

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

Moohebat Shoyukhi

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The study presents detailed information about the topic. The authors investigated student perception of academic dishonesty using a survey study, and they discovered that students' views on professors' and peers' dishonest behaviors and the justifiability of academic dishonesty were significantly different.

The research questions: The research questions and aims were not clearly defined, and a separate section is required to justify them according to the proposed topic.

The study design and aim: The study design is survey-based; however, the aims do not appear in this article. Researchers could discuss the aims, relate them to the survey items, and attach their survey questions as supplementary material.

Validity and reliability of the method: Since survey design affects validity, researchers would better report the survey items to ensure content validity. There was also no justification or discussion about the construct validity of the survey.

Replication: There is not enough detail about the survey's reliability to help future researchers replicate the study.

The process of subject selection: The process of subject selection seems appropriate.

Definition of the variables: The variables were not clearly defined in this study.

Clarity of the stated results: It would be better to avoid redundant information so that readers find it easy to check up on the results. While the first sentence of the results section indicated that the study examined students' and professors' perceptions of academic dishonesty, the whole article only discussed students'.

Data presentation: According to the article, researchers involved 300 students in survey research. Table 2, however, evidenced some missing data not indicated on it. In contrast, the sum of participants for unfair-article-evaluation was 313 students!!!

Overall, including the survey questionnaire as supplementary material would ensure the accuracy of the data analysis.

Page 9, the second paragraph: Self-cheating in exams does not appear in Table 2, but researchers discussed it in this paragraph.

Table 11 reported only the correlation coefficient matrix, including the R values, followed by three paragraphs reporting

the p-values associated with the correlations. This matrix could be more attractive if designed visually.

There were instances of inconsistent vocabulary between tables and article text. "Writing without citation" in the text versus "plagiarism-no-referencing" (page 9, para 3), effect size instead of Partial Eta Squared (pages 10 and 11), or students versus clients (page 1, para 1). Consistent vocabulary would reduce readers' distraction.

"Copy pasting from internet=89 and copying without citation=63" was not indicated as survey items on table 2 (page 9, para 3).

There are no agree, disagree, etc., scales for unfair scoring and unfair article evaluation.

It was not easy to navigate information referring to each table. On page 10, the first paragraph, for example, correlations between the dependent variables and Box's test results were hanging in the body with no tabulated data. It would be much more appropriate to be brief because elaboration, especially with numeric data, equals readers' confusion.

Discussion and conclusion: The article presented no discussion section and directly focused on the conclusions. It could enrich multiple aspects instead of focusing on only two survey items.

In this section, there was no discussion about the research questions.

The first paragraph of the conclusion reported the prevalence of academic dishonesty among professors with a non-Likert scale without having already discussed it in the text body or in Table 2. The conclusion section was, however, supported by six references associated with two survey items of the study. According to the conclusion, only 16% confessed to "engaging in academic dishonesty themselves." There is no evidence explaining this confession in the results section.

Discussing the limitations: The limitations were stated in the first paragraph of the conclusion, followed by a suggestion for future research.

The references: The references are relevant; however, these three articles published in 2023 might be helpful.

* Orok, E., Adeniyi, F., Williams, T., Dosunmu, O., Ikpe, F., Orakwe, C., & Kukoyi, O. (2023). Causes and mitigation of academic dishonesty among healthcare students in a Nigerian university. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 19(1), 13.

*dos Santos Neto, A.V., Bonfim, M. P., & Silva, C. A. T. (2024). Academic dishonesty: motivations of accounting students. *REVISTA AMBIENTE CONTÁBIL-Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte*, 16(1).

* Abuhammad, S., Al-Natour, A., & Hamaideh, S. (2023). Religiosity, gender, and correlates of academic dishonesty among children: a Jordanian study. *International Journal of Children's Spirituality*, 1-16.

Title: The title is informative and relevant.

Abstract: The abstract clearly summarizes what methodology was used. However, the lack of consistency between the results and conclusion is making the abstract vague to readers.

Overall: The article is not consistent within itself and contains instances of discrepancy.