

Review of Academic Dishonesty among College Students

Abolfazl Zolfaghari¹

¹ Sociology Department, Shahed University, Shahed, Iran

Correspondence: Abolfazl Zolfaghari, Sociology Department, Shahed University, Shahed, Iran. E-mail: zolfaghariab@gmail.com

Received: September 12, 2016

Accepted: September 18, 2016 Online Published: November 20, 2016

doi:10.5539/res.v8n4p158

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/res.v8n4p158>

Abstract

Cheating and academic dishonesty is a moral anomaly in the field of scientific research and reflecting, i.e., academic environment and studies show that this phenomenon in many of the worlds is important problem.

This study measured the dishonesty of students in a quasi-experimental design. For this purpose, features lack of integrity by manipulating the facts were examined and meanwhile first, basic English language test coordination between the strict terms of the 280 students come to practice and after correction of examination papers by teachers, without leaving any traces on them instead, the plates are returned to students and provide them with answers to their paper to correct their score Master announced. The difference between the actual score (score of master) and score of the students to have their own, amount of honesty or lack of integrity appointed them and its relationship with some demographic and socio-ethical characteristics have been studied.

The results showed that more than 62 percent of the students in your grade to master completely honest with 26.6 percent have low honesty and the rest did not have the necessary integrity and the mean difference of scores announced by the professors and students have been about two score. Also results of chi-square tests and gamma, about the relationship between students' evaluation of amount of sincerity with sincerity in the declared objective amount of the master score was not significant, this finding means that between demonstrators and people of integrity and honesty in practice, there are gaps.

Keywords: cheating, academic dishonesty, plagiarism, scientific code of conduct, ethics of science

1. Introduction

Basically, scientific misconduct is defined as a structure that includes various forms of deviancy, including cheating on tests, plagiarism and collaboration in scientific work to be incorrect (Kisamore et al., 2007, p. 382). According to some scholars, students, despite it being wrong understanding confessed to committing it (Davis et al., 1992).

So perhaps cheating related to the costs and benefits of it (Bunn et al., 1992; Kerkvliet, 1994). Scientific codes of conduct that are written in most universities, cheating in connection with academic dishonesty (Academic Dishonesty) have defined (Hilliard et al., 2011).

There are many studies that show cheating and academic dishonesty in many universities in the world are serious problems and topics that focus for long-term academic research including measurement comments that are cheating (Bernard et al., 2004). Some of these studies include: technology applications in the way of helping people who cheat (Popp & Wertz, 2009), the effect of age (Smyth & Davis, 2004; Nonis, 2001; Crown & Spiller, 1998), the impact of demographic factors (demographic) (Hetherington & Feldman, 1964), and the impact of conditions in the fraud (Kisamore et al., 2007).

According to the review of which was conducted over three years by researchers at Duke University, improper behavior like cheating among university students around the world, especially females and more generally on the rise over the past 65 years has tripled. Studies also show international schools that academic dishonesty is a widespread problem in the world (Chapman & Lupton, 2004; Lambert et al., 2003).

In Iran also in accordance with the disciplinary committee secretary of the Central Council of the Ministry of Science, Research and Technology, highest number cases of cheating in exams is a student disciplinary committee (Quoted from the site Fararoo).

Despite the fact that most universities in the world, guidelines and codes of behavior for students have written, cheating and plagiarism are not clear for them. In many cases, most students do not read these policies. Academic integrity is one of the most important features that all educational institutions are trying to instill in all students take it. The assessment is an important aspect of the educational process. This aspect has been highlighted by many reputable people.

In addition, one of the leading causes of creating caravanserais along roads was the heterogeneity of people of that age. Local nomads and rebellious, villainous people of the mountains were troublesome to travelers and peddlers and demanded road tolls (Ghasemi & Farid, 2015, p. 27).

1.1 Widespread Cheating and Academic Dishonesty at the University

“Cheating and academic dishonesty” among graduate business students: The prevalence, causes and proposed solutions as research based on the responses of 5331 students in 32 colleges of higher education in the United States is doing. This study concluded that 56 percent of graduate business students—who are often MBA courses—in comparison with 47 percent of graduate students have cheated in non-commercial applications. On the other hand, although some universities about academic dishonesty, emphasizes this point that a post-graduate students and graduates in terms of ethical standards, should be higher and more righteous than undergraduate students (Hilliard et al., 2011, p. 5) also despite the difference between graduate programs and undergraduate students, we are still the subject of cheating and academic dishonesty in the face of undergraduate students.

Many studies have investigated amount of cheating undergrads and although results vary, in most cases accept (self-admission of cheating) cheating is very high (Sheard, 2002). High levels of cheating and plagiarism in recent studies has been registered. Graham and O’Brien, a study conducted on 500 college students and results showed 90 percent of admissions fraud (Owunwanne et al., 2010, p. 6).

Due to the high rate of participation in the cheating, the students believe that numerous cases of cheating are accepted. For example, a dishonesty on the campus of plagiarism is often done by students, but because of the ease of access to materials plagiarism, student’s plagiarism as a form of cheating are not classified. In order to properly analyze the prevalence of academic dishonesty might be better that first students understand what to consider as cheating or plagiarism.

For example, in a study at Howard University (Howard) was done in America, this turns out that 40% of students helping a friend or get help from a friend to complete homework outside of class—that can be done independently—not considered cheating (Owunwanne et al., Ibid). Similarly presentation of the work completed in the previous class to other classes of teachers many of whom will not be considered cheating.

1.2 Why do Students Cheat?

Emphasis on grades and academic performance in college students may fall into the trap of academic cheating. Scores only as a way to measure what students have learned the curriculum is not used, but also as a measure for concessions are different. Scores also can be used as motivation is very important for students to give their best performance of your expression.

This impression they need to succeed and win at any cost to (survival of the fittest) fuels. So scoring procedure for raising achievement and the pressures and expectations on students for success can be entered as an incentive for students to cheat.

The prevalence of cheating in an educational institution can contribute to the proliferation of cheating, when students know that other students can benefit fraud, they will be forced to cheat. Although universities try to ensure their students that all of them fair and equal opportunity to achieve success in their own college education. But because of the perceived “fair and equal opportunity” for a breakthrough, for it is impossible and unreal, to see justice in their cheating.

Because observers that academic cheating is done at all levels. At last year’s conference was held with the theme of increasing cheating in the UK higher education system, it was found that a quarter of British university students cheated in his exam and of these, only three percent when cheating is detected and dealt with seriously and law (Asr-e Iran, 2010).

What things is unclear concept of cheating and that fraud has led to confusion among many students. This confusion is easily turned into a justification and excuse for their implied that dirty. Studies show that, for example, plagiarism action based on fraud and dishonesty within the university, which is often done by students and yet because of the easy access to material from the Internet plagiarism, students plagiarism as a form of cheating are not classified (Owunwanne & Rustagi, 2010).

The factors that have been discussed so far, individual factors and the university, but in scientific and academic fraud, with the other two approaches can also be used to argue with. The first approach, the second approach is educational-ethical, social approach.

In the first approach, i.e., educational and moral approach, what is of interest to scientific ethics, respect for the traditions of academic, scientific training and scientific maturity. But about scientific training should be how to nurture a noted scholar. Although researchers have scientific training in the environment and have a student with whom finally, the extent to which the growth and development of its scientific expertise and efficiency have been. Scientific fraud occurs usually by those that have not had a proper scientific training.

Finally, scientific maturation process where a researcher over many years of research it is effective and based on the maturity of the credit finds that article, the arbitration papers and ... Those who have this maturity of over one hundred years old and want to create a cross-like approach, unfortunately, are among those who are infected more scientific fraud (Ahmadi, 2007).

The second approach to investigate irregularities and cheating in scientific, social approach. In this approach, dishonest people, not guilty and not guilty, but it is said that they are the victims of policies in a society that has been shaped over time.

2. Research Method

This semi-experimental study (experimental) has been done. In this way that first Test of English as a coordinator, among the various semesters of students come to the university in general English lessons and while a number of questions related to the fields of demographic, social and ethical. So their suspicion is not being questioned. In order to validate internal issue and make a real difference and create the potential for fraud and dishonesty among college students, tried to be consistent mid-term exam is tough as possible.

After conducting the tests, examination papers and then corrected by teachers without leaving anything on the score sheet instead of remaining securities is correct, students themselves returned to the key questions they are located and the students were asked to exchange their exams, they give the correct score. The difference between the actual score (score master) and the score given itself the level of dishonesty has nominated them.

It is obvious that all necessary measures have been taken at different stages of research students not take any suspicions to the test.

In terms of external validity refers to the generalizability of the results to the whole community should be pointed out that any results that may be obtained from a pilot project in terms of generalizability is limited (Delavare, 1993, p. 28). However, in this study we tried to learn a common language that all students from all university students, have been studied.

The experimental group consisted of students of various groups are studying medicine, engineering, basic science, agriculture and liberal arts university English class had eleven that 65% of them were female and 35 percent male.

3. Data Analysis

After data collection through questionnaires and student exam papers, in this section, we discuss data analysis. Analysis of the data obtained, first for the analysis of single variable data descriptive and inferential statistical methods and data at a later stage in the bivariate analysis, in terms of levels through tests measure the variables, the assumptions are very different.

3.1 Single Variable Analysis of Data

Gender

Among students, the proportion of girls is more than boys, so that more than two-thirds of the students are girls.

Age category

During the survey among students Minimum age 17 years and maximum 31 years.

Field of Study

The largest number (42.9) in Humanities have been suitable for the students of the humanities in college.

Place of residence

About two-thirds of samples among university students in Tehran and the third location in the city.

Language courses at the University ago

Among the students, 92% have stated that they have not already English course at the University. In contrast, less than 10 percent passed the course. It should be noted that this course for incoming students that score their language exam is offered a lesser extent.

Amount of interest in English

The results show that more than half (56.1 percent) of respondents are interested too high and in English and about 10% at very low and low interest rates have shown themselves in English.

Amount of interest in discipline

The vast majority of students in answering the question “What is amount of interest in educational field?” Have only expressed their field of study. In contrast, 10 patients (less than 5%) are dissatisfied with their study.

Evaluation of their sincerity

The majority of subjects in response to the question “To what extent do myself honest you know?” Have expressed their honest person. So that 71.4 percent high or too pointed, in contrast, less than 2 percent in low to very low and have noted amount of their sincerity.

Amount of individual perseverance

Results further questions about “how do you assess your assiduous?” indicates that the proportion of students who have announced their persistence little more than those who have expressed their full effort. Nearly half of students (50 percent) said they are a little perseverance.

Language course grade students

According to the results announced by the scores of teachers expressed 21.4 and the mean scores of the students is equal to or 23.1. So there is an average of the two scores.

Amount of integrity of the results report

According to the survey of 280 students study results showed, more than 62 percent of students said their score to master, absolutely honest, 26.6 percent have little integrity and honesty do not comprise the rest.

3.2 Analysis of Bivariate Data

3.2.1 Relationship between Sex with Honesty

The results of the tests, chi-square and v Kramers, honesty about relationship between sexes with students with language lessons to master the score, show that the integrity between the male and female in this regard is not much different view. As can be seen from 60.7 percent among girls, and the boys were 66.3 percent completely honest.

Also, among those who are not at all honest, i.e., those who have announced to her teacher score 11 score over 4 percent of girls and 4.3 percent of the students are boys. Therefore statistical correlation does not acknowledge ($s=0.7$). Of course, using two independent samples t parametric test also confirmed this finding does not, because the average score of dishonesty girls at 1.9, and 1.5 is equal among boys ($t=0.9$; $s=0.37$).

Table 1. Status honesty males and females

Total	Without honest	Very low honest	Low honest	Completely honest	Gender/honesty
100	4	7.3	28	60.7	Girl
100	3.4	5.6	24.7	66.3	Boy

Note. $s=0.84$, $v=0.05$, $x^2=0.8$.

3.2.2 Concerning the Age Group with Amount of Honesty

The results of the tests, chi-square and v Kramers age group with amount of honesty of the relationship has not been confirmed. As can be seen, 66.2 percent of students 18 and under, 67.4, 19 percent of students and 55.6 percent of students 20 years old and most were honest in expressing score to master. Of course, as is clear in the dispute is not so much to cause a significant relationship is honesty. Therefore statistical correlation does not acknowledge ($s=0.49$).

Table 2. Honesty status of students by age group

Total	Without honest	Very low honest	Low honest	Completely honest	Age/honesty
100	2.6	5.2	26	66.2	18 years old and lower
100	5.6	5.6	21.3	67.4	19 years old
100	2.8	13.9	27.8	55.6	20 years old and more

Note. $\chi^2=5.3$, $s=0.49$, $v=0.11$.

3.2.3 Relationship Place of Residence with Honesty

The results of the tests, chi-square and v Kramers location relationship with the students is a significant amount of dishonesty. As can be seen, amount of people honesty is not much different, but more significantly low and very low on people's honesty, so that 14.9 percent of students in Tehran, and 5.7 percent of county students amount of their rights is very little and not at all. Of course, using two independent samples t parametric test also confirmed this finding does not. This finding means that students cannot be true but county average of dishonesty against 2.05 Tehrani students, and among county is equal to 1.6 ($t=0.9$; $s=0.37$).

Table 3. Honesty status of students in terms of place of residence

Total	Without honest	Very low honest	Low honest	Completely honest	Resident/honesty
100	3.2	11.7	23.4	61.7	Tehran
100	5.7	-	27.1	61.7	Small cities

Note. $\chi^2=9.4$, $s=0.02$, $v=0.20$.

3.2.4 Relationship Interested in English with Honesty

The results of tests on the relationship Chi and Gamma interest in English, has been a significant amount of honesty in declaring the master score. This finding means that the interest of the people to learn more languages, the score also decreased their dishonesty and conversely the fewer people said they only lack of honesty is true.

Table 4. Status honesty by degree of interest in English

Total	Without honest	Very low honest	Low honest	Completely honest	Interest/honesty
100	28.6		14.3	57.1	Very low
100	7.1	-	35.7	57.1	Low
100	3.6	9.5	27.4	59.5	Approximately
100	2.6	6.4	37.2	53.8	High
100	1.8	8.8	10.5	78.9	Very high

Note. $\chi^2=28.4$, $s=0.005$, $G=-0.18$.

3.2.5 Evaluation of Perseverance Relationship with Honesty

The results of the tests Chi and Gamma, about his relationship with the student's evaluation of amount of persistence to master amount of honesty in declaring score does not show meaningful relationship. This finding means that the individual's assessment of his perseverance does not affect amount of honesty of the announced score.

Table 5. Honesty status of students in terms of evaluation of perseverance

Total	Without honest	Very low honest	Low honest	Completely honest	perseverance/honesty
100	-	8.8	29.4	67.8	Very low
100	6.2	9.9	25.9	58	Low
100	4.4	4.4	26.4	64.8	Approximately
100	-	10.3	31	58.6	High
100	-	-	-	100	Very high

Note. $\chi^2=9.6$, $s=0.64$, $G=-0.08$.

3.2.6 Relationship with Amount of Honesty Objective Assessment of their Sincerity

The results of the tests Chi and Gamma, about the relationship between students' evaluation of amount of honesty with honesty in the declared objective amount of the master score does not show meaningful relationship. This finding means that amount of individual's assessment of his integrity and honesty in operation with no impact score.

Lack of significant of this content, is because of the 280 students surveyed, only one person amount of your honesty very little and three people others have announced at least in part, have pointed to high and very high. So we can conclude there is no difference between opinion and behavior of individuals in the norm honesty.

Table 6. Honesty objective situation of students depending on their evaluation of their sincerity

Total	Without honest	Very low honest	Low honest	Completely honest	Evaluation/honesty
100	-	-	-	100	Very low
100	-	-	66.7	33.3	Low
100	4.5	10.6	28.8	56.1	Approximately
100	4.3	5.1	25.6	65	High
100	1.9	9.6	25.0	63.5	Very high

Note. $\chi^2=7.6$, $s=0.88$, $G=-0.10$.

From a sociological perspective, this phenomenon can be cleaned with a double meme and the "goal-directed action" and "value-oriented action" be analyzed. A distinction between these two types of action, based on the duality of human behavior that is hard to understand. In most cases, this distinction only exists in the mind of the observer that is, if the observer feels that immediately understands the behavior of others, his attitude is that rational describe this behavior and instead, in cases where else in his behavior are ambiguous and unclear, it is his tendency to interpret it unreasonable or irrational.

But this axiom should be noted that: Individual actions are not understood except in reference to the social context within which they are located or either expressed more precisely by reference to the construction of the interactions that are involved with it. Behavior, social factors cannot be understood except by recognizing the mutual interaction in which they are located.

Each of acting on the basis of personality, attitudes towards risk, its claims, information about their location data and situational variables that undoubtedly part of it is dependent on social interaction and social history, trying to make the most appropriate decision in relation to its interests, as it detects up (Bodon, 1991, pp. 6-31).

In accordance with this sociological axiom can be said to be acting alone (here student) does not operate in a vacuum or social institution and he continues to act in a context of social constraints and factors and data flows that are imposed on him.

Once in the environment (university, class) cheating deterrent mechanisms do not exist or are weak, or in the broader community levels witnessed scenes of widespread immorality and injustice in our society, or social mobility system is not based on merit or as already mentioned, with tricks and lies of those in power and influence for their symbolic capital and make fake documents and titles, should be expected to focus on the value

of moral action (scientific integrity) are goal-oriented rational action (cheating and dishonesty academic) to be converted.

Student in a position to decide that portray yourself as an honest (in terms of value), and in a position to try and compete especially in a situation that can be reasonably low, decides that reaches any loss by any means to bring him to his goal.

Select the most appropriate means (not suitable in terms of the values of society), i.e., dishonesty and cheating to achieve the goal (passing the exam) rational action toward the same object and of course this, i.e., students have the character actor as well that in the process of socialization within the family, schools and the media environment and shape and his experience and knowledge of this environment in dual action, he is effective. Dual action (the gap between theory and practice or pretend to be something or act contrary to it), but unfortunately the generalized problems of our society.

4. Conclusion and Recommendations

Scientific ethics, commitment to strive for innovation and change in the areas of social life and to open the doors of knowledge and understanding of the dynamic of social issues to the members of the community, one of the anomalies of the ethical and scientific fraud and dishonesty in scientific research and deliberation, the University is. In principle, the practical ethics of individual personal beliefs about what is right or wrong in what position is defined and rooted in socialization and acculturation of individuals within families, schools and other social institutions.

This study sought to is that dishonesty assesses students in a quasi-experimental design. Of course, academic dishonesty, plagiarism is the most common variety, i.e., presentation of the work of others as their own work, without citing sources, helping a student to another, provide a working simultaneously in different courses without teachers, earning the questions or answers are unauthorized and more.

In this study, dishonesty and manipulation of the facts were examined. In this way the first test of English at mid-term are harmoniously the various university students in English courses taken public and while a number of questions related to demographic, social and ethical fields were also questioned.

After doing so stringent tests, examination papers by the respective professors correction and then, without a trace of the score and correct papers on board rather than be left, returned to the students and provide them with the keys to your questions, correct their paper and their score Master announced. The difference between the actual score (the master) and score of the students to have their own, amount of dishonesty it has set.

According to the survey of 280 students, more than two-thirds of them in with your score Master of honesty have shown (150), and in front about 38 percent of the students (N=130) did not have the necessary integrity. Average scores announced by the teachers (actual score) 21.4, and in front of scores announced by the students is equal to 23.1. So there is an average of the two scores.

Two-variable analysis data also suggest that amount of integrity of students according to gender, does not reveal much difference, but among those who have severe dishonesty (those who score 11 more than the professor said to him), 4% of girls and 3.4 percent of the students are boys. The relationship accommodation (Tehran and other cities) and also amount of interest in English, with honesty in students is significant and some variables such as age, individual assessment of their perseverance, they have not shown a significant relationship with amount of truth.

Finally, the results of the tests Chi and Gamma about the relationship between students' evaluation of amount of sincerity with sincerity in the declared objective amount of the master score does not show meaningful relationship. This finding means that amount of individual's assessment of his integrity and honesty in operation with no impact score.

Lack of significant of this content is because of the 280 students surveyed, only one person amount of your integrity as too little and too low in the three stated and the rest on the surface to some extent, have pointed to high and very high. So we can conclude there is no difference between opinion and behavior of individuals in the norm honesty. This is also a function of the overall state of society represents the gap between theory and practice or manifestation and action.

In the end, we must point out again that cheating and academic dishonesty, however, one of the fundamental issues of education and universities. Giving false and extreme value for the score and achievement and neglect of the educational and moral aspects of university system—which will allow the development community provides its desirable path, this anomaly is likely to increase to follow. To prevent this situation will have no choice:

Firstly, balance personality and methods of education programs and students, to teach and what the university system and the system of education in school is heavier. Because otherwise students today fraudulent, dishonest people in public life will be tomorrow.

Secondly, although according to some experts, university culture due to the unique environment of complex and its decentralized structure, in creating an ethical environment creates challenges (Weber, 2006, p. 24), but despite this complex environment, the creation of a code of conduct serves as a deterrent to fraud. Unfortunately, we do not have country code academic community. Having a code of conduct and of life in a scientific culture is important for any institution and our universities can also conduct regulations and conditions are available on their sites.

These regulations shall be considered as a contract between the University and the student will clearly evident violations of science, can even register incoming students, especially graduate-level courses or exams postponed to the period in which it issues, related to scientific ethics, academic honesty, contrary cases of scientific, various instances of plagiarism and fraud, as well as the relevant penalties.

Finally, academic institutions, in addition to punishment-based mechanisms, methods for build a moral society, including specific communication rules and standards, social ethics, academic community members and mutual respect between students and teachers and professors who instead of punishment, students are certain advantages.

For example, exams open source (Open Book) without the presence of the invigilator or Self-Scheduled exam can create moral community, act as a hidden curriculum, where students get tips informal according to ethical issues and the incentive mechanism, in ethics and other ethical issues of their institution participate.

References

- Ahmadi, M. (2003). *Klasdary, looked at another way*. Mashhad: publications enshrine the sun.
- Bernardi, R., Giuliano, J., Komatsu, E., Potter, B., & Yamamoto, S. (2004). Contrasting the Cheating Behaviours of College Students from the United States and Japan. *Global Virtue Ethics Review*, 5(4), 5-31.
- Bodon, R. (1991). *Social logic, translator Abdolhossein Nik*. Gohar: Tehran Javidan Press.
- Bunn, D., Caudill, S., & Gropper, D. (1992). Crime in the Classroom: An Economic Analysis of Undergraduate Student Cheating Behavior. *Journal of Economic Education*, 23, 197-207. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00220485.1992.10844753>
- Chapman K., & Lupton, R. (2004). Academic Dishonesty in a Global Educational Market: A Comparison of Hong Kong and American University Business Students. *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 18, 425-435. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09513540410563130>
- Crown, D. F., & Spiller, M. S. (1998). Learning from the Literature on Collegiate Cheating: A Review of Empirical Research. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 17, 683-700.
- Davis, S., Grover, C., Becker, A., & McGregor, L. (1992). Academic Dishonesty: Prevalence, Determinants, Techniques, and Punishments. *Teaching of Psychology*, 19(1) 16-20. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15328023top1901_3
- Delavar, A. (1993). *Statistical style in the Social Sciences*. Tehran, Arasbaran.
- Ghasemi, F. (2015). *The Principles of Designing the "Silk Road Hotel-Faculty"*. Inspired by the Usage of Caravanserai in this International Road.
- Hetherington, E. M., & Feldman, S. E. (1964). College cheating as a function of subject and situational variables. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 55, 212-218. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0045337>
- Kerkvliet, J. (1994). Cheating by Economics Students: A Comparison of Survey Results. *Journal of Economic Education*, 25, 121-133. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00220485.1994.10844821>
- Kisamore, J., Stone, T., & Jawahar, I. (2007). Academic Integrity: The Relationship between Individual and Situational Factors on Misconduct Contemplations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 75, 381-394. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10551-006-9260-9>
- Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., & Barton, S. M. (2003). Collegiate Academic Dishonesty Revisited: What Have They Done, How Often Have They Done It, Who does it and Why Did They Do It? *Economic Journal of Sociology*.
- McCabe, D. (2005). *Levels of cheating and plagiarism remain high*. The Center for Academic Integrity.

- McCabe, D., & Drinan, P. (1999). Toward a Culture of Academic Integrity. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 46, 8.
- Mohseni, M. (2004). Fraud, checkmate. *Teacher Development Journal*, 186.
- Nonis, S., & Swift, C. O. (2001). An Examination of the Relationship between Academic Dishonesty and Workplace Dishonesty: A Multi-Campus Investigation. *Journal of Education for Business*, 77(2), 69-77. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08832320109599052>
- Owunwanne, D., Rustagi, N., & Dada, R. (2010). Students Perceptions of Cheating and Plagiarism in Higher Institutions. *Journal of College Teaching and Learning*, 17(11). <http://dx.doi.org/10.19030/tlc.v7i11.253>
- Papp, R., & Wertz, M. (2009). To Pass at Any Cost: Addressing Academic Integrity Violations. *Journal of Academic and Business Ethics*, 2, 2-11.
- Rafipour, F. (2003). *Special techniques of research in social sciences*. Tehran Publishing Company. Retrieved from http://www.academicintegrity.org/cai_research.asp
- Sheard, J., Dick, M., Markham, S., Macdonald, I., & Walsh, M. (2002). Cheating and plagiarism: Perceptions and practices of first year IT students. *ACM SIGCSE Bulletin*, 34(3), 183-187. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/637610.544468>
- Smyth, L. S., & Davis, J. R. (2004). Perceptions of Dishonesty among Two-year College Students: Academic Versus Business Situations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 51, 62-73. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/B:BUSI.0000032347.79241.3c>
- Weber, J. (2006). Implementing an Organizational Ethics Program in an Academic Environment: The Challenges and Opportunities for the Duquesne University Schools of Business. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 65, 23-42. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10551-005-3970-2>
- Zaker, S. G. (2010). *Scientific fraud: Legal and social aspects*. Tehran Institute of Social and Cultural Studies.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).