A COMPARISON OF FACULTY AND STUDENT PERSPECTIVES OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY IN AN ONLINE ENVIRONMENT: A PILOT STUDY

Dr. Robert Stevens, Southeastern Oklahoma State University

Dr. Lawrence Silver, Southeastern Oklahoma State University

Dr. Rhonda Richards, Southeastern Oklahoma State University

Dr. Kitty Campbell, Southeastern Oklahoma State University

Abstract

The March 2020 COVID-19 pandemic caused many universities to move face-to-face and hybrid courses to completely online formats, resulting in increased challenges to academic integrity. Although academic misconduct and academic dishonesty among students is nothing new, the literature is inconclusive as to whether there is more cheating in online classes than in face-to-face classes. However, online education has made it much more difficult for instructors to detect instances of cheating. The purpose of this study is to compare faculty and student perceptions and attitudes regarding violations of academic integrity, particularly in online courses. An Internet survey link was sent to all faculty and students enrolled at a southwestern university.

Keywords: online, academic integrity, safeguards, technology

In looking for people to hire, look for three qualities: integrity, intelligence, and energy. And if they don't have the first one, the other two will kill you.
-Warren Buffet

Introduction

Online education has grown at a rapid pace in the last few years as more and more universities develop programs to reach the online community and offset declines in on-campus attendance. In some cases, this has allowed universities to reach entirely new market segments. The movement to an online environment also brought with it the possibility of a decrease in academic integrity in courses as many online websites offer "help" with homework, term papers and even taking courses for students. Since Covid-19, universities have reported a substantial increase in cheating and academic dishonesty due to online learning. This research addresses these issues through a survey of students and faculty at a regional university in the southwest.

Literature Review

Academic integrity has received a great deal of interest in the educational literature, both for universities and K-12 schools, (e.g., Silver & Stafford, 2017). Incidents such as

the Atlanta school cheating scandal (Blinder, 2015) raise awareness in the general public, but teachers, administrators, and students are aware that cheating is an everyday problem. According to McCabe, Butterfield, & Trevino (2012) over the 13-year period from 2002 to 2015, in a survey of 71,300 students, 68% of undergraduates admitted to cheating in some form as did 43% of graduate students. In the same survey, 95% of high school students reported they had either cheated on a test, plagiarized, or copied homework (McCabe, et al., 2012). Since Covid-19 there have been a substantial increase of rates of cheating and academic dishonesty since the shift to online learning (Baskin, 2020).

While there are numerous definitions of academic integrity (e.g., East & Donnelly, 2012; Turner & Beemsterboer, 2003), this study adopts the definition offered by the Office of Academic Affairs at The Ohio State University. Here, academic integrity is defined as the moral code or ethical policy of academia. This includes values such as avoidance of cheating or plagiarism; maintenance of academic standards; honesty and rigor in research and academic publishing (https://www.oaa.osu.edu/academic-integrity-and-misconduct)

Academic dishonesty includes a number of behaviours such as unauthorized collaboration on homework, cheating during exams, plagiarism, and purchasing term papers. Collaboration on homework is a form of collusion where students work together or share information about an assignment and then present it as an individual effort. Plagiarism includes, at the low end, improperly citing another person's work and, at the high end, completely incorporating someone else's work into an assignment and presenting it as one's own work. Purchasing term papers is a form of "contract cheating," particular to online classes (Atkinson, Nau & Symons, 2016). In contract cheating, students pay someone with an online presence to complete the assignment or the class for them through payment for services. There was an upsurge in contract cheating in 2016. Contract cheating often lacks identifiable course content and often appears "too professional" but is hard to prove. The experiment by Malesky, Baley, and Crow (2016), resulted in the instructors being unable to detect the company that took the course for the student and the student received an A on the presentation required for the course.

When asked why they cheat, students often say, in one form or another, "It depends." Richards (2012) in his work on K-12 cheating made the following observation:

Perhaps the most alarming news is that students say their cheating is contextual: based on the teacher, the assignment, or their overall workload. Decisions appear to be based on the extent to which the student can rationalize cheating in a given circumstance. Essentially, the academic integrity scale is a sliding one given the situation at hand, rather than a matter of a person's sense of right or wrong (p. 97).

A study by Burgason, Sefiha, and Briggs (2019) examined student perceptions of "levels" of cheating. Their findings indicated that a large percentage of both face-to-face and online students engaged in practices normally defined as cheating, yet often did not consider these to be violations of academic integrity. At worst, many of these behaviors constituted a "trivial" level of cheating, as opposed to serious.

Two other factors may contribute to cheating: culture and English language proficiency. Many foreign students, when entering U.S. universities, experience culture shock and need to learn Western academic mores. Some time may need to be set aside for intercultural learning on the part of the student and the instructor.

Many universities in the U.S., Canada, Australia, and the U.K. require English language proficiency. Yet, students arrive at English speaking universities with a variety of English language skills. This lack of language skill may cause inadvert plagiarism through misunderstanding or, if the language skills are sufficiently deficient, as the only way to pass the assignment. The solution is not to punish the students but for the institution to have sufficient language support services (Atkinson, et al., 2016).

The literature is inconsistent as to whether there is more cheating in online classes than in face-to-face classes (Lanier, 2006). Some studies have shown that the more "distant" students feel they are from the traditional classroom, their classmates, and teachers, the more likely they are to engage in academic misconduct (Rowe, 2004; Deranek and Parnther, 2015).

While there may be no difference in cheating incidents in different delivery methods, online education has made it much more difficult for instructors to detect academic dishonesty (Malesky, Baley, & Crow, 2016). For instance, Burgason, et. al (2019) assert that online cheating is easier because students are often more computer savvy than their instructors and are more aware of ways to cheat using electronic media. As of 2016, 6.3 million university students in the United States were taking an online course (Freidman, 2018).

Cheating does not begin in college. As noted above, in one study 95% of high school students admitted to some form of cheating. An emphasis on grades and high stakes testing for college admissions have contributed to this trend (Price-Mitchell, 2015). Stuber-McEwen et al. (2009) found a correlation between cheating in high school and college. Students who admitted that they cheated in high school were more likely to cheat in college. This included students who were caught cheating in high school. The solution to the problem of cheating is not an easy one and views differ on how to address it. There are even differences among educators in attitudes about whether academic integrity can be taught (Lofstrom, et al. 2015).

In a survey of university professors in New Zealand and Finland, Lofstrom, et al. (2015) found that while professors agreed that academic integrity was more than following rules, they disagreed on whose role it was to teach academic integrity or even whether the underlying values of academic integrity could be taught at all.

Potential employers are also concerned about the integrity of online courses. A study done in 2018 found that 41.6% of CPAs would let an online degree impact their decision to hire an employee (Richards, Stevens, Silver, Metts, 2018). As part of this study the authors conducted interviews with CPAs and found that many CPA firms are now giving entrance exams to evaluate new hires. This concern has come from CPA firms' experience with hiring students with accounting degrees who have very limited knowledge of accounting. Also, in this study, the authors learned CPAs viewed the CPA exam as a levelling tool for accounting degrees. The CPA exam is a nationwide exam given in a secure testing environment. With a CPA license, employers were not as

concerned with online learning due to the uniformity of the exam and the security and identification controls in place for testing.

Differences in Faculty/Student Perceptions of Ethical Dilemmas and Academic Dishonesty

As noted, there is no consistency in the literature as to whether or not cheating has increased along with the increase in distance education. However, the increase in online learning has brought with it a large variety of students. Many non-traditional students and students who need to work fulltime are attracted to online learning because of the flexibility of the schedule. It is important, then, to understand this more diverse cohort of students in terms of attitudes toward academic integrity and to see how it compares with the academic integrity perceptions of faculty, many of whom are also relatively new to online learning.

Miller and Young-Jones (2012) examined the differences in cheating in online classes as compared to face-to-face classes. Their results indicated that, although the majority of students agreed that cheating was easier in an online class, students who took only online classes cheated less than other students. The very nature of online education may actually serve to reduce dishonest behavior. Online courses tend to have more flexible scheduling, thus reducing "panic cheating", particularly in regard to testing (Tolman, 2017). Interestingly, students who took a combination of online and face-to-face classes were more likely to cheat in their online classes.

Faculty do not view academic dishonesty as an "all or nothing" situation. Rather, academic misconduct on the part of students is on a continuum with some actions considered more serious than others (Pincus & Schmelkin, 2003). However, in their study, faculty and students both believed that cheating on an exam was more serious than cheating on a paper (e.g., plagiarism).

Numerous studies have examined student demographics and personal variables, such as age, gender, self-control, and pressure from the student and others regarding grades, to identify the likelihood of cheating behavior. Although students often acknowledged the importance of academic integrity, common reasons stated for cheating included procrastination, poor study habits, low self-esteem, and lack of time due to other commitments such as having a job (San Jose, 2022). According to Lanier (2006), students who were having a difficult time academically and those who needed to retain their scholarships were more likely to cheat. Tremayne and Curtis (2021) surveyed 1340 university students and found that as students' understanding of plagiarism and perceptions of the seriousness of plagiarism increased, there was a significant reduction in plagiarism behaviors.

In a study of the differences in perceptions of general business ethics among first-year students, seniors, and business faculty, Stevens, et al. (1993) found that seniors showed more ethical concern than first-year students and faculty showed more ethical concern than seniors.

In contrast, Gundersen, et al. (2008) found no difference in ethical perceptions due to educational attainment. Faculty were, overall, no more or less ethical than

undergraduates. Hall and Beradino (2006) found no difference in perceptions about cheating and plagiarism among students, faculty, and employers.

Szabo, Larkin, and Sinclair (2018) examined academic integrity of master's-level graduate students in terms of cheating and plagiarism perceptions and behaviors. Interestingly, some of the results contradicted a number of earlier studies regarding the prevalence of cheating. The data indicated that while students believed cheating was easy to do, they did not believe that it occurred very often. Students were aware of web-based cheating tools but 97% reported that they did not use these tools. They also believed that the incidence of dishonesty in online courses did not differ from that of other course formats. According to the researchers, these findings might indicate that the student's beliefs and attitudes about cheating are a greater influence on actual behavior than course design.

While there are these studies comparing student and faculty perceptions of academic dishonesty and perceptions of more general business ethics, none of the above studies address these issues in an online environment. This paper makes an initial effort to fill that gap in the literature.

Methodology

In this study, an Internet survey link was sent to all faculty and students at a southwestern university. The faculty list included 214 full and part-time faculty and about 2300 students. The survey had been approved by the university's Institutional Review Board (IRB) and the Vice President for Academic Affairs prior to sending it out. Respondents were informed of the nature of the survey and given a definition of academic integrity to assure cognizance of the survey intent. Two hundred seventy-one students responded, yielding a 11.7% response rate. Seventy faculty responded, yielding a 32.7% response rate.

Student characteristics were as follows: (1) 86% were juniors, seniors or graduate students; (2) 29% were in the School of Arts and Sciences, 45% were from the School of Business, and 22% were from the School of Education; (3) 65% were female and 35% were male.

Faculty characteristics were as follows: (1) had an average of 15.3 years of teaching experience with and an average of 11.1 years at current university; (2) having taught an average of 2.96 online courses in their career and at current university before the spring, 2020, semester – None – 15 respondents; 1-3 courses – 19 respondents; 4-6 courses – 4 respondents and 7 or more courses – 31 respondents; (3) 61 % were in the School of Arts and Sciences, 20 % were from the School of Business, and 19% were from the School of Education. Respondents included 35% full professors, 9% associate professors, 15% assistant professors, 16% instructors, and 25% were adjuncts.

The survey instrument used in this study was adapted from student and faculty questionnaires developed at the University of South Florida. (students: https://myusf.usfca.edu/sites/default/files/AcadIntegStudentSurvey.pdf and faculty: https://myusf.usfca.edu/sites/default/files/AcadIntegFacultySurvey.pdf)

As previously noted, academic integrity was defined as follows: Academic integrity is the moral code or ethical policy of academia. This includes values such as avoidance of

cheating or plagiarism; maintenance of academic standards; honesty and rigor in research and academic publishing. (https://oaa.osu.edu/academic-integrity-and-misconduct)

SPSS software was used to analyse the resulting data. The analysis produced means, medians, and percentages where appropriate with the results shown. in the tables below.

Findings

In the middle of March 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic resulted in most campuses across the U.S. to close for face-to-face and hybrid/blended courses. This is reflected in Exhibits 1 and 2, as it shows that 31% of the student respondents in this survey had never taken an online course before the current semester, and 19% of the faculty had never taught an online course prior to that semester. This means some of these students and faculty had no experience in online education and the challenges to academic integrity that ensue with such courses. Some of the University's programs were already 100% online and therefore, were unaffected by the changes involved in an online format.

Table 1 and 2: Number of Online Courses Taken/Taught Before the Current Semester

Table 1: Taken by Students:

None	81	31%
1-3	59	22%
4-6	54	20%
7 or more	**74**	**28%**

Table 2: Taught by Faculty:

None	13	19%
1-3	14	20%
4-6	6	9%
7 or more	37	53%

However, they were all aware of the need for academic integrity and had specific actions that they felt would be taken by the instructor if a student had cheated on a major test or assignment in their course. Instructors also expressed their most likely actions for cheating. These results are shown in Tables 3 and 4.

Most likely actions taken by you/your instructor if you were caught cheating on a major test or assignment:

Table 3: Student Responses:

Reprimand or warn the student.	156 59%	263
Lower the student's grade.	142 54%	263
Fail the student on the test or assignment.	144 55%	263
Give the student a failing grade for the course.	76 29%	263
Report the student to the department chair or Director of Student Conduct.	103 39%	264
Do nothing/ignore the incident.	21 8%	262

Table 4: Faculty Actions:

	Very Likely	Responses
Reprimand or warn the student	53 77%	69
Lower the student's grade	42 61%	69
Fail the student on the test or assignment	38 54%	70
Give the student a failing grade for the course	9 13%	70
Report the student to the dean, judicial officer or disciplinary committee.	17 25%	69
Do nothing/Ignore the incident	66%	69

When asked about their observances of other students cheating, most students reported seeing few instances of cheating. The most common forms of cheating reported were 1) working on an assignment with another student when it was supposed

to individual effort (23%), 2) getting answers from someone who had already taken an exam (21%), and 3) copying some material without footnoting it in the paper (20%).

When faculty were asked what incidents with student cheating they had experienced in the last three years, the most frequently occurring issue was related to plagiarism. This included copying material almost word for word, from any source and turning it in as one's own work (67%); copying a few sentences of material without footnoting them in the paper (59%), and plagiarizing a paper in any way using the internet as a source (59%).

Faculty were also asked about what types of safeguards were used in their courses to prevent cheating. The most frequently used safeguard is information placed in the syllabus about cheating and plagiarism (89%), followed by using tools like SafeAssign/Turnitin (79%), and using a lockdown browser for quizzes and exams (63%). The majority (63%) also felt that an honor code would be an effective tool in maintaining academic integrity.

Many faculty members felt that other faculty ignored student cheating (44%) because they didn't want to go through the process of reporting (40%) or they didn't think anything would be resolved (33%). A small proportion (14%) stated that they didn't want to punish students. Faculty were also asked how they felt their university responded to student cheating. These results are shown in Table 5.

Table 5: How does your university respond to student cheating:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Faculty members handle instances of student cheating in a uniform manner	11 16%	**22** **32%**	**22** **32%**	12 18%	1 1%
Faculty members try hard to detect cheaters	3 4%	8 12%	24 35%	**30** **43%**	4 6%
Cheating is a serious problem our university	4 6%	16 23%	**25** **36%**	16 23%	8 12%
The judicial process at our university is fair and impartial	1 1%	3 4%	**29** **42%**	25 36%	11 16%
Faculty at our university should be held responsible for monitoring the academic integrity of their students	2 3%	3 4%	15 22%	**30** **44%**	18 26%

Table 6: In the last three years how often have you observed any of the following behaviors in your classes:

	Never	Once	More than Once
Copying from another student during a test or exam without his or her knowledge.	40 59%	**10** **15%**	**18** **26%**
Copying from another student during a test with his or her knowledge	52 76%	9 13%	7 10%
Using unpermitted crib notes (or cheat sheet) during a test	46 69%	13 19%	8 12%
Getting questions or answer from someone who has already taken the test	43 62%	12 17%	14 20%

Helping someone else cheat on a test	**50** **74%**	7 10%	11 16%
Altering a graded test or exam and submitting it for additional credit	**64** **96%**	2 3%	1 1%
Copying material, almost word for word, from any source and turning it in as one's own work	11 16%	12 17%	**46** **67%**
Fabricating or falsifying a bibliography	**50** **74%**	9 13%	9 13%
Turning in as one's own, work done by someone else	26 38%	12 18%	**30** **44%**
Receiving substantial, unpermitted help on an assignment	**40** **60%**	10 15%	17 25%
Working on an assignment with other students when the instructor asked for individual work	**40** **60%**	7 10%	20 30%
Copying a few sentences of material without footnoting them in the paper	18 26%	10 15%	**40** **59%**
Writing or providing a paper for another student	**54** **79%**	7 10%	7 10%
Turning in a paper either purchased or plagiarized, in large part, from a term paper mill or website	**40** **60%**	10 15%	17 25%
Using false or forged excuse to obtain an extension on a due date	**35** **51%**	7 10%	26 38%
Plagiarizing a paper in any way using the Internet as a source	18 26%	10 15%	**40** **59%**
In a course requiring computer work, copying a friend's program rather than doing one's own	**50** **76%**	3 5%	13 20%
Falsifying lab or research data	**62** **94%**	2 3%	2 3%

Faculty were also asked what safeguards they used to reduce cheating in their own courses. These results are shown is Table 7.

Table 7: What safeguards do you employ to reduce cheating in your courses? (please check all that apply)

None. I do not use any special safeguards in my courses.	2 3%
Use Internet tools like Safe-Assign and Turnitin to confirm plagiarism	42 61%
Provide information in syllabus about cheating/plagiarism	**66** **96%**
Change exams regularly	38 55%
Use different versions of each exam	41 59%
Discuss your views on the importance of honest and academic integrity with your students	47 68%
Remind students periodically about their obligations under your school's academic integrity policy	45 65%
Tell students about methods you will use to detect and deter cheating in your course	40 58%
Utilize Lockdown Browser Software or other monitoring programs during online tests/exams	18 26%
Set times for online tests/exams	44 64%
Other (please specify)	16 23%

When asked about whether increased availability of technology increased the opportunity to cheat, 54% of the faculty responded yes and 84% of the students responded yes. Faculty were also asked in what ways they felt technology had influenced cheating. These results are shown in Table 8.

Table 8: If yes, in what ways?

Made plagiarism easier	**50** **86%**
Made cheating on test easier	48 83%
Increased the incidence of someone taking a test or course for someone else	40 69%
Increased the incidence of students sharing material from courses	49 84%

Discussion and Conclusions

Both students and faculty were aware of the need for academic integrity of online courses. However, students reported much lower instances of cheating than faculty but they reported the same types of issues of cheating.

One interesting observation on the findings of this research is that while both faculty and students indicated that they felt that the increased availability of technology threatened academic integrity of courses, the most common safeguard to thwart cheating was a statement in the syllabus about cheating. In other words, the increased availability of technology was seen as a threat to course integrity and yet available technology used to identify cheating was not the most frequently mentioned tool used to maintain academic integrity.

This would lead to a conclusion that faculty were aware of the issue of integrity and were concerned about it by the use of various tools to discourage cheating. Hopefully, this awareness, in itself, would be a hindrance to cheating by students.

Future research may look at the post-Covid impact as time passes and students beginning returning to the classroom. There is no doubt that the world of education is in the midst of paradigm shift with the increase in online learning, online meetings and tools enhanced to meet these needs. And quite possibly as the world returns to a normal pace, students may begin to focus back on learning rather than surviving in the classroom through academic dishonesty. Future research may also look at the return of students to the classroom after working in an environment they were unprepared for due to academic dishonesty.

References

Atkinson, D., Nau, S. Z., & Symons, C. (2016). Ten years in the academic integrity trenches: Experiences and issues. *Journal of Information Systems Education*, *27*(3), 197-208.

Basken, P. (2020, December 23). "Universities say student cheating exploding in Covid era." Times Higher Education (THE).

https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/universities-say-student-cheating-exploding-covid-era

Blinder, A. (2015) Atlanta Educators Convicted in School Cheating Scandal – NY Times 04/01/15 Accessed at https://www.nytimes.com/2015/04/02/us/verdict-reached-in-atlanta-school-testing-trial.html

Buffett, W. (n.d.). *Quotable Quotes.* https://www.goodreads.com/quotes/917810-in-looking-for-people-to-hire-you-look-for-three

Burgason, K., Sefiha, O., & Briggs, L. (2019). Cheating is in the eye of the beholder: an evolving understanding of academic misconduct. *Innovative Higher Education,*44. 1-16. 10.1007/s10755-019-9457-3.

East, J. and Donnelly, L. (2012). Taking responsibility for academic integrity: A collaborative teaching and learning design, *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 9(3), 2012. Available at: http://ro.uow.edu.au/jutlp/vol9/iss3/2

Freidman, J. (2018). Study: More Students Are Enrolling in Online Courses, https://www.usnews.com/higher-education/online-education/articles/2018-01-11/study-more-students-are-enrolling-in-online-courses. Accessed 05/18/2020.

Gundersen, D., Capozzoli, E. and Rajamma, R. (2008). Learned ethical behavior: An academic perspective. *Journal of Education for Business,* 83(6), 315-324.

Hall, A. & Beradino, L. (2006). Teaching professional behaviors: Differences in the perceptions of faculty, students, and employers. *Journal of Business Ethics,* 63(4), 407-415.

Lanier, M. M. (2006). Academic integrity and distance learning, *Journal of Criminal Justice Education,* 17: 244-261.

Lofstrom, E., Trotman, T., Furnari, M. & Shephard, K. (2015). Who teaches academic integrity and how do they teach it? *Higher Education 69*, 435-448. D)I 10-1007/s10734-014-9784-3.

Malesky Jr, L. A., Baley, J., & Crow, R. (2016). Academic dishonesty: Assessing the threat of cheating companies to online education. *College Teaching*, *64*(4), 178-183.

McCabe, D. L., Butterfield, K. D., & Trevino, L. K. (2012). Cheating in college: Why students do it and what educators can do about it. *JUH* Press.

Miller,A. & Young-Jones, A. (2012). Academic integrity: Online classes compared to face-to-face classes. Journal of Instructional Psychology,,Sept-Dec 2012, 29 (3), 138-145.

Pincus, H. S. & Schmelkin, L. P. (2003). Faculty perceptions of academic dishonesty: A multidimensional scaling analysis. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 74(2), 196-209.

Price-Mitchell, M. (2015). Creating a Culture of Integrity in the Classroom https://www.edutopia.org/blog/8-pathways-creating-culture-integrity-marilyn-price-mitchell

Richards, P. (2012) Academic integrity: A case for good teaching, *Independent School, 71*(4), 96-98.

Richards, R., Stevens, R., Silver, L. & Metts, S. (2018). Overcoming employer perceptions of online accounting education with knowledge, Administrative Issues Journal: Connecting Education, Practice, and Research, Winter 2018, Vol. 8, No. 2: 70-80. DOI: 10.5929/2019.1.14.5

Rowe, N.C. (2004). Cheating in online student assessment: Beyond plagiarism, *Online Journal of Distance Learning,* 7 (2)

San Jose, A.E. (2022). Academic integrity of students during the COVID-19 pandemic: A mixed method analysis, *European Journal of Education and Pedagogy,* DOI:10.24018/2022.3.4.400

Silver, D. & Stafford, D. (2017). *Teaching Kids to Thrive*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Stevens, R. E., Harris, O. J., & Williamson, S. (1993). A comparison of ethical evaluations of business school faculty and students: A pilot study. *Journal of Business Ethics,* 12: 611-619.

Stuber-McEwen, D., Wiseley, P., & Hoggatt, S. (2009). Point, click, and cheat: Frequency and type of academic dishonesty in the virtual classroom. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 12*(3), 1-10.

Szabo, S., Larkin, C. & Sinclair, B. (2018). Examining the academic integrity of current graduate level education students. The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin – International Journal for Professional Educators, 84(5), 26-36.

The Ohio State Office of Academic Affairs. https://www.oaa.osu.edu/academic-integrity-and-misconduct. Accessed January 17, 2022

Tolman, S. (2017). Academic dishonesty in online courses: Considerations for graduate prepatory programs in Higher education. *College Student Journal*, 2017; 51(4):579-584. Accessed September 5, 2022. https://search-ebscohost-com.ezproxy.se.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=126676702&site=ehost-live

Turner, S. P., & Beemsterboer, P. L. (2003). Enhancing academic integrity: Formulating effective honor codes. *Journal of Dental Education, 67* (10), 1122-1129.