.524. We can say that the Pearson Chi-Square result of 0.524 is not significant, which means that there is no relation between faculty and the number of times academic integrity policies are discussed in a term. There are no major differences between faculty's to determine that one is better than another at promoting academic integrity during the term. The professors are all individuals who determine for themselves how many times they wish to discuss academic integrity.

Table 14: Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.242[a]	3	.524
Likelihood Ratio	2.239	3	.524
Linear-by-Linear Association	.028	1	.868
N of Valid Cases	69		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.30.

Table 15: Cross-tabulation

			Professor Engagement		
			Once or less	2 or more	Total
What faculty are you currently a part of?	Faculty of Health & Community Studies	Count	5	10	15
		% within rows	33.3%	66.7%	100.0 %
		% of Total	7.2%	14.5%	21.7%
	Faculty of Fine Arts & Communications	Count	8	10	18
		% within rows	44.4%	55.6%	100.0 %
		% of Total	11.6%	14.5%	26.1%
	Faculty of Arts and Science	Count	9	7	16
		% within rows	56.3%	43.8%	100.0 %
		% of Total	13.0%	10.1%	23.2%
	School of Business	Count	7	13	20
		% within rows	35.0%	65.0%	100.0 %
		% of Total	10.1%	18.8%	29.0%
Total		Count	29	40	69
		% within rows	42.0%	58.0%	100.0 %
		% of Total	42.0%	58.0%	100.0 %

Research Question #6

Does the amount of violations professors deal with during an academic year vary between faculties?

We used a cross-tabulation in this question to explore if the amount of violations professors deal with differs between faculties (see Tables 16 and 17). After we conducted our Chi-Square test, with a p-value of 0.05, we received a Pearson Chi-Square of 0.897. This confirmed that we should not reject our null hypothesis as the variables explored in this question are not related. We thought that the School of Business would have the highest instances of violations dealt with by the professor. Our results actually showed that the professors mostly deal with one academic violation in a year. We can conclude that there are no main differences between faculties based on our survey results. If we had analyzed another variable we may have found different results suggesting otherwise.

The number of incidents of violations, by students, is significantly related to the faculty of studies, at p-value < 0.01. The probability a student has no incidents, given that s/he is a School of Business student, is 42.3%, this probability increases to 72.1%, if a student is from the faculty of Health and Community Studies. Conversely, the probability a student has two or more incidents is 21.2%, this probability increases to 38% if that students is from the School of Business.

Table 16: Crosstabulation

What faculty are you currently part of? * Incidents Crosstabulation

			Incidents				
			No incidents	One Incidents	Two incidents	Three incidents	Total
What faculty are you currently part of?	Faculty of Health & Community studies	Count	49	9	8	2	68
		% within What faculty are you currently part of?	72.1%	13.2%	11.8%	2.9%	100.0%
	Faculty of Fine	Count	36	18	5	6	65

	Arts & Communications	% within What faculty are you currently part of?	55.4%	27.7%	7.7%	9.2%	100.0%
	Faculty of Arts and Science	Count	50	13	6	5	74
		% within What faculty are you currently part of?	67.6%	17.6%	8.1%	6.8%	100.0%
	School of Business	Count	30	14	17	10	71
		% within What faculty are you currently part of?	42.3%	19.7%	23.9%	14.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	165	54	36	23	278
		% within What faculty are you currently part of?	59.4%	19.4%	12.9%	8.3%	100.0%

Table 17: Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	25.064[a]	9	.003
Likelihood Ratio	24.601	9	.003
Linear-by-Linear Association	11.136	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	278		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.38.

Conclusions and Recommendations

It is important to evaluate the appropriate role that the Academic Integrity Office should take while combatting academic dishonesty at MacEwan University. During our initial report, we came up with different assumptions and put our hypothesis to test during the final report. It goes to show that some of our hypothesis held true, while other ones were not. The School of Business had the highest amount of student academic dishonesty; but to our surprise, the Health and Community and Communication faculties had the most academic violations reported by professors. During our study to evaluate the appropriate ways to promote the policy, presentations and emails were the most popular choice among students and faculty. There was a clear discrepancy that students valued what the professors present. It is important, that if the Academic Integrity Office wants to promote this culture at MacEwan, they need to not only target students in all faculties but also target the sources of cheating. There needs to be implementation that faculty members set the policy in class and ensure to praise and repeat it throughout the term. Those students that think professors have given them enough information are less inclined to cheat.

The Academic Integrity Office needs to target students that have had one or more instances of cheating. We find that people will not cheat if they have confidence that their professors have given them enough information. Therefore, in this case, we recommend motivating instructors to build that relationship with their classroom and make sure that the students know the policy.

Our second recommendation will be, not to target students as individuals but more so as a unit. The university can find a way to implement and target students together rather than individual students. That way, students feel that being academically honest is not only beneficial for them, but their peers as well, since students are more inclined to cheat if they see a peer cheat. By simply implementing ways to lower the amount of cheating in a social circle will lower the instances at MacEwan University. This can be changed by faculty within their classroom culture and in assignments, making sure to make changes from term to term.

Our third recommendation, from a student perspective, focuses on ways to implement the policies, taking into consideration what the students' desire. Based on our results, students still want to hear the policies from their professors. Students seem to value what their professors tell them. As well, direct e-mails were the second choice students would want to hear about the policies. This is something that can easily be implemented by the Academic Integrity Office because it does not take time and there is a low cost with it.

Professors were inclined to choose a presentation from other members in the school to present about the topic instead of presenting about it themselves. Although the faculties' perspective is important, the problem in this case is to prevent students from cheating. With that being said, to accommodate for faculty and students it would be important for faculty to implement a presentation on the policy for their students. This way, we can accommodate what most professors want, as well as a successful response from students.

Since our study showed there is no correlation between faculty and the amount of times they discuss the policy, we recommend targeting, as individual professors, not as faculty. Professors should be notified of the importance of discussing the policy more than once a term.

Our last recommendation, from a faculty perspective, is to focus more on the faculties that tend to have a higher reported amount of cheating. Such faculties would be the Faulty of Health and Community Studies and Faculty of Fine Arts and Communications which have the highest instances of academic violations. It is important for these faculties to evaluate the nature of their exams and assignments.

Limitations

Throughout this research, we were faced with some limitations. Here we will evaluate the most apparent ones. MacEwan University is composed of different centers. Therefore, during our evaluation and research we were limited to only conduct research and concentrate on the students, faculties, and programs at the City Center Campus. As well, during the data collection process, each student conducting surveys were limited to find specific students or faculty members by gender. This could have impacted the amount of results we got back from the respondents because those that did not find the specifics of the people on campus did not have a valid survey. As well, we can argue that the sensitivity of the topic was not handled to its fullest. As we handed out the surveys, there was not much privacy because the students were filling

out the surveys as the researcher was standing by, waiting for them to finish. This could have impacted the way that some students and/or faculty answered certain questions in the survey. As we came to the end of the research and started to evaluate the data on SPSS, we began to accommodate the results to work with our initial research and hypothesis. Some bias may be present in student surveys. This could have been caused because the students did not take the survey seriously, answered dishonestly, or any other external reasons. An example of bias may be that some students agreed that professors gave them enough knowledge about the policy yet they still cheat or say that they are not that aware of the policy. Therefore, there was a misunderstanding that students faced, as they underwent the survey or they may had have been dishonest in the process. Most of these limitations could have been avoided if there was more privacy and time given to those candidates. Online surveys tend to serve a high benefit because the candidates can do it on their own time, and not be disrupted, or time pressured.

References

Barnes, C., Paris, B. (2013). *An Analysis of Academic Integrity Techniques Used In Online Courses at a Southern University*. Retrieved from http://www.nedsi.org/proc/2013/proc/p121024007.pdf

Bernardi, R. A., Banzhoff, C. A., Martino, A. M., & Savasta, K. J. (2012). Challenges to academic integrity: Identifying the factors associated with the cheating chain. *Accounting Education*, *21*(3), 247-263. doi:10.1080/09639284.2011.598719

Broeckelman-Post, M. A. (2008). Faculty and student classroom influences on academic dishonesty. *IEEE Transactions On Education*, 51(2), 206-211. doi:10.1109/TE. 2007.910428

Caldwell, C. (2010). A ten-step model for academic integrity: A positive approach for business schools. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *92*(1), 1-13. doi:10.1007/s10551.009-0144-7

Dufresne, R. L. (2004). An action learning perspective on effective implementation of academic honor codes. *Group & Organization Management,* 29(2), 201- 218.

Livermore, J. A. (2009). Incorporating academic integrity into an online information assurance program. *Business Education Innovation Journal*, 1(2), 68-73 Retrieved from http://web.b.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.macewan.ca/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=2d7b6c25-3da8-4fe4-9c8431ebc8d1d26d%40sessionmgr115&vid=6&hid=127

MacEwan University. (2014). Academic Integrity at MacEwan University. Retrieved from https://facultycommons.macewan.ca/wp-content/uploads/AI_Brochure2014.pdf

Okoro, E. A. (2011). Academic integrity and student plagiarism: Guided instructional strategies for business communication assignments. *Business Communication Quarterly*, *74*(2), 173-178. doi:10.1177/1080569911404064

Perry, B. (2010). Exploring academic misconduct: Some insights into student behaviour. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 11(2), 97-108. doi: 10.1177/1469787410365657

Schein, E. H. (2006). *Organizational culture and leadership* (4th Ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Spain, J. W., & Robels, M. M. (2011). Academic integrity policy: The journey. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 151-159. doi:10.1177/1080569911404407

Spear, J. A., & Miller, A. N. (2012). The effects of instructor fear appeals and moral appeals on cheating-related attitudes and behavior of university students. *Ethics and Behavior*, 22(3), 196-207.

Stearns, S. A. (2001). The student-instructor relationship's effect on academic integrity. *Ethics & Behaviour*, 11(3), 275-285. doi: 10.1207/S15327019EB1103_6

Thakkar, M., & Weisfeld-Spolter, S. (2012). A qualitative analysis of college students' perceptions of academic integrity on campus. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, 16, 81-88. Retrieved from http://www.ebscohost.com/ACADEMIC/business-source-complete

Voelker, T. A., Love, L. G., & Pentina, I. (2012). Plagiarism: What don't they know?. *Journal Of Education For Business*, 87(1), 36-41. doi:10.1080/08832323.2011.552536

Yang, S. C., Huang, C.-L., & Chen, A.-S. (2013). An investigation of college students' perceptions of academic dishonesty, reasons for dishonesty, achievement goals, and willingness to report dishonest behavior. *Ethics and Behaviors*, 23(6), 501-522.