

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

Patricia Fidalgo¹

¹ Emirates College for Advanced Education

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

INTRODUCTION

The article's Introduction section about "Views on Academic Dishonesty: Understandings from the University of Tehran" reviews the worldwide academic dishonesty problem, specifically the Iranian situation. Although the introduction discusses different facets, some parts could be enhanced to make it more straightforward, unified, and interesting.

Clarity and Cohesion: The initial paragraph is quite tangled and may perplex the reader. It is suggested that the sentences be reorganized so they are clearer and better connected.

The transition from discussing the global issue of academic dishonesty to the specific context of Iran needs to be smoother. Consider providing a clearer bridge between these discussions.

Citation Integration: The citations to particular research studies (for example, Shahghasemi et al., 2023; Kapoor, 2012; Roig, 2015) could be integrated more seamlessly into the narrative flow of the writing. Instead of listing them in succession, weave them into the discussion to illustrate points more effectively.

Redundancy: There is some repetition in discussing the challenges posed by the internet and outsourcing academic work. Consider consolidating these points to avoid redundancy.

Engagement and Hook: The introduction does not have an intriguing hook to grab the readers' attention. Think about adding a thought-provoking question, an astonishing statistic, or a short story to fascinate the audience right from the start.

Language and Tone: The language used is mostly formal, but there are times when it could be polished for increased academic strength. Additionally, ensure consistent terminology, such as using "academic dishonesty," throughout.

Global Perspective: The article introduces the worldwide problem of academic dishonesty, but it could benefit from placing greater emphasis on how universal this issue is and the need to consider different viewpoints when tackling it.

Organizational Structure: Organizing the introduction could follow a more logical flow. Consider organizing it following a clear sequence, such as introducing the global problem, transitioning to the Iranian context, and concluding with the significance of addressing academic dishonesty through education.

Engagement with the Reader: The concluding sentences express a belief in the importance of tackling academic

dishonesty but could be more assertive and conclusive. You could strengthen the thesis statement to convey the main argument and goal of the article assertively.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review presents a helpful summary of the research done on academic dishonesty in Iranian universities. However, there are some aspects that could be enhanced to make the discussion clearer and more thorough.

Organizational Structure: The literature review does not contain a clear introductory statement or structure that describes the objective and organization of this part. Consider providing an introductory paragraph to guide the reader through the studies.

Synthesis of Findings: While each study is individually discussed, there's an opportunity to provide a more synthesized overview of common themes, trends, or contradictions across the studies. This could help readers grasp the broader landscape of academic dishonesty in Iranian universities.

In-text Citations: The authors often mention methodology, tools, and findings without directly citing the sources. Strengthen the literature review by consistently integrating in-text citations to reinforce the credibility of the discussed studies.

Brevity and Inclusion Criteria: The decision to highlight only five studies for brevity is understandable, but it may be beneficial to briefly mention the broader scope of the 24 identified studies to provide context for the selected ones. Additionally, clarify the criteria used for selecting these particular studies.

Contextualization of Studies: Provide a brief context or rationale for selecting studies. Why were these specific studies chosen, and how do they contribute to the overall understanding of academic dishonesty in Iranian universities?

Consistent Terminology: Ensure consistency in terminology and formatting. For example, consistently use full names or abbreviations when referring to the researchers and their studies.

Statistical Analysis Reporting: The studies often involve statistical analyses, but the presentation of results could be more reader-friendly. Consider summarizing key statistical findings or trends without overwhelming the reader with detailed numerical data.

Thematic Connection: Create smoother transitions between the studies to maintain the thematic connection. For example, explore commonalities or differences in the methodologies employed by the researchers.

Critical Analysis: Include a critical examination of the methodologies and restrictions of the studies. Talk about potential prejudices, sample size considerations, and any methodological deficiencies that may affect the applicability of the findings.

Conclusion Transition: The transition from the last study to the conclusion is abrupt. Consider adding a concluding sentence summarising the collective insights gained from the discussed studies and smoothly transitioning into the next

section.

Method

The methods section provides a detailed account of the study's participants and procedures. While the information is generally clear, refinement and additional detail could benefit some areas.

Sampling Procedure Clarity: The mention of "proportionate stratified sampling" is positive, but it would be helpful to elaborate on how this method was specifically employed. Specify the strata considered and how the proportions were determined to enhance transparency and reproducibility.

Response Rate Explanation: The details about the response rate are useful, but it would be helpful to explain how the response rate affects the ability to generalize the results to a broader population. Also, if possible, comparing the traits of those who did not take part to those who did would improve knowledge of potential biases.

Data Collection Locations: The text notes data was collected in multiple places, but more information on the process for selecting those locations and when data was gathered could be included. Providing those details would give a better understanding of how representative the data sample is.

Ethical Considerations: The mention of assuring complete anonymity is crucial. However, it would be advantageous to expand on additional ethical considerations, like securing informed permission, processes for post-study briefing, and any systems established to manage possible upset among participants.

Institutional Review Board (IRB) Discussion: Recognizing Iran's lack of a formal IRB system provides important insight. However, it would be helpful to expand on the measures taken to uphold ethical standards, possibly by describing an independent ethical review or consultation procedure that was followed.

Research Instrument Development: The research instrument is explained in depth. However, more information on how the questionnaire was validated would improve it. Discuss any pilot testing, reliability checks, or modifications based on feedback during development.

Scoring Scale Explanation: The questionnaire included Likert scales and other scales for different items. Explain the reasoning behind using different scales for different questions. Justify selecting particular scales for specific items and how using suitable scales for each item helps ensure the responses accurately reflect what is being measured.

Item Pool Refinement: The process of refining the questionnaire is briefly mentioned. Elaborating on this process by providing more information about the standards used to decide which items to include or exclude would make the research tool more trustworthy.

RESULTS

The Results section thoroughly presents the findings, giving a complete summary of the study. However, some aspects could be improved for enhanced clarity and understanding.

Introduction to Results: Begin the Results section with a concise introduction summarizing the primary focus of the analysis and the key variables investigated. This will help readers anticipate the subsequent detailed findings.

Outlier Analysis Clarification: Provide more details about the exploratory analysis to identify outliers, specifying the thresholds or criteria used for defining outliers based on leverage, Cook's D, and Mahalanobis distance. This transparency will enhance the credibility of the data cleaning process.

Frequency Distribution Presentation: While Table 2 summarizes the prevalence of academic dishonesty, consider presenting the percentages alongside raw frequencies to provide a clearer perspective on the distribution.

Chi-square Tests Interpretation: After reporting the results of chi-square tests, offer concise interpretations of the findings. For instance, specify the practical significance of significant differences in responses related to awareness of problems, contribution to society, and the importance of a rich CV.

Detailed Reporting of Significant Findings: When reporting significant chi-square results, provide more detail on the nature of the differences. For instance, specify the proportions of students who "agree" or "completely agree" to gain insights into the magnitude of attitudes toward cheating acceptability and contextual support for cheating.

Demographics and AD: The MANOVA analysis results are well-detailed, but consider providing effect sizes (Eta Squared) alongside statistical significance to better understand the practical importance of the observed differences.

Age and Perception Correlations: Clearly articulate the practical implications of the correlations between age and different types of academic dishonesty. Connect the findings to existing literature or theories, explaining why certain correlations might exist.

Limitation Acknowledgment: The study's constraints, like possible biases in self-reporting or the cross-sectional aspect of the data, should be recognized. This admission promotes transparency and assists readers in contextualizing the results.

Statistical Assumptions Checking: In the description of the statistical tests, briefly explain the assumptions checked for each test and their significance. This will enhance the robustness of the statistical analysis.

Qualitative Insights Integration: Consider integrating qualitative insights or participant comments to better understand the context behind specific responses. This can enhance the interpretability of quantitative findings.

CONCLUSION

The conclusion effectively summarizes key findings, but some areas can be refined for clarity, depth, and coherence.

Synthesis of Findings: Begin the conclusion by briefly summarizing the main findings to set the stage for the discussion. This aids readers in understanding the overall significance of the study.

Trust in the University System: Provide a more nuanced analysis of the implications of low trust in the university system. Delve into potential reasons for this lack of trust and how it may impact academic integrity. Propose specific

recommendations or interventions for university authorities to address this issue.

Reporting Discrepancy: Elaborate on the observed reporting discrepancy in academic dishonesty. Discuss potential reasons for participants' reluctance to admit their own involvement. Consider exploring the social desirability bias and its impact on self-reporting. This discussion will contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of the reliability of self-reported data.

Gender Differences: Extend the discussion on gender differences in academic dishonesty. As scholars like McCabe, Trevino, & Butterfield (2010) suggested, acknowledge the existing debate regarding self-reporting tendencies among genders. This will add nuance to the interpretation of gender-related findings.

Evolution of Academic Perception: Expand on the intriguing finding related to the evolution of students' perceptions of the academic environment. Discuss the potential implications of students' increasing belief in the existence of a "dirty world" in academia. Explore how this perception may influence academic behaviour and institutional trust over time.

Promoting Plagiarism Consciousness: Enhance the discourse on spreading consciousness of plagiarism. Provide insights into the possible repercussions of the extreme unawareness regarding plagiarism prevalent among learners and educators in Iran. Talk about tactics for increasing cognizance and cultivating a culture of academic honesty.

Integration of Scholarly Views: When citing previous studies (Aiken (1991), Davis, Grover, Becker, & McGregor (1992), Tibbetts (1999), Hensley, Kirkpatrick, & Burgoon (2013), McCabe, Trevino, & Butterfield (2010), Stiles, Wong, & LaBeff (2018)), provide a more contextualized integration of these findings into the current study. Discuss how these studies align or differ with your results.

Future Research Recommendations: Explicitly outline specific directions for future research based on your findings. Propose research questions or areas that could benefit from more in-depth investigation, especially concerning the observed discrepancies and evolving perceptions.

Global Contextualization: Contextualize the findings within the global academic integrity discourse. Discuss how the observed patterns align with or differ from trends reported in other international contexts. This will provide a broader perspective on the significance of your study.

Concluding Remarks: End the conclusion with a concise recapitulation of the study's main contributions and their potential impact on academic policy, practice, and future research.