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

Sahar Issa[1]

1 Faculty of Medicine Alexandria University

1. **Introduction:**

- **Clarity and Structure:** The introduction is clear and sets the stage for discussing academic dishonesty. However, the transition to the Iranian context is somewhat abrupt. Consider smoothing the transition between the global perspective on academic dishonesty and the specific case of Iran.

- **Referencing and Citations:** Citations are provided for specific claims and instances, which is good. However, for a scientific review, more references to academic studies, research findings, or established theories on academic dishonesty would strengthen the scholarly basis of the discussion.

- **Repetition and Redundancy:** There is some redundancy in emphasizing the prevalence of academic dishonesty in both the global and Iranian contexts. Consider streamlining the text to avoid repetitive statements and maintain reader engagement.

- **Data and Statistics:** The introduction lacks specific data or statistics on the prevalence of academic dishonesty in Iran. Incorporating relevant statistics or research findings would add empirical support to the claims made.

- **Language and Tone:** The use of phrases like "this is not simply about" and "this bubble growth" can be perceived as informal. Maintain a more formal and objective tone consistent with academic writing standards.

- **Depth of Analysis:** While the text discusses the consequences of academic dishonesty in Iran, it would benefit from a deeper analysis of the root causes, examining factors contributing to this phenomenon in the Iranian academic context.

- **Proposal for Addressing the Issue:** The proposed solution is commendable, emphasizing education over punitive measures. However, it lacks specificity. Consider providing more details on what kind of educational initiatives or programs could be implemented to address the identified causes of academic misconduct.

- **Integration of AI:** The mention of AI-assisted article writing is intriguing but is not explored further. Consider expanding on this point and discussing how AI might contribute to or exacerbate academic dishonesty, especially in the Iranian context.

- **Balance and Neutrality:** The text seems to lean towards a negative portrayal of the Iranian academic system. Ensure a balanced perspective by also highlighting positive aspects or potential solutions within the Iranian academic landscape.

- **Conclusion Transition:** The transition from discussing the Iranian academic context to the concluding statement about education and awareness is somewhat abrupt. Consider providing a smoother transition to enhance the flow of the text.

- **Headings and Subheadings:** Consider incorporating headings and subheadings to improve the organization and

readability of the text, especially when introducing different aspects or discussing various solutions.

- **Final Statement Clarity:** The final statement, "authorities will probably be forced to 'do something' about it," leaves room for ambiguity. Consider specifying what actions or measures are implied by this statement.

1. **Literature Review:**

- **Language and Tone:** The language is generally clear, but there are some grammatical issues and awkward phrasing. Ensure that the text is polished for formal academic writing, and consider seeking proofreading assistance.

- **Repetition:** The mention of the challenges of academic dishonesty is repeated in the introduction and literature review. Avoid redundancy and maintain a smooth flow between sections.

- **Citations:** The literature review would benefit from more recent and diverse references. Include a variety of sources to provide a comprehensive overview of the existing literature on academic dishonesty.

- **Ethical Considerations:** Consider including a brief section on ethical considerations, especially when conducting research involving human subjects.

- **Generalization:** Be cautious about generalizing findings without proper statistical support. Clearly state the limitations of the study, including any factors that might impact the generalizability of the results.

- **Recommendations:** Provide recommendations for future research based on the study's limitations or areas that require further exploration in the field of academic dishonesty in Iran.

1. **Methodology:**

- **Participant Description:** The participant demographics are well-described, but it would be beneficial to include information about the ethnic and cultural diversity within the sample, especially considering the potential impact on perceptions of academic dishonesty.

- **Sampling Method:** While the text mentions proportionate stratified sampling, it lacks details about how the strata were determined and why this method was chosen. Provide a brief rationale for selecting this sampling technique and how it contributes to the study's precision.

- **Response Rate:** It would be helpful to include the actual numbers (e.g., the total number approached and the number who agreed to participate). This information is crucial for understanding the representativeness of the sample.

- **Informed Consent:** The information about informed consent is clear. However, consider specifying the content of the information provided to participants to ensure transparency about the study's purpose and potential impact.

- **Anonymity and Confidentiality:** The assurance of anonymity is essential, but the text could elaborate on the specific measures taken to ensure participant confidentiality, especially when dealing with a sensitive topic like academic dishonesty.

- **Ethical Considerations:** While the text mentions the absence of an Institutional Review Board (IRB) system in Iran, it would be valuable to discuss any alternative ethical review processes followed or ethical guidelines adhered to during the study.

- **Measure - Questionnaire:** The description of the questionnaire is informative. However, it lacks information on the validation process and reliability of the instrument. Include details about any pilot testing, validation studies, or reliability

assessments conducted.

- **Likert Scale:** Explain the rationale for choosing a 5-point Likert scale for some items and a 4-point Likert scale for others. Ensure consistency in the scale used for similar types of items.
- **Item Examples:** Consider providing a few examples of the questionnaire items to offer readers a clearer understanding of the types of questions asked.
- **Clarity and Organization:** The method section is well-organized but could benefit from subsections such as "Participant Recruitment," "Data Collection," and "Instrument Development" for clearer navigation.
- **Grammar and Style:** There are minor grammatical issues in the text. Proofreading for clarity and coherence would improve the overall readability of the section.

1. **Results:**

While the text is generally informative, there are several weaknesses and areas for improvement:

- **Interpretation of Chi-Square Tests:** The text reports chi-square tests without providing interpretation or implications of the results. Readers may benefit from a brief explanation of how these results contribute to the overall understanding of academic dishonesty perceptions.
- **Demographics and AD:** The section on demographics and academic dishonesty lacks a clear transition. It would be helpful to introduce the demographic factors before presenting the results and their implications.
- **Multivariate Analysis:** The presentation of multivariate analysis results lacks clarity. Consider providing a more concise summary and interpretation of the MANOVA findings, emphasizing the most relevant outcomes.
- **Multiple Comparisons:** The section on multiple comparisons could benefit from a more straightforward presentation. Use concise language to communicate the significant differences and their implications, and consider presenting the information in a more organized manner.
- **Correlation Analysis:** The correlation matrix is presented without interpretation. Discussing the strength and direction of significant correlations, as well as their practical implications, would enhance the narrative.
- **Discussion of Weaknesses:** The text lacks a self-reflective discussion. It lacks any review of the study's limitations. Addressing potential biases, methodological constraints, and areas for future research would contribute to a more comprehensive discussion.

 The text concludes abruptly, without summarizing the main findings or highlighting their   broader implications. A well-structured conclusion can provide a concise summary of   key results and suggest avenues for future research.

- **Citation Style:** The citation style is inconsistent. Ensure that all citations follow a consistent format, and consider providing a full reference list at the end of the document.

The text mentions several previous studies (e.g., Aiken (1991), Davis, Grover, Becker, & McGregor (1992), Tibbetts (1999), Hensley, Kirkpatrick, & Burgoon (2013), McCabe, Trevino, & Butterfield (2010), Stiles, Wong, & LaBeff (2018), and Miguel Roig (2014)), but the citation style is inconsistent. Ensure adherence to a specific citation format (e.g., APA, MLA) throughout the text.

- **Grammar and Language:** Some sentences are long and complex, leading to potential confusion. Simplify sentences for better readability, and ensure that grammar and punctuation are correct throughout the text.

1. **Conclusions:**

There are several weaknesses that need to be addressed for the text to meet scientific review standards:

- **Clarity and Structure:** The organization of the conclusion lacks clarity. It would benefit from a more structured approach, with distinct sections for each key finding and a clear flow of ideas.

Consider breaking down the information into subheadings (without subtitles) such as "Prevalence of Academic Dishonesty," "Gender Disparities," and "Perceptions of Plagiarism" to enhance readability.

- **Data Presentation:** The text provides percentages (e.g., "approximately 2%") without specifying the actual numbers or sample sizes. Including this information is crucial for the reader to assess the significance of the findings.
- **Generalizations and Assumptions:** The statement that "this low level of trust in the university system suggests potential implications for university authorities" lacks specificity. It would be more scientifically rigorous to explicitly state what these implications might be or to avoid making broad assumptions without supporting evidence.
- **Qualitative Analysis:** The text primarily relies on quantitative data. Including qualitative insights, such as direct quotes from participants, could provide a richer understanding of the nuances in student attitudes towards academic integrity.
- **Attribution of Views:** Statements like "Our participants did not view plagiarism with the gravity it deserves" may be overly generalized. It would be more scientifically sound to attribute these views to specific survey responses or data points. Make your work more formal and scientific and avoid this generalization.
- **Integration of Contrasting Views:** When discussing gender differences in academic dishonesty, the text mentions opposing views from scholars but does not thoroughly integrate these perspectives into the analysis. A more nuanced discussion of conflicting findings would strengthen the conclusion.
- **Language Precision:** The use of phrases like "dirty world" may be considered colloquial and imprecise in a scientific context. Ensure the use of precise and neutral language to convey findings and interpretations.
- **Grammar and Style:** Proofread the text for grammatical errors and ensure a consistent writing style throughout.