

Review of: "Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty: Insights from the University of Tehran"

Aurelius Ratu¹

¹ Institut Teknologi Sepuluh Nopember

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This paper provides a thought-provoking analysis of academic dishonesty; however, there are some issues that require critical examination. Although the research is intriguing, it tends to be more of a descriptive analysis rather than offering explicit insights into its contribution to mitigating academic dishonesty. Providing a clearer explanation of the theoretical and practical consequences arising from the research findings would strengthen the overall influence of the paper.

An important concern arises from the methodological approach used, particularly the utilization of the Manova technique with academic dishonesty as the dependent variable. This decision prompts inquiries regarding the lucidity of interpretation, specifically concerning the views of academic dishonesty among students from various academic years. The article's methodological robustness would be considerably enhanced by providing additional clarification on how to interpret the findings, such as the observation of academic dishonesty among third- and fourth-year students, as well as the small effect size observed among psychology, social science, and management students.

Moreover, the article would be improved by conducting a more detailed analysis of the data findings within the framework of academic standing. The author acknowledges the intricate interaction of social, economic, political, and racial elements, although the article fails to establish a clear link between these causes and the disheartening data outcomes. Providing a comprehensive study of the data and its implications within a larger context would enhance the article's depth and maybe offer insights for tackling academic dishonesty.

To enhance the scholarly contribution of this research, it is recommended to add the presentation of theoretical and practical implications, provide clearer methodological interpretations in the discussion section, and conduct a more thorough contextual analysis of the data. This would further engage readers with the topic of academic dishonesty.