The Use of Remote Proctoring in Detecting Cheating:
An Academic Dishonesty or Not Scenario

Angela J. Murphy*
School of Business & Industry
Florida A & M University
Tallahassee, FL USA 32307
E-mail: angela.murphy@famu.edu

Samique March-Dallas
School of Business & Industry
Florida A & M University
Tallahassee, FL USA 32307
E-mail: samique.march@famu.edu

Angela Tidwell
School of Business & Industry
Florida A & M University
Tallahassee, FL USA 32307
E-mail: angela.tidwell@famu.edu

Abstract

Bowers (1964) found that the majority of college students engaged in some form of cheating to enhance their grades. More recent academic dishonesty research shows that not much has changed (McCabe et al., 2012; Schaffhauser, 2017). This paper explores academic dishonesty and academic integrity through a literature review, a scenario that depicts possible cheating behavior, discussion questions to debrief the scenario, and a teaching note to facilitate the scenario. The literature review shares key findings on what constitutes cheating, how much students cheat, the role of peers in cheating, faculty behavior and organizational processes that impact cheating, as well as practices that encourage academic integrity. The scenario depicts a quiz that took place in less-than-ideal circumstances utilizing Respondus remote proctoring technology. Professors can use this scenario at the beginning of the semester to segue into conversations with students on academic integrity expectations in their courses. This scenario can also be helpful activity in faculty development workshops to encourage professors to reflect on academic dishonesty and academic integrity in their classes. The discussion questions can encourage students and faculty to critically think about cheating, provoke proactive conversation on academic dishonesty before assignments are due, and seek to generate solutions to maintain academic integrity. The teaching note provides a framework for debriefing the activity.

Keywords: academic dishonesty, academic integrity, cheating, proctoring, Respondus

Introduction

Ethical lapses occur in a broad range of organizations. The automaker, Volkswagen, admitted to software deception to fool emission tests from 2006 to 2015; this included approximately 11 million "clean diesel" vehicles around the world (Parloff, 2018). Hollywood actresses, Felicity Huffman and Lori Loughlin, and wealthy elites such as Agustin Huneeus Jr., a Napa Valley vintner, and insurance executive Toby MacFarlane, were enmeshed in a fraudulent scheme to get their children admitted to elite universities (Brown, 2019; McLaughlin, 2020; Rosa, 2020).

Theranos, a health care company, was in the business of providing accurate tests with a single drop of blood until reports leaked that it fabricated lab results; the CEO, Elizabeth Holmes, is currently charged with fraud (Comen& Frohlich, 2019). Wells Fargo Bank incurred over 2 billion in penalties because employees opened fake bank accounts to achieve unrealistic performance targets; 5,000 employees and the CEO lost their jobs when this became public (Comen& Frohlich, 2019).

Given this context, it should come as no surprise that unethical behavior also persists in academic institutions. When ethical lapses occur in the classroom, they are often known as breaches of academic integrity or cheating. Much like in the previous examples, students cheat because they want specific outcomes associated with getting ahead, such as maintaining academic standing, retaining scholarships, access to internship and permanent placement interviews or increasing the chance of chance of acceptance to post-secondary schools (McCabe et al.,2012). While unethical behavior by students is not new, the more recent ethical lapses in corporations provide a reminder for faculty to redouble their efforts to proactively address academic dishonesty. Students who cheat are more likely to develop into dishonest workers or workers who tolerate unethical workplace behavior (Crittenden et al., 2001).

This paper explores academic dishonesty and academic integrity through a literature review, a scenario that depicts possible cheating behavior, discussion questions to debrief the scenario, and a teaching note to facilitate the scenario. The literature review shares key findings on what constitutes cheating, how much students cheat, the role of peers in cheating, faculty behavior and organizational processes that impact cheating, as well as practices that encourage academic integrity. The scenario depicts a quiz that took place in less-than-ideal circumstances utilizing Respondus remote proctoring technology. Professors can use this scenario at the beginning of the semester to segue into conversations with students on academic integrity expectations in their courses. This scenario can also be helpful activity in faculty development workshops to encourage professors to reflect on academic dishonesty and academic integrity in their classes. The discussion questions can encourage students and faculty to critically think about cheating, provoke proactive conversation on academic dishonesty before assignments are due, and seek to generate solutions to maintain academic integrity.

Literature Review

What Is Academic Dishonesty or Cheating?

One of the most frustrating aspects of a professor's job can be holding students accountable for academic integrity violations. Academic dishonesty and academic integrity are two sides of a single coin. Whereas academic integrity emphasizes behavior that upholds the ethical values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility, academic dishonesty focuses on violations of expected ethical values, (Fishman, 2012). Academic dishonesty or cheating occurs when students try to enhance their grades using prohibited methods or assist other students in doing the same (Josien et al., 2015; McCabe et al., 2012; Pavela, 1997). The rest of the literature review covers the frequency of academic dishonesty, the role of peers in cheating, the impact of major on academic dishonesty, how faculty and administration can influence cheating, as well as strategies to enhance academic integrity.

High School Cheating

While the focus of this review is college student cheating, it is important to note the cheating can begin much earlier. Cheating in high school is a common occurrence independent of whether the high school is public, private or religiously affiliated (McCabe et al., 2012). In 2009, McCabe and Katz found that nearly 75% of high school juniors and seniors cheated (McCabe et al., 2012). Another study of high school students revealed a range of cheating from about 30% to 50%, depending on the specific cheating behavior (Josephson Institute, 2012). It is not unreasonable to assume that high school students bring a cheating mindset into college settings.

College Cheating

Bowers (1964) research on college student cheating surveyed more than 5000 people. He found that the majority about 75% of students engaged in academic dishonesty at least once and 51% did it more often. Bowers (1964) classified cheating into several categories, (e.g., cheating on tests, plagiarism, using unauthorized content during tests, representing someone else's work as their own, unauthorized assignment collaboration). More recent research indicates little change.

In 1993 and 1997, McCabe and Trevino found that most college students cheated, (i.e., 74-87%). A survey of North American college students came to a similar conclusion, (i.e., 65% cheating rate) (McCabe et al., 2012).

Why do students cheat? Some students express a lack of clarity of what practices constitute plagiarism or cheating (Bowers, 1964; Hudd et al., 2009; McCabe, 2005; McCabe &Pavela, 2004; Tatum & Schwartz, 2017). Some students do not perceive behaviors, such as using inaccurate or fictitious sources in a bibliography, as cheating (Hudd et al., 2009; Tatum & Schwartz, 2017). There is also a higher likelihood to engage in cheating if students have less awareness of academic dishonesty policies (McCabe et al., 2012; McCabe & Trevino, 1993; O'Rourke et al., 2010). Even good students engage in academic dishonesty. High achieving students cheat due to internal and external pressures, such as internal needs to maintain their high standards, heavy course loads coupled with involvement in multiple activities, increased rationalization that justify cheating and cultural pressure to be successful (Miller et al., 2017).

Peers and Cheating

Peers can also play a role in the decision to uphold or reject academic dishonesty. One can think of cheating as a type of social or behavioral contagion that spreads from one person to another (Wheeler, 1966). Whereas peer disapproval of cheating can be an effective cheating deterrent, students are more likely to cheat if they believe that their peers condone or engage in the same behavior (McCabe et al., 2012; McCabe & Trevino, 1993; O'Rourke et al., 2010). Peer reinforcement of cheating over time creates a strong norm of academic dishonesty that becomes entrenched; academic integrity then becomes an actual disadvantage (McCabe et al., 2012).

A major form of cheating involves unauthorized collaboration with peers. This can include multiple people working together on homework the professor designated as individual work, viewing a classmate's assignment for hints on how to answer questions, asking a peer who already took the quiz for answers before you take the quiz, or getting someone else to complete an assignment) (McCabe et al., 2012). Students can view unauthorized collaboration as a time management strategy or a trivial form of cheating; their rationalizations include a variety of reasons, (e.g., the high number of their commitments outside of the classroom, lack of assignment comprehension, unavailability of the professor, unimportant content) (McCabe et al., 2012).

Major and Cheating

In addition to peer influence, it appears that academic major can impact cheating. Premedical, engineering and business students are more likely to engage in cheating than students in other majors (Lanier, 2006; McCabe et al., 2012). Business students typically have one of the highest rates of cheating behaviors or attitudinal tolerance for cheating of any undergraduates (McCabe et al., 2012). A study found that 60% to 70 percent of business students cheated. This is consistent with Bowers' (1964) research that found a 66% rate of academic dishonesty among business students. Lawson (2004) suggests that business students follow the news of unethical behavior in the work world and use that as a justification for their own unethical behavior. While academic dishonesty should be a concern for all faculty, faculty in business schools should be especially mindful.

Faculty, Administration and Cheating

Research suggests that faculty employment status can influence how faculty members perceive academic integrity violations. Perhaps due to the difference in the number of classes taught or the years in the profession, full-time faculty believe that cheating is more prevalent and seek more sanctions than part-time faculty (Hudd et al., 2009). While the percent of part-time or non-tenure track faculty grew by over 100% between 1993 and 2013, the number of full-time, tenure track or tenured faculty only increased by 45% over that same period (Ran & Xu, 2019). It is unlikely that trend will change soon given the decrease in college enrollment growth (Smith, 2017). Given the increasing number adjuncts or instructors, it is important that tenured professors encourage adjunct faculty to uphold academic integrity and ensure there will be no negative impact on future contract renewals (Hudd et al., 2009; Ran & Xu, 2019).

Student perception of professor behavior can impact their intention to cheat. When students perceive faculty as apathetic, inconsistent, too lenient or excessively rigorous, they are more likely to engage in academic dishonesty (Anderman et al., 1998; Stueber-McEwen et al., 2009).

These perceptions may be "conveniently" in place for students to justify their decisions to cheat. While faculty flexibility and content rigor can vary by course, it is important that professors consistently embody interest in student learning and enforce consequences for academic integrity violations (McCabe et al., 2012).

A key administrative challenge to deterring cheating is a lack of centralized reporting mechanisms to track violations by students (Anderman et al., 1998; Walker & White, 2014). When these mechanisms exist and executed by faculty, it is easier to identify repeat offenders, as well as, to provide consequences that brightly signal to all stakeholders that academic dishonesty is not acceptable (Anderman et al., 1998; Walker & White, 2014). The mechanisms may include a mandatory reporting policy for all incidents of cheating to more accurately capture the breadth of how often cheating occurs, a centralized cheating database that tracks cheating by student to encourage more consistent penalties or establishing an academic integrity director with responsibilities to ensure enforcement of academic integrity violations and establish an institution wide academic integrity program (Atkinson et al., 2016; Bealle, 2017; Hudd et al., 2009).

Academic Integrity Practices

There are a range of things that faculty can do to increase academic integrity and deter academic dishonesty. They can proactively review academic integrity information with students through conversations and assignments with academic integrity affirmations or quiz questions throughout the semester to remind them of the importance of academic integrity (Bertram-Gallant, 2008; Tatum & Schwartz, 2017). Students tend to do better with point-of-need content, (e.g., information, demonstrations, examples, activities, etc.), timed to occur right before an assignment is due that utilizes that content (Bealle, 2017).

The ten principles of academic integrity provide a framework for faculty to incorporate academic integrity into their courses (McCabe &Pavela, 2004; McCabe et al., 2012). They include:

a. reinforcing academic integrity as a core value,
b. communicating expectations and measuring how well the students understand them,
c. minimizing temptations to cheat on assignments,
d. responding to academic dishonesty violations when they occur,
e. encouraging student capacity for self-management, learning and trust,
f. creating assignments that enhance student learning,
g. affirming the professor's role as a guide,
h. fostering a commitment to lifelong learning,
i. promoting academic integrity as a collaboration among administrators, students and faculty, and
j. aligning academic integrity with other core values of the institution.

Faculty can use these principles to complete an assessment of how well these 10 principles are baked into the culture of their institutions or courses and determine how to close any gaps between the current and the desired culture.

Some colleges have academic honor codes to reinforce academic integrity (McCabe, 2005; McCabe & Trevino, 2002). Honor codes include students taking an oath to uphold academic integrity as articulated by their institutions, completing exams without proctoring, reporting honor code violations of their peers, and/or participating in resolving academic integrity breaches in some form (Melendez, 1985). Honor codes are only as good as they are communicated and implemented throughout the institutional stakeholders (McCabe et al., 2012). While faculty often support the intent of honor codes, the perception of their effectiveness, implementation and fairness can sometimes fall short (McCabe et al., 2012; Ruderman et al., 2006).

Originality software such as TurnItIn and SafeAssign can facilitate academic integrity and discourage academic dishonesty by identifyingpossible incidents of not properly citing research prior to final submission (Zlomek, 2013). One of the authors of this paper requires that students utilize TurnItIn reports on assignments to reduce plagiarism.
TurnItIn reports assign color codes based on the intensity of possible plagiarism; submission reports with high yellow, (i.e., 35% or higher), orange or red (excluding the references), usually indicate that students need to properly quote their sources or paraphrase with intext citations.

Prince et al. (2009) suggest that proctoring is important in maintaining academic integrity and discouraging academic dishonesty.

They found significant differences in the scores of proctored and unproctored exams in their study; students who took unproctored exams scored substantially higher than students who took exams in person or with a remote proctor (Prince et al., 2009). Fask et al. (2014) reported a similar outcome in their research on unproctored, on-line exams versus proctored in-class exams. Zhao et al. (2021) explored the impact of trust messaging on academic dishonesty; they found that cheating significantly decreased when the exams were proctored in class versus when exams were unproctored in class. They also discovered that trust messages accompanying unproctored exams had little impact on decreasing cheating (Zhao et al., 2021).

Contrary to expectations, Stuber-McEwen et al. (2009) found that on-line students were less likely to cheat than students who attended in-person courses. Lanier (2006) had an opposite result; forty-one percent of students admitted to cheating in on-line courses but only 22% did so in physical or in-person classes (Lanier, 2006). Miller and Young-Jones (2012) echoed this sentiment; students seem to be more comfortable cheating in a virtual environment.

There are electronic tools to proctor in-person or online assessments. Respondus Lockdown Browser and Respondus Monitor are internet-based proctoring tools; the former prevents students from navigating away from the exam page and the latter records the student while taking assessments (Respondus, 2021). The videos are prioritized for faculty review based on what the camera observed during the recording (Respondus, 2021). Stack (2015) found no significant difference in the exam scores of students who were proctored in person versus with that the use of Respondus Lockdown Browser only; this suggests this tool can be useful in maintaining academic integrity. The academic dishonesty scenario in this paper includes the use of this technology.

Academic Dishonesty or Not Scenario

Note: While the names have been changed, this scenario is largely based on an incident that occurred in an Organizational Behavior course at a university located in the United States. While reading the scenario, reflect on whether or not there were academic integrity violations and suggestions for improvement.

Dr. Margaret Conner was a tenured professor who taught an Organizational Behavior course. In an effort to reduce the use of paper, she required students to use laptops and Respondus Lockdown Browser and Monitoring software to electronically complete quizzes. This software prevents students from leaving the web page while taking assessments and makes audiovisual recordings that professors can review within 24 hours of completion. Even though Dr. Conner was typically in the room during quizzes, she required the use of video-monitoring in case she had to leave the room.

It was two weeks into the semester; Dr. Conner had just completed a critical thinking module. She reminded students that there would be an in-class closed book quiz, (i.e., no notes, text, or assistance), using their laptops with Respondus. She informed them to download Respondus onto their laptops prior to attending class. They had access to a Respondus study guide, campus resources and office hours if they needed assistance.

At the start of the next class, Dr. Conner began preparations for the quiz; she told the students to quiet down and remove everything from the desk except their laptops. As the quiz began, she noticed that some students did not have laptops. In addition, there were some students with laptops, who had just started the process of downloading Respondus and were not sure how to do it. She began helping these students, but soon she realized that there were too many who needed assistance. She grew increasingly overwhelmed with the requests for her assistance; some students started asking their peers for assistance or to borrow their classmates' laptops. This resulted in periodic noise in the classroom. Dr. Conner initially did not allow assistance or borrowing but relented in an effort to move things forward. Dr. Conner reminded them that there was no talking unless they were helping a neighbor with a computer issue. After a while, everyone was done with the quiz, and she began her lecture. Dr. Conner was glad when class ended so that she could go home and relax.

The next day Dr. Conner reviewed the quiz scores. She noticed that there was significantly more chatter than she recalled during the quiz. In addition, six of the students had irregularities that violated the quiz instructions. Two of the students had blank screens during the entire quiz. It was hard to understand how this occurred since Respondus takes students through an environmental check to verify the audio connections and video surroundings. Two students asked classmates for answers.

One student put his hand over the camera and audibly asked for answers during the quiz. Another student put her hand over the camera for a period of time and removed it; a few minutes later, she pulled out notes. Dr. Conner was flabbergasted and disheartened; she could not believe that so many students were cheating so early in the semester, especially while she was in the room, and they knew that they were being recorded.

Academic dishonesty was a serious endeavor in Dr. Conner's class. According to her syllabus, the consequence of cheating on any course assignments is failing the entire course. At the same time, she did not relish the idea of flunking 15% of her class a month into the semester. She wondered if this was somehow a joke or if there was something that she did that resulted in this type of student behavior. Maybe what she saw on the video only looked incriminating; there might be good explanations. Half of the students were business majors, and the others were healthcare management; maybe this could some of the behavior. Maybe non-business disciplines had different closed-book quiz norms.

Rather than start with accusations of academic dishonesty, Dr. Conner decided to focus on behaviors in the video. She emailed the six students some version of this email:
" I had a chance to review a video of your critical thinking quiz. Is there a
reason that you reached down to pick something up and appeared to look at it while you were taking the closed-book quiz; please explain".

Only one student admitted cheating. Her explanation was that although she knew
that she was being recorded, she did not fully realize it until she viewed the video of her behavior. The others came up with explanations like:

"During the quiz, I had a cold and I dropped my napkin on the floor and I was reaching
down do get it".
This was a version of Dr. Conner's response to several of the students:
"Thanks for responding. Let's watch the video together on Monday at 2pm so that we can see how your explanation fits with the video. Please meet me at 2:00pm in my office".

As Dr. Conner prepared to meet with the students, several colleagues came out of a meeting; she asked them how they handled cheating in their classes. Cameron Zillman mentioned that cheating was not an issue in his courses because his assignments were "cheat proof". Dr. Callie Nguyen remarked that she ignored cheating as much as possible because it took too much time away from her research. In addition, she was going up for promotion next year, and did not want to risk low student evaluations. Another colleague, Professor Kenya Baptiste shared that she counseled cheaters on their behavior and provided retakes. Dr. Minnie Patel revealed that cheating students earned zeros on the assignment. Dr. Moses Gwin stated that students who violated academic integrity automatically failed his course and he also reported them to the University's Division of Student Affairs for violating the honor code. After listening to her colleagues and reviewing her syllabus, Dr. Conner was unsure what to do.

Scenario Discussion Questions

1. Provide an individual, group and organizational analysis of the case. Use a topic from each level of organizational behavior, (e.g., individual, interpersonal or group and organizational), to create a question to analyze a problem in this case.
2. If you were Dr. Conner's colleague, what advice would you give?
3. Should cheating consequences be different for students, who admit to cheating versus students, who lie about it? Should Dr. Conner treat the students with blank screens differently than the students, who asked for answers or used notes during the quiz?
4. To what extent does Dr. Conner bear any responsibility for the cheating?
5. Research academic integrity practices; do not use blogs or Wikipedia. Develop three specific, one sentence recommendations on how to minimize cheating or uphold academic integrity. Use APA intext citations and references in each of the recommendations.

Teaching Note for the Scenario Questions

1. Skip this question if you are not teaching an Organizational Behavior course.

The answers to this question will vary.   An organizational behavior (OB) analysis views problems as having individual components that can interact with one another and occur within an organizational context. The levels of OB provide a classic way to divide OB course content. The individual level of OB includes topics such as attitude, personality, motivation, perception, emotions, values and decision making.   The interpersonal level includes subjects such as teams, leadership, communication, power and conflict.   The organizational level focuses on topics such as culture, structure, policies, and change. Students can practice framing issues from multiple perspectives by developing questions that would help analyze the problem(s). These are examples of questions using a topic from each level of OB:

- To what extent did the values of the students impact their behavior (individual level)?
- To what extent was group or social contagion apparent among the students (interpersonal level)?
- To what extent was the academic dishonesty policy a deterrent if so many students cheated with a professor in the room (organization level)?

As it relates to the individual level of OB, ask students to explore the topic, (e.g., values) on the individual behavior of the students in the scenario. Ask them to think about the influence of values on cheating behavior; do you think that ethics training or students who strongly identify with ethical values, (e.g., honesty, integrity), cheat less?   Consider using clickers or the Kahoot app to pose this question.   The evidence is actually mixed. Some research indicates that values have little impact in terms of cheating or plagiarism (Jewe 2008; Lampe &Engleman-Lampe 2012). At the same time, Etter et al. (2007) found that academic dishonesty was more abhorrent to students, who attended religious institutions than students, who attended public universities.

Some research suggests that students are less likely to cheat when they perceive that their peers look down upon that behavior (McCabe & Trevino 1997). As it relates to facilitating conversation about the interpersonal level of OB on academic dishonesty, ask if there are more norms in their groups that reject or support academic honesty.   For example, the GroupMe app is sometimes used in cases of academic dishonesty (Jones, 2020).   Ochs (2020) has a very informativevideo that discusses the student use of GroupMe and cheating; faculty can view it to learn more.

As it relates to facilitating conversation about the organizational level of OB, there is an opportunity to focus on the impact of policy on cheating. Ask if there is enough awareness of academic dishonesty policies in the class or university.   Culture might also play a role in academic honesty or dishonesty. Ask them to consider what activities or cultural artifacts, (e.g., stories, rituals and symbols), are in place to explicitly encourage a culture of academic integrity throughout the university, (e.g., classes, residence halls, cafeteria, library), (Choong & Brown 2007).

2. The responses to this question will vary. At the same time, highlight how the responses may vary based on who the colleagues are, (e.g., rank, tenure). Should Dr. Conner purposely seek out colleagues outside of the people mentioned in the scenario to solicit their opinions? To what extent should Dr. Conner base her decision on her colleagues' suggestions or her syllabus?

Some believe that the initial incident of academic dishonesty should be developmental, not punitive (McCabe 2005; Scanlon 2003). The focus should be educational and forego a harsh penalty, (e.g., course grade of F, suspension from the university). Alternatively, Moten et al. (2013) discuss the importance of ensuring that universities and faculty firmly address repeated incidents of academic dishonesty, or the universities run the risk of affirming cultures of academic dishonesty. Should there be a consistent response to academic integrity breaches? What supports can organizations put into place to support adjuncts and non-tenured faculty upholding academic integrity?

3. The focus of this question is whether there should be leniency based on remorse. Additionally, this question explores if there should be a continuum of consequences based on cheating severity.   When facilitating this question ask the students to address which ethical system is most consistent with their answers, (e.g., relativism, egoism, universalism, virtue ethics).

4. It is also important to assess whether Dr. Conner bears some responsibility in this case. Had she discussed what constituted cheating or plagiarism prior to the quiz? Did she inform the students of the consequences of cheating? Classroom management was not ideal for a uiz. She allowed students who did not have laptops to stay in the room even though they knew that laptops with Respondus were required.

5. Could she have predicted that students without laptops or Respondus would become disruptive? Should she have asked them to step out until the quiz was finished? Was she responsible because she spent time helping those who had not downloaded Respondus prior to the class? Should she have focused more on facilitating a quiet quiz environment? If she bore any responsibility, should that mitigate the cheating consequences? Consider using clickers or the Kahoot app to pose some of these questions.

6. The answers vary to this question. While students should do their own research, it might be beneficial to provide key words for the recommendation literature search, (e.g., academic integrity, academic dishonesty, cheating, plagiarism). Examples of research-based recommendation statements might be:

- Since Bealle (2017) found that students do better with point-of-need content, Dr. Conner should review the academic dishonesty policy in class prior to the quiz to remind students what constitutes cheating and the consequences, as well as, to answer any questions.

- Given that Bealle (2017) found that students do better with point-of-need content, Dr. Conner should add academic dishonesty questions to the quiz to encourage students to be knowledgeable about academic integrity violations and cognizant of the consequences.
- Since that Bealle (2017) found that students do better with point-of-need content, Dr. Conner should review the APA intext citation and reference format prior to the assignment due date.

Scenario Postscript

Dr. Conner's academic dishonesty policy stated that students who cheated or plagiarized would fail the course. She did not enforce this policy due to her imperfect classroom management. Additionally, she did not want so many students to fail so early in the semester.

Four of the six students ultimately admitted cheating. Albeit three of them framed the cheating as accidental; they thought that the quiz was just for practice. Rather than fail the course, they received a 10% reduction in their final grades and some additional conditions, (i.e., earn a B on an academic integrity assignment and maintain a positive attitude in class). One of the students was unable to meet those conditions and failed the course. The two students, with blank videos, never admitted cheating. Their position was that they were so focused on the quiz that they "forgot" to remove the paper that they taped over the webcam. Dr. Conner told them that if it happened again, they would fail the course. Dr. Conner later discovered that one of these students intentionally covered the webcam to cheat.

The word got out about cheating in Dr. Conner's class. Some students felt that she made too big of a deal about it and the consequences were too severe. Others expressed disappointment that she did not enforce the academic dishonesty policy in her syllabus.

Dr. Conner no longer provides Respondus support during quizzes in the classroom; she refers students to the Respondus guide, campus technology resources or her office hours for assistance. If students bring laptops without downloading Respondus, they must download it without assistance and are not given additional time to complete the quiz. If students do not have laptops, they must sit in a separate area, and wait for their classmates to finish before quietly making requests to borrow their laptops. If they are successful, there is no additional time to take the quiz. If they are not able to borrow laptops, they forego the quiz.

References

Anderman, E. M., Griesinger, T., &Westerfield, G. (1998). Motivation and cheating during early adolescence. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 90*, 84-93. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.90.1.84

Atkinson, D., Nau, S. Z., & Symons, C. (2016). Ten years in the academic integrity trenches: Experiences and issues. *Journal of Informational Systems Education, 27*(3), 197-207.

Bealle, P. (2017). Community college academic integrity lessons that put research intopractice. *Theory Into Practice, 56*(2), 144-155. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2017.1283573

Bertram-Gallant, T. (2008). Dimensions of the issue: Toward a robust explanation. *ASHE Higher Education Report, 33*(5), 47-63.

Bowers, W. J. (1964). *Student dishonesty and its control in college*. Columbia University Bureau of Applied Social Research.

Crittenden, V. L., Davis, C., Perren, R., Brodowsky, G. H., Tarr, E., Ho, F. N., &Sciglimpaglia, D. (2020). Tolerance for cheating from the classroom to the boardroom: A study of underlying personal and cultural drivers. *Journal of Marketing Education, 42*(1), 23–36. https://doi.org/10.1177/0273475319878810

Brown, S. (2019, March 12). 8 universities. Millions in bribes. 10 corrupt coaches. What you need to know about the admissions-bribery scandal. *The Chronical of HigherEducation*. https://www.chronicle.com/article/8-Universities-Millions-in/245873

Choong, P., & Brown, B. S. (2007). The future of academic honesty. *Academy Of Educational Leadership Journal, 11*(2), 91-102.

Comen, E., & Frohlich, T. C. (2019, December 20). The biggest corporate scandals of the decade. *24/7 Wall St.*https://247wallst.com/special-report/2019/12/20/the-biggest-corporate-scandals-of-the-decade/3/

Etter, S., Cramer, J. J., & Finn, S. (2006). Origins of academic dishonesty: Ethical orientations and personality factors associated with attitudes about cheating with information Technology. Journal of Research on *Technology in Education, 39*(2), 133–155.https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2006.10782477

Fask, A., Englander, F., & Wang, Z. (2014). Do online exams facilitate cheating? An experiment designed to separate possible cheating from the effect of the online test taking environment. *Journal of Academic Ethics, 12*(2), 101-112. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-014-9207-1

Fishman, T. (2012). *The fundamental values of academic integrity* (second edition).International Center for Academic Integrity.

Hobbs, T. D. (2021, May 13). Cheating at school grows rampant --- students isolated at home find academic dishonesty is easier than ever. *Wall Street Journal*.http://www.wallstreetjournal.com.

Hudd, S. S., Apgar, C., Bronson, E. F., & Lee, R. G. (2009). Creating a campus culture of integrity: Comparing the perspectives of full- and part-time faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education, 80*(2), 146–177. http://www.jstor.org/stable/25511100

Jewe, R. D. (2008). Do Business Ethics Courses Work? The Effectiveness of Business Ethics Education: An Empirical Study. *Journal of Global Business Issues, 2,* 1–6.

Jones, J. (2020, November 17). Georgia State students warn about cheating throughGroupMe. *Georgia State Signal.*http://georgiastatesignal.com/2020/11/

Josephson Institute. (2012). Honesty and integrity: For the first time in a decade, lying, cheating and stealing among American students drops. *The ethics of American youth.*https://charactercounts.org/2012-report-card/

Josien, L., Eugene, S., Csipak, J., & Rampal, R. (2015). Cheating: Studentsand faculty's perception of potential cheating activity. *Journal of Legal, Ethical and Regulatory Issues, 18*(2), 21-37.

Lampe, M., &Engleman-Lampe, C. (2012). Mindfulness-based business ethics education. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal, 16*(3), 99-111.

Lanier, M. (2006). Academic integrity and distance learning. *Journal of Criminal JusticeEducation, 17*(2), 244–261. https://doi.org/10.1080/10511250600866166

Lawson, R. A. (2004). Is classroom cheating related to business students' propensity to cheat inthe "Real World"? *Journal of Business Ethics, 49*(2), 189–199. https://doi.org/10.1023/B:BUSI.0000015784.34148.cb

McCabe, D. L. (2005). It takes a village: Academic dishonesty & educational opportunity. *Liberal Education, 91*(3), 26–31.

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

McCabe, D., & Katz, D. (2009). Curbing cheating. *Education Digest, 75*(1), 16–19.

McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (2002). Honesty and the honor code. *Academe 88*(1), 37-41. https://doi.org/10.2307/40252118

McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (1997). Individual and contextual influences on academicdishonesty: A multicampus investigation. *Research in Higher Education, 38*(3), 379–396. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1024954224675

McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (1993). Academic dishonesty: Honor codes and other contextual influences. *Journal of Higher Education, 64*(5), 522–538. https://doi.org/10.2307/2959991

McLaughlin, K. (2020, May 25). Here's everyone who has been sentenced inthecollegeadmissions scandal so far. *Insider.*https://www.insider.com/college-admissions-scandal-full-list-people-sentenced-2019-9

Melendez, B. (1985). *Honor Code Study.* Harvard University.

Miller, A. D., Murdock, T. B., &Grotewiel, M. M. (2017). Addressing academic dishonesty among the highest achievers. *Theory Into Practice, 56*(2), 121–128.https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2017.1283574

Miller, A., & Young-Jones, A. D. (2012). Academic integrity: Online classes compared to face- to-face classes. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 39*(3-4), 138–145.

Molnar, K., Kletke, M., &Chongwatpol, J. (2008). Ethics vs. IT ethics: Do undergraduate students perceive a difference? *Journal of Business Ethics, 83*(4), 657–671. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-007-9646-3

Moten, J., Fitterer, A., Brazier, E., Leonard, J., & Brown, A. (2013). Examining online college cyber cheating methods and prevention measures. The Electronic Journal of E-Learning, 11(2), 139-146. https://academic-publishing.org/index.php/ejel/article/view/1664/1627

Nonis, S., & Owens-Swift, C. (2001) An examination of the relationship between academic dishonesty and workplace dishonesty: A multicampus investigation. *Journal of Education for Business, 77*(2), 69-77. https://doi.org/10.1080/08832320109599052

Ochs,J.[SmartSocial.Com].(2020, March 4). *GroupMeapp dangers* [Video].YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lWOWda1DFV8

O'Rourke, J., Barnes, J., Deaton, A., Fulks, K., Ryan, K., &Rettinger, D. A. (2010). Imitation is the sincerest form of cheating: The influence of direct knowledge and attitudes on academic dishonesty. *Ethics & Behavior, 20*(1), 47– 64. https://doi.org/10.1080/10508420903482616

Parloff, R. (2018, February 6). How VW paid $25 billion for "dieselgate" -- and got off easy. *ProPublica*. https://www.propublica.org/article/how-vw-paid-25-billion-for-dieselgate-and-got-off-easy

Pavela, G. (1997). Applying the power of association on campus: A model code of academic integrity. *The Journal of College and University Law, 24,* 97-118.

Prince, D. J., Fulton, R. A., &Garsombke, T. W. (2009). Comparisons of proctored versus non-proctored testing strategies In graduate distance education curriculum. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning (TLC), 6*(7).https://doi.org/10.19030/tlc.v6i7.1125

Ran, F. X., & Xu, D. (2019). Does contractual form matter? The impact of different types of non-tenure-track faculty on college students' academic outcomes. *Journal of Human Resources, 5*4(4), 1081–1120.

Respondus. (2021). Respondus Monitor: Fully automated proctoring for online exams.*Respondus*. https://web.respondus.com/he/monitor/

Rosa, C. (2018, May 28). The college cheating scandal: Everything you need to know. *Glamour*. https://www.glamour.com/story/the-lori-loughlin-and-felicity-huffman- college-cheating-scandal-is-too-fascinating.

Ruderman, J., Kiss, E., Airall, Z., Astrachan, O., Berges, P., Bonk, J., ... & Turner, F. (2006). Academic integrity inundergraduate life at Duke University: A report on the 2005-2006 survey. *Duke University.* http://integrity. duke. edu/reports/index. html

Scanlon, P. M. (2003). Student online plagiarism. *College Teaching, 51*(4), 161–165. https://doi.org/10.1080/87567550309596432

Schaffhauser, S. (2017). 9 in 10 students admit to cheating in college, Suspect faculty do the same. *Campustechnology.com.* https://campustechnology.com/articles/2017/02/23/9-in-10-students-admit-to-cheating-in-college-suspect-faculty-do-the-same.aspx

Smith, N. (2017). Too many people dream of a charmed life in academia. *Bloomberg.Com*. https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2017-10-04/too-many-people-dream-of-a-charmed-life-in-academia

Stack, S. (2015). The impact of exam environments on student test scores in online courses. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 26*(3), 273–282.https://doi.org/10.1080/10511253.2015.1012173

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.

Tatum, H., & Schwartz, B. M. (2017). Honor codes: Evidence based strategies for improving academic integrity. *Theory Into Practice, 56*(2), 129–135.https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2017.1308175

Walker, C., & White, M. (2014). Police, design, plan and manage: developing a framework for integrating staff roles and institutional policies into a plagiarism prevention strategy. *Journal of Higher Education Policy & Management, 36(*6), 674–687. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2014.957895

Wheeler, L. (1966). Toward a theory of behavioral contagion. *Psychological Review, 73*(2), 179–192. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0023023

Williams, S., Tanner, M., Beard, J., & Chacko, J. (2014). Academic misconduct amongbusiness students: A comparison of the US and UAE. Journal of Academic Ethics, 12(1),65-73. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-013-9200-0

Zhao, L., Zheng, J., Mao, H., Yu, X., Ye, J., Chen, H., Compton, B. J., Heyman, G. D., & Lee, K. (2021). Effects of trust and threat messaging on academic cheating: A field study. *Psychological Science (0956-7976), 32*(5), 735–742. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797620977513

Zlomek, E. (2013). Master's in plagiarism. *Bloomberg Businessweek, 4326*, 44–46.