CONFÉRENCE INTERNATIONALE CONJOINTE SUR L'ÉTHIQUE ET L'INTÉGRITÉ ACADÉMIQUE EN ENSEIGNEMENT SUPÉRIEUR: PLAGIAT, PRÉVENTION ET PÉDAGOGIE DANS UNE NOUVELLE ÈRE NUMÉRIQUE

LIVRE DES RÉSUMÉS

21-24 MAI 2024

Université du Québec en Outaouais
283, Blvd. Alexandre-Taché
Gatineau (Quebec) J8X 3X7
Canada

PRESENTÉ PAR

ENAI PUPP Partenariat universitaire sur la prévention du plagiat CSAI

May 23rd, 2024 at 10h45 / 23 mai 2024 à 10 h 45

Rethinking Academic Integrity and Plagiarism for a New AI Era

Martine Pellerin & Malaïka Ogandaga, University of Alberta, Canada

The advent of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI) has ignited a mixture of apprehension and concern within Higher Education, primarily rooted in worries about its potential adverse effects on plagiarism and academic integrity. However, at the opposite end of the spectrum, there is a notable surge in transformative educational perspectives that embrace the profound potential of GAI tools to completely redefine our academic integrity culture in this new era (Bearman et al., 2020; Eaton, 2021). Furthermore, there is a growing awareness of the imperative to re-envision the concept of academic integrity, harmonizing it with students' agency, digital citizenship, and professional responsibilities in higher education. Our primary goal is to prepare students for a future involving generative artificial intelligence (GAI) as part of their professional responsibilities. To do so also means empowering faculty to explore the potential of GAI and its implication for academic integrity. This presentation explores the conceptualization of academic integrity and the need for institutions to adapt their policies to address the issues related to students using GAI in their academic and professional training. We first explore the concept of students' agency and engagement in reconceptualizing academic integrity. Secondly, we examine how students using GAI as a cognitive offloading tool (Dawson, 2020) might contribute to rethinking policies on academic integrity and plagiarism. Finally, we inquire into the evolution of academic integrity in conjunction with digital citizenship and professional responsibility as competencies in the corpus of Higher Education for a new era.

Bibliography

Bearman, M., Dawson, P., Ajjawi, R., Tai, J., & Boud, D. (2020). Re-imagining University Assessment in a Digital World. *The Enabling Power of Assessment, 7*. Springer International Publishing.

Dawson, P. (2020). Cognitive Offloading and Assessment. In Bearman, M., Dawson, P., Ajjawi, R., Tai, J., & Boud, D. (Eds), *Re-imagining University Assessment in a Digital World*. *The Enabling Power of Assessment, 7*. Springer, Cham.

Eaton, S. (2021). *Plagiarism in Higher Education: Tackling Tough Topics in Academic Integrity.* Libraries Unlimited.

May 23rd, 2024 at 10h45 / 23 mai 2024 à 10 h 45

Academic publisher guidelines on AI usage: A ChatGPT supported thematic analysis

Mike Perkins, British University of Vietnam, Vietnam

Background: As Artificial Intelligence (AI) technologies such as Generative AI (GenAI) have become more common in academic settings, it is necessary to examine how these tools interact with issues of authorship, academic integrity, and research methodologies. The current landscape lacks cohesive policies and guidelines for regulating AI's role in academic research and prompting discussions among publishers, authors, and institutions.

Methods: This study employs inductive thematic analysis to explore publisher policies regarding AI-assisted authorship and academic work. Our methods involved a two-fold analysis using both AI-assisted and traditional unassisted techniques to examine the available policies from leading academic publishers and other publishing or academic entities. The framework was designed to offer multiple perspectives, harnessing the strengths of AI for pattern recognition while leveraging human expertise for nuanced interpretation. The results of these two analyses are combined to form the final themes.

Results: Our findings indicate six overall themes. These were labelled as: Human-Exclusive Authorship, Disclosure and Transparency, Fluid Policy Landscape, Author Accountability, Research Integrity, and Constraints and Exclusions. The first three listed themes were identified in both the AI-assisted and manual analyses, with the AI assisted analysis identifying the further three themes. Based on the six themes, a broad consensus appears among publishers that human authorship remains paramount and that the use of GenAI tools is permissible but must be disclosed. Although an overall note of caution towards the use of GenAI tools is identified, these tools are increasingly acknowledged for their supportive roles in the research process, especially in language editing. The study also discusses the inherent limitations and biases of AI-assisted analysis, necessitating rigorous scrutiny by authors, reviewers, and editors.
Conclusions: There is a growing recognition of GenAI's role as a valuable additional tool in academic research, but one that comes with caveats pertaining to integrity, accountability, and interpretive limitations. This study used a novel analysis supported by GenAI tools to identify themes emerging in the policy landscape, underscoring the need for an informed, flexible approach to policy formulation that can adapt to the rapidly evolving landscape of AI technologies.

AI Usage Disclaimer This study used Generative AI tools to analyse data, create preliminary themes, produce draft text, and revise wording throughout the production of the manuscript and abstract. Multiple modes of ChatGPT over different time periods were used, with all modes

using the underlying GPT-4 Large Language Model. The authors reviewed, edited, and take responsibility for all outputs of the tools used in this study.

Bibliography (N/A)

May 23rd, 2024 at 10h45 / 23 mai 2024 à 10 h 45

Old Habits, New Tools: Unpacking the Psychological Continuity of Academic Dishonesty in the AI Era

Maciej Koscielniak & Agata Chudzicka-Czupała, SWPS University, Poland

The growing global interest in generative models of artificial intelligence presents novel challenges to academic integrity within educational institutions worldwide. The ease with which services like ChatGPT can be employed for outsourcing academic papers or generating responses for online exams not only supersedes traditional essay mills but also poses formidable obstacles to detection. Our ongoing research project aims to elucidate whether the psychological underpinnings of this emerging trend portray it as a distinct phenomenon or simply constitute an evolution of traditional academic dishonesty. The preliminary study, with a sample size of 296 participants, is grounded in the Theory of Planned Behavior—an established framework frequently utilized to decode the underpinnings of traditional academic dishonesty. We examined the likelihood of participants engaging in unethical academic behaviors, using the measures proposed in a prominent cross-cultural study by Chudzicka-Chupala et al. (2015) as possible correlates. Furthermore, we incorporated the variable of past academic dishonesty into our model. Hierarchical regression analysis substantiated that attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control—all elements of the Theory of Planned Behavior—are significant predictors of using AI for academic dishonesty. We also demonstrated that the past frequency of engaging in traditional academic dishonesty explained the variance in AI academic misconduct above and beyond the Theory of Planned Behavior. We are currently expanding our research through a more comprehensive cross-cultural project based on the aforementioned methodology. During the conference presentation, we intend to elaborate further on the study's findings, positing that academic dishonesty facilitated by artificial intelligence should not be viewed as an isolated issue. Instead, it should be understood as an extension of traditional academic dishonesty, thereby requiring an integrated approach for effective mitigation.

Bibliography

Chudzicka-Czupała, A., Grabowski, D., Mello, A. L., Kuntz, J., Zaharia, D. V., Hapon, N., & Börü, D. (2016). Application of the theory of planned behavior in academic cheating research–cross-cultural comparison. *Ethics & Behavior, 26*(8), 638-659.

Koscielniak, M. & Bojanowska, A. (2019). The role of personal values and student achievement in academic dishonesty. *Frontiers in psychology*, 1887.

May 23rd, 2024 at 10h45 / 23 mai 2024 à 10 h 45

Detecting and analysing plagiarism in the era of generative IA

Rui Sousa-Silva, University of Porto, Portugal

Plagiarism has been traditionally defined as taking someone else's words and passing them off as one's own (Cambridge, n/d). Thus, establishing the existence of plagiarism has been typically associated with a comparison between the plagiarising (derivative) text(s) and the plagiarised (original) text (Johnson, 1997; Sousa-Silva, 2013, 2021; Turell, 2008). This comparison would then allow the suspect(s) to be proven plagiarist(s). However, plagiarism is often a silent 'crime' and frequently passes unnoticed, even to the attentive reader, notwithstanding the fact that plagiarism may exist even if the original is not found. The acknowledgement of this fact has led to the development of two plagiarism detection approaches: external plagiarism detection (i.e., comparison against other sources, considered the original texts) and intrinsic plagiarism detection (i.e., stylistic analysis of the texts suspected of plagiarism to find style shifts that are indicative of plagiarism) (Meyer Zu Eissen & Stein, 2006; Oberreuter, L'Huillier, Ríos, & Velásquez, 2011; Stamatatos, 2006). Intrinsic plagiarism detection approaches, however, have not prospered, in no small part due to the fact that, during their academic life, students undergo an academic writing learning process, and hence stylistic shifts are to be expected which result from a legitimate attempt to write (Howard, 1995; Pecorari, 2008). Consequently, most plagiarism detection approaches are based on external comparison, such as the ones used by similarity detection software. However, this scenario changed with generative artificial intelligence (AI), which enabled plagiarists to produce apparently original texts which cannot be detected by traditional, external plagiarism detection methods (Ibrahim, 2023; Steponenaite & Barakat, 2023; Xiao, Chatterjee, & Gehringer, 2022). As has been empirically demonstrated, even more sophisticated textual overlap detection systems fail to detect AI-generated text, and thus mark such texts as original. This session presents a novel method, based on forensic linguistics approaches, that combine plagiarism detection and authorship analysis methods to detect plagiarism resulting from generative AI tools. A list of linguistic features will be presented which signal the existence of plagiarism, and which span beyond stylistic issues. The session concludes with operational recommendations for educational institutions.

Bibliography

Howard, R. M. (1995). Plagiarisms, Authorships, and the Academic Death Penalty. *College English*, *57*(7), 788–806. https://doi.org/10.2307/378403

Ibrahim, K. (2023). Using AI-based detectors to control AI-assisted plagiarism in ESL writing: "The Terminator Versus the Machines". *Language Testing in Asia*, *13*(1), 46. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-023-00260-2

Johnson, A. (1997). Textual kidnapping—A case of plagarism among three student texts? *The International Journal of Speech, Language and the Law*, *4*(2), 210–225.

Meyer Zu Eissen, S. & Stein, B. (2006). Intrinsic Plagiarism Detection. *Proceedings of the European Conference on Information Retrieval (ECIR-06)*, 1–4.

Oberreuter, G., L'Huillier, G., Ríos, S. A., & Velásquez, J. D. (2011). Approaches for Intrinsic and External Plagiarism Detection: Notebook for PAN at CLEF 2011. *Notebook Papers of CLEF 2011 LABs and Workshops*. Amsterdam.

Pecorari, D. (2008). *Academic Writing and Plagiarism: A Linguistic Analysis*. Continuum.

Sousa-Silva, R. (2013). *Detecting plagiarism in the forensic linguistics turn* [PhD Thesis, Aston University].

Sousa-Silva, R. (2021). Plagiarism: Evidence-based plagiarism detection in forensic contexts. In M. Coulthard, A. May, & R. Sousa-Silva (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Forensic Linguistics* (2nd ed., pp. 364–381). Routledge.

Stamatatos, E. (2006). Intrinsic Plagiarism Detection Using Character n-gram Profiles. *ReCALL*, *2*, 38–46.

Steponenaite, A. & Barakat, B. (2023). Plagiarism in AI Empowered World. In M. Antona & C. Stephanidis (Eds.), *Universal Access in Human-Computer Interaction* (pp. 434–442). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.

Turell, M. T. (2008). Plagiarism. In J. Gibbons & M. T. Turell (Eds.), *Dimensions of Forensic Linguistics* (pp. 265–299). John Benjamins.

Xiao, Y., Chatterjee, S., & Gehringer, E. (2022). A New Era of Plagiarism the Danger of Cheating Using AI. *2022 20th International Conference on Information Technology Based Higher Education and Training (ITHET)*, 1–6. Antalya, IEEE. https://doi.org/10.1109/ITHET56107.2022.10031827

May 23rd, 2024 at 10h45 / 23 mai 2024 à 10 h 45

In Their Words: Toward an Understanding of Assessment Outsourcing

Corrine D. Ferguson & Margaret A. Troye, Bow Valley College, Canada

Why learners do and do not engage in assessment outsourcing continues to plague educators as we seek ways to better support our students and prevent academic integrity violations. As Curtis & Clare (2023) have argued, using theory to frame academic integrity research is critical toward explaining and predicting future behaviour. Much of the theory work in academic integrity research focuses on perspectives from criminology and psychology including control theory (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990), differential association theory (Sutherland, 1947), techniques of neutralization (Sykes & Matza, 1957), social learning theory (Bandura, 1977), theory of planned behaviour (Beck & Ajzen, 1991), and personality traits such as the dark triad (Lee et al., 2020). Awdry & Groves (2023) have suggested that it is likely that we need to take a multi-theoretical approach to understanding the reasons behind assessment outsourcing. Using data from a 2021 self-report survey of community college students in Canada, we present findings from qualitative analysis of open-ended responses to assess the efficacy of criminological and psychological explanations for engaging in commercial outsourcing and sharing behaviour. Our results reveal a complex story suggesting that not only are multiple theoretical frameworks useful and necessary, but the utility of theories appear to vary according to whether outsourcing occurs by way of commercial sources or with sources known to the engagers (e.g., family, friends, peers). Additionally, a sociological theory, the stress process model, may also contribute to an understanding of a variety of outsourcing behaviours. In this session we suggest ways to make sense of the findings and discuss how they may inform interventions toward curtailing commercial outsourcing and sharing behaviour at our institutions.

Bibliography

Awdry, R. & Groves, A. (2023). Why they do and why they don't: A combined criminological approach to understanding assignment outsourcing in higher education. *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 19*(7). https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-023-00126-3

Bandura, A. (1977). Social learning theory. Prentice Hall.

Beck, L. & Ajzen, I. (1991). Predicting dishonest actions using the theory of planned behavior. *Journal of Research in Personality, 25(*3), 285–301. https://doi.org/10.1016/0092-6566(91)90021-H

Curtis, G.J. & Clare, J. (2023). Academic integrity scholarship: The importance of theory. In Eaton, S.E. (Ed)*, Handbook of Academic Integrity*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-079-7_164-1

Curtis, G. J., Cowcher, E., Greene, B. R., Rundle, K., Paull, M., & Davis, M. C. (2018). Self-Control, injunctive norms, and descriptive norms predict engagement in plagiarism in a theory of planned behavior model. *Journal of Academic Ethics, 16*(3), 225–239. https://doi-org/10.1007/s10805-018-9309-2

Gottfredson, M. L. & Hirschi, T. (1990). A general theory of crime. *Stanford University Press*.

Lee, S. D., Kuncel, N. R., & Gau, J. (2020). Personality, attitude, and demographic correlates of academic dishonesty: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 146*(11), 1042–1058. https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000300

Rundle, K., Curtis, G.J., & Clare, J. (2023). Why students do not engage in contract cheating: A closer look. *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 19*(11). https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-023-00132-5

Sutherland, E.H. (1947). Principles of Criminology, 4th ed. (pp. vii, 643). JB Lippincott Company.

Sykes, G.M. & Matza, D. (1957). Techniques of neutralization: A theory of delinquency. *American Sociological Review, 22*(6), 664-670.

Tindall, I., Fu, K. W., Tremayne, K., & Curtis, G. J. (2021). Can negative emotions increase students' plagiarism and cheating? *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 17*(25), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979- 021- 00093-7

Walsh, L.L., Lichti, D.A., Zambrano-Varghese, C.M., Borgaonkar, A.D., Sodhi, J.S., Moon, S., Wester, E.R., & Callis-Duehl, K.L. (2021). Why and how science students in the United States think their peers cheat more frequently online: Perspectives during the COVID-19 pandemic. *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 17*(23). https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-021-00089-3

May 23rd, 2024 at 10h45 / 23 mai 2024 à 10 h 45

Perceptions of Persuasive Website Features that Lure Students to Use Contract Cheating Services

Sydney Kreitz & Brenda M. Stoesz, University of Manitoba, Canada

Contract cheating websites have become a major problem in recent years and traffic on these sites increased dramatically during the COVID-19 pandemic when most postsecondary institutions transitioned teaching and learning to remote environments (Lancaster & Cotarlan, 2021). According to Hill et al. (2021, p. 2), contract cheating is "a situation in which students can have their assignments commercially ghost written." The websites of contract cheating service providers are made to be accessible and very easy for students to use, and they provide inexpensive educational support for students in need to "fix" their academic problems (Rowland et al., 2018). Contract cheating websites target vulnerable students by emphasizing students' lack of time, high stress levels, and struggle to keep up with course work, and utilize an approach that eases student guilt and allows them to keep positive self-image about their academic behaviour (Rowland et al., 2018). Tactics, such as use of persuasive words and phrases, interactivity, promise of quality, and reasonable costs, are employed by contract cheating service providers to appear credible and invoke consumer trust (Rowland et al., 2018). The focus of this project was to examine how undergraduate students at a research-intensive university in Canada perceive the trustworthiness of contract cheating websites in comparison to the websites of legitimate educational support services. This study utilized an intervention design where participants viewed screenshots of websites and rated various aspects of credibility before and after completing the tutorial to educate participants about persuasive website features, contract cheating, academic integrity, and credible educational support services. By teaching undergraduate students about the tactics used by these websites, appropriate educational support services, and academic integrity, students are in a better position to make good decisions about their academic work and avoid being manipulated by commercial contract cheating service providers to engage in academic misconduct.

Bibliography

Hill, G., Mason, J., & Dunn, A. (2021). Contract cheating: an increasing challenge for global academic community arising from COVID-19. *Research and Practice in Technology Enhanced Learning*, *16*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41039-021-00166-8

Lancaster, T. & Cotarlan, C. (2021). Contract cheating by STEM students through a file sharing website: a Covid-19 pandemic perspective. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, *17*(1). https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-021-00070-0

Rowland, S., Slade, C., Wong, K. S., & Whiting, B. (2018). 'Just turn to us': the persuasive features of contract cheating websites. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, *43*(4), 652–665. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2017.1391948

May 23rd, 2024 at 10h45 / 23 mai 2024 à 10 h 45

The curriculum dilemmas in fostering future citizens to collaborate and to compete

Charlotta Rönn, Linnaeus University, Sweden

In Sweden, likewise in many other countries, there is an enhanced focus on assessment for learning as well as assessment of learning, on individual pupils' results, grades, and national testing. In the last Swedish curricula (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2011, 2022) it is stated that pupils are to take a personal responsibility for their academic success, and to develop an eagerness for lifelong learning. Moreover, they are to learn to e.g. compose texts on their own in writing assignments given by the teachers. Simultaneously, the aims of public education are according to the curricula that pupils are to develop democratic values and solidarity. When it comes to writing assignments, the curricula as well as in the comment material to the Course Plan (e.g. Swedish National Agency for Education, 2017) stresses that pupils should be given opportunities to co-write texts together with peers, give feedback to peers on their texts as well as to receive feedback from peers on their own texts. However, it is not stated in the curricula how these co-composed texts are to be assessed and/or graded.

The background for this presentation is a more comprehensive study from a Swedish municipal lower secondary school of which some parts have been published (Rönn, 2022; Rönn and Pettersson, 2023). Within the frames of an ethnographic study with an outspoken pupils' perspective, the researcher conducted observations in one class during several months in Year 8 (14-year-olds) with a focus on how they collaborated informally with classmates during lessons in several school subjects. The aim was to explore how they assisted peers in low-voiced conversations out of the teachers' supervision. One year later, when the pupils were in 9th grade (the last year of compulsory school in Sweden) the researcher interviewed pupils in the same class, in total 18 interviews on their view of schoolwork, grades, assisting peers, and future plans. At this stage, no interviews with the teachers were conducted, but at the school Urkund (now Ouriginal) was used for plagiarism control of the pupils' writing assignments. The aim of the study was to explore and provide an account of what informal social strategies pupils apply in dealing with formal individual assignments as well as to try to understand how these strategies could be understood in a formal school context heavily relying on formative assessments of writing assignments and summative assessing of the individual pupil, such as e.g. tests and the National Tests. The results showed that pupils, out of the teachers' supervision, since Year 6 (12 year-olds) had applied various informal social strategies. Some examples of this were that: a) high achieving pupils in the class, on requests from peers, forwarded pictures of their completed writing assignments to classmates to be reformulated in the classmates' "own words", b) pupils could swap computers behind the teachers' back and write original texts for peers, and to c) pupils logged into classmates' Google Classroom-accounts and wrote original texts for peers or make comprehensive proofreading of the peers' texts. The aim with these informal social strategies was, according to the pupils, to achieve better grades with little efforts for some of the

pupils. When the pupils started forwarding pictures of completed assignments in Year 6, they did not understand that they were not meant to do this (Year 6 is the first year in Sweden that pupils are graded). It is important to keep in mind that this is a generation who are accustomed to share pictures of everything in their everyday life. It was not until Year 8 that they started to understand that the exercises were not meant to be completed this way, but then it was difficult for them to stop using these informal social strategies. One finding was that the pupils considered sharing pictures and reformulating peers' writing assignments rather unproblematic. The pupils were loyal to their (close) friends, and few pupils regarded their strategies in a bigger context of solidarity, of equity of grades locally and nationally. Since the findings of the study have been reported back to the teachers and headmaster of the school, they have changed their way of working. For example, only texts which are written during lessons at school are now graded; the pupils can prepare for the writing at home but the writing has to take place at school. The teachers at the school have inspired other schools to follow their example. This has led to that the parents to pupils at one school in another part of the municipality, where most parents are well-educated high-income earners, complain loudly when they are no longer alowed to help their children with writing assignments for assessments.

With a starting point in the findings from the more comprehensive study, this presentation will focus on dilemmas in the curricula; how the aim of solidarity and the fostering of democratic citizens are to coexist with an enhanced focus on individualization, competing and grading. It also problematises what future citizens are to become of pupils who, without the teachers' awareness, apply the above mentioned informal social strategies; thus pupils who

- rely on informal contacts to compose formal assignments,
- recycle peers' arguments within a text instead of making their own opinions/voices heard
- rely on the willingness/time of peers to fulfill the tasks given by the teachers,
- do not consider it problematic that they are graded individually for the achievement of someone else
- miss out years of exercises in composing their own texts
-

According to the curricula, public education should foster future citizens. In practice, there seem to be a dilemma in the tension between pupils' collaboration (and in particular pupils' informal social strategies in composing texts together with peers without the teachers' awareness) and individual achievements for assessment in the competition for elevated grades which will be highlighted in the presentation. Moreover, how can teachers help pupils to an awareness about some of the problematic aspects of the pupils' informal social strategies on both an individual as well as societal level – as in becoming future citizens.

Bibliography

Rönn, C. (2022). Pupil's informal social strategies in a Swedish compulsory school – What pupils do and say, out of sight of the teachers, while managing written individual assignments. *Educational Review.* https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2022.2054955

Rönn, C. & Pettersson, D. (2023). Swedish students' everyday school life and teachers' assessment dilemmas: peer strategies for ameliorating schoolwork for assessment. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11092-022-09400-3

Swedish National Agency for Education (2017). *Kommentarmaterial till kursplanen i svenska 2011: reviderad 2017*. [Comment Material to the Course Plan in Swedish 2011: revised 2017]. Skolverket.

Swedish National Agency for Education. (2011). *Läroplan för grundskolan, förskoleklassen och fritidshemmet* [Curriculum for the Compulsory School, Preschool Class and School-age Educare]. Skolverket.

Swedish National Agency for Education (2022). *Läroplan för grundskolan, förskoleklassen och fritidshemmet* [Curriculum for the Compulsory School, Preschool Class and School-age Educare]. Skolverket.

May 23rd, 2024 at 10h45 / 23 mai 2024 à 10 h 45

Equity and Excellence in AI Education: Crafting an Integrative Path to Ethical and Inclusivity

Zander Janse van Rensburg & Sonja Van der West Huizen, North West University, South Africa

The integration of AI technologies is revolutionising higher education, raising important questions about the authenticity of student-generated content and the retention of core knowledge and skills. However, South Africa and other developing countries are faced with additional challenges regarding access to digital devices (Sokolow, 2020; DHET, 2020:7-10; Naidoo & Raju, 2012:34) and low literacy rates (Durbin, 2023; Govender & Hugo, 2020:1), which could exacerbate the existing digital divide. In response to these challenges, this presentation introduces a framework designed to harness AI's potential while upholding educational values rooted in digital, academic, and information literacy. This framework serves as a starting point, for the ethical integration of AI models into higher education, focusing on enhancing essential academic skills. This proposed framework encompasses digital literacy, information literacy, academic literacy, and academic integrity, offering the potential to navigate AI integration in higher education. For we believe that integrating AI into education offers exciting opportunities to enhance writing skills, critical thinking, and personalised learning. Therefore, addressing the digital and literacy gap in South African education becomes paramount in achieving equitable AI integration. The proposed framework equips higher education institutions with the necessary resources to prepare students for three potential trajectories: "augmented scholars" who seamlessly combine human ingenuity with AI's efficiency ethically; “over-reliant dependents" who risk excessive dependence on AI resulting in academic misconduct or poor knowledge and skills acquisition; and the "disconnected" individuals are left behind in an increasingly digitised world. Our advocacy centres around inclusive AI education frameworks in higher education, clearly focusing on digital access and skill development to bridge difficulties surrounding the new age of higher education in South Africa. This proactive approach aims to empower students to become "augmented scholars," leveraging AI for academic enrichment and aligning AI integration with the principles of equity and excellence.

Bibliography

DHET (Department of Higher Education and Training). (2020). *Students' access to and use learning materials: SAULM Survey report 2020*. https://www.usaf.ac.za/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/DHET_SAULM-Report-2020.pdf

Durbin, A. (May 2023). Eight in 10 South African children struggle to read by age§ of 10. *BBC news*. https://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-65618058

Govender, R. & Hugo, A.J. (2020). An analysis of the results of literacy assessments conducted in South African primary schools. *South African Journal of Childhood Education, 10*(1), pp. 1-13. https://dx.doi.org/10.4102/sajce.v10i1.745

Naidoo, S. & Raju, J. (2012). Impact of the digital divide on information literacy training in a higher education context. *South African Journal of Libraries and Information Science, 78*(1,) pp. 34-44.

Sokolow, A. (2020). *South Africa's Fourth Industrial Revolution limited by lack of computer literacy, access*. Medill reports. https://news.medill.northwestern.edu/chicago/south-africas-fourth-industrial-revolution-limited-by-lack-of-computer-literacy-access/

May 23rd, 2024 at 10h45 / 23 mai 2024 à 10 h 45

Old School: Early Challenges to Plagiarism

Carolyn Creed, University College of the North, Canada

Through encounters with plagiarists in the late 1970s up to 2020s Zoom confabs with potential cheaters, the presenter examines her career of producing authentic student authors. From the earliest instances of hand-copied passages out of books to the first identification of on-line "borrowings", the author's lived experience of plagiarism detection and remediation can demonstrate an arc of increase in skills for the task. The cautionary model of "three distinctive words in a row" for cheat-detection will emerge as a standard by which students can determine the need for proper attribution—a bar set by the professor in the first days of any English class. Using Perkins' "Reducing plagiarism through academic misconduct education" (2020), along with PUPP scrapbooking strategies, Dr. Creed supports her overview of word-sleuthing with documents that show the rewards inherent in the process.

Bibliography

Perkins, M., Gezgin, U. B., & Roe, J. (2020). "Reducing Plagiarism Through Academic Misconduct Education".*International Journal for Educational Integrity, 16*(3), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-020-00052-8.

Peters, M., Glendinning, I., & Jamieson, S. (2023). "Designing International Research to Promote Academic Integrity from Funding to Educating". In *Handbook of Academic Integrity* (pp. 1-16). Springer Link. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-079-7_159-1.

"Poetry". *World Book Encyclopedia*, 1988. [sic]

Turabian, K L. (2018). *A Manual for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations* (9th ed.). University of Chicago Press, Print.

May 24th, 2024 at 13h15 / 24 mai 2024 à 13 h 15

Disrupting the Plagiarism Pipeline

Kelly Ahuna, Loretta Frankovitch & Vivienne Blake, University at Buffalo and EF Academy New York, USA

Any consideration of how to reduce plagiarism among university students must include an analysis of two often overlooked salient factors: (1) high schools do not always adequately prepare students with the required skills and knowledge to prevent plagiarism and (2) norms and expectations about plagiarism vary throughout the world, putting international students at a disadvantage from the outset. Ameliorating these two issues could prevent a significant number of plagiarism cases.

First, secondary schools would ideally prepare students by including research skills practice and critical thinking about what academic integrity means. A literature review reveals that this forward investment for student success in higher education is not widespread. Several case studies illustrate the potential and the challenges for high school students' preparedness, including examination of the culture around academic integrity (Çelik & Razı, 2023), initiatives to establish academic integrity awareness in K-12 students (Khan et al., 2023), the use of source criticism in secondary school (Premat, 2023), and the effects of peer culture on academic dishonesty (Waltzer et al., 2023).

Second, academic integrity practitioners have long noted differences between domestic and international students in their understanding of academic integrity policies and practices. Many international students, working in their second (or subsequent) language, face challenges with language skills, often leading to academic integrity violations (Walker, 2010). Plagiarism then stems from a lack of fluency in the native language (Bretag, 2007) as well as different understandings of what plagiarism means (Click 2012).

This presentation will consider concrete ways to address these two issues. Specifically, secondary schools can both provide curricular opportunities for students to hone research skills and work with local universities to bridge the transition from high school to higher education. Additionally, university staff can examine differences between cultural approaches to academic integrity to identify ways to prepare new international students for success.

Bibliography

Bretag, T. (2007). The emperor's new clothes: Yes, there is a link between English language competence and academic standards. *People and Place, 15*(1), 13-21.

Çelik, Ö., & Razı, S. (2023). Facilitators and barriers to creating a culture of academic integrity at secondary schools: an exploratory case study. *International Journal for Academic Integrity, 19*(4). https://edintegrity.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1007/s40979-023-00125-4

Click, A. (2012). Issues of plagiarism and academic integrity for second-language students. *MELA Notes, 85*, 44-53. https://www.jstor.org/stable/23392491

Deckert, G.D. (1993). Perspectives on plagiarism from ESL students in Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 2*(2), 131-148.

Dussourd, E., Kim, N., and Otto, K. (2016, September 22). *Teaching students from around the world: perspectives on academic integrity* [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s8Sy2rOyloU

Khan, Z. R., Hysai, A., John, S. R., & Khan, S. A. (2023). Transitional Module on Academic Integrity to Help K-12 Students in the UAE Prepare for Next Stage of Education. In S. Bjelobaba, T. Foltýnek,, I. Glendinning,, V. Krásničan, & D. H. Dlabolová (Eds.), *Ethics and Integrity in Educational Contexts* (EBook ed., Vol. 4). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-16976-2_15

Pennycook, A. (1996). Borrowing words and ideas: Insights from Japanese L1 writers. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication, 15*(1), 15-29.

Premat, C. (2023). Engaging upper secondary school pupils with integrity and source criticism. *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 19*(5). https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-023-00127-2

Stoesz, B. M., Quesnel, M., & De Jaeger, A. E. (2023). Student perceptions of academic misconduct amongst their peers during the rapid transition to remote instruction. International *Journal for Educational Integrity, 19*(4). https://edintegrity.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1007/s40979-023-00136-1

Walker, J. (2010). Measuring plagiarism: Researching what students do, not what they say they do. *Studies in Higher Education, 35*(1), 41-59.

Waltzer, T., DeBernardi, F. C., & Dahl, A. (2022). Student and teacher views on cheating in high school: Perceptions, evaluations, and decisions. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 33*(1), 108-126. https://doi.org/10.1111/jora.12784

May 24th, 2024 at 13h15 / 24 mai 2024 à 13 h 15

The interplay between peer support and institutional connection on self-reported rates of academic integrity violations

Kelley Packalen & Kate Rowbotham, Queen's University, Canada, and Irene Lee, Glacier Media Group

In this study, we investigated how two features of inclusive environments – perceived social support from peers (Caplan et al., 1980) and the extent to which one identifies with and feels connected to the institution (Balfour & Wechsler, 1996) – correlate with self-reported rates of academic misconduct. Prior research has found that strong peer connections correlate with increased socially-focused academic integrity violations such as collaborating on individual assignments (Awdry & Ives, 2020; Chapman et al., 2004). Thus, we argued that the extent to which students felt socially supported by their peers would influence both the extent to which they engaged in academic misconduct as well as the type of misconduct in which they engaged. Organizational commitment measures the more elusive connection that an individual has to an institution and its members in general. Past research has demonstrated that organizational commitment is positively correlated with ethical behaviour (Fu, 2014). As such, we argued that a strong connection to the university may minimize the extent to which peer support correlated with self-reported academic misconduct. We tested our hypotheses on samples of undergraduate students from a Canadian university both in the period before and following the COVID-19 pandemic and found similar results in the two samples. After controlling for year of study and the percent of their peers they perceived to have engaged in academic misconduct, the preliminary results from our zero-inflated negative binomial regression showed that in both 2019 and 2022 those with the strongest peer supports, but a disdain for the institution engaged in academic misconduct to the greatest extent, those with the weakest peer supports and a distain for the institution engaged in the fewest, and there is little difference between the extent to which peer support influenced the rate of academic misconduct among those with the strongest commitment to the university.

Bibliography

Awdry, R. & Ives, B. (2020). Students cheat more often from those known to them: situation matters more than the individual. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 1-15. 10.1080/02602938.2020.1851651

Balfour, D. & Wechsler, B. (1996). Organizational commitment: Antecedents and outcomes in public organizations. *Public Productivity and Management Review, 29,* 256-277.

Caplan, R.D., Cobb, S., French, J.R.P, Van Harrison, R., & Pinneau, S.R. (1980). Job Demands and worker health. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, *Institute of Social Research,* 251-252.

Chapman, K. J., Davis, R., Toy, D., & Wright, L. (2004). Academic integrity in the business school environment: I'll get by with a little help from my friends. *Journal of Marketing Education, 26*(3), 236-249. https://doi.org/10.1177/0273475304268779

Fu, W. (2014). The impact of emotional intelligence, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction on ethical behavior of Chinese employees. *Journal of business ethics, 122*(1), 137-144. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1763-6

May 23rd, 2024 at 13h15 / 23 mai 2024 à 13 h 15

Shifting the Academic Integrity Paradigm: Stakeholder Views from a UK University

Daniel Quinn, Coventry University, UK

For the academic integrity paradigm to truly shift from detection to prevention in a university, the entire institution needs to be taking a similar, if not the same, approach to each of the elements that constitute it: assessment, policy, pedagogy and academic support. To get a sense of a higher education institution's (HEI) approach to academic integrity, the perspectives of different stakeholders, such as lecturers, students and academic support staff, need to be taken into account. Not only the perspectives, but the formal and informal networks, connections and relationships that exist to establish, develop and uphold academic integrity should also be ascertained. When all of these are taken together, a more detailed and nuanced picture will emerge of an institution's approach to academic integrity. This talk will present a set of preliminary findings from the first stage of a research project that seeks to do just that. The project uses a single case study research strategy and will apply a combination of institutionally specific findings from the PUPP lecturer questionnaire with interview and focus group responses from staff and students at the same UK based institution. It is intended that this combination of data will provide a detailed and nuanced view of how academic integrity is approached at this institution, along with some examples of good practice in this area. Additionally, the talk will show how these particular institutional approaches towards academic integrity, in all their potential complexity and diversity, can be accurately captured and presented in the form of an 'ecosystem' model. Finally, the talk will present an outline of the next steps in the project which will involve using the same approach on other PUPP affiliated institutions.

Bibliography

Adner, R. (2017). Ecosystem as Structure: An Actionable Construct for Strategy. *Journal of Management. 43*(1), 39–58. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316678451

Amigud, A. and Pell, D., J. (2021). When academic integrity rules should not apply: a survey of academic staff. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 46*(6), 928-942. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1826900

Jackson, N. J. (2019). Ecologies for Learning and Practice in Higher Education Ecosystems. In. N.J. Jackson & R. Barnett (Eds.), *Ecologies for Learning and Practice* (pp. 81-96). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351020268

Reedy, A.K., Wurm, P.A.S, Janssen, A. and Lockley, A. (2021). A community of practice approach to enhancing academic integrity policy translation: a case study. *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 17*(12) https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-021-00080-y

May 23rd, 2024 at 13h15 / 23 mai 2024 à 13 h 15

Institutional policies for academic and research integrity: Scope, focus, characteristics (Round Table)

Irene Glendinning, Coventry University, UK

Policies for academic and research integrity are often discussed as though they are well-defined and consistent. However, research tells a different story. What people understand by policies for academic integrity, research integrity and ethics vary geographically and even across different institutions in the same country. These terms (or equivalent translations) are not used everywhere – many institutions, in the UK for example, use terms such as plagiarism, misconduct or dishonesty policies. Despite development of well-established conceptual models, including research led by Tracey Bretag and colleagues (2011a, 2011b) that started over a decade ago, the scope, focus and characteristics of what may be included under the banner of academic integrity policies vary hugely between institutions. Given the fundamental lack of agreement, this round table will consider what advice should be given to institutions who are struggling either to define new policies or to update existing policies, on how they should proceed. The facilitators will explore existing models for policies to frame discussions on how to develop and maintain institutional policies and what defines effective policies for academic and research integrity.

Bibliography

Bretag, T., Mahmud, S., East, J., Green, M., & James, C. (2011). *Academic integrity standards: A preliminary analysis of the Academic integrity policies at Australian Universities* Proceedings of AuQF 2011 Demonstrating Quality, Melbourne. Academic integrity standards: A preliminary analysis of the Academic integrity policies at Australian Universities (uow.edu.au)

Bretag, T., Mahmud, S., Wallace, M., Walker, R., James, C., Green, M., East, J., McGowan, U., & Partridge, L. (2011). Core elements of exemplary academic integrity policy in Australian higher education. *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 7*(2), 3-12. https://doi.org/10.21913/IJEI.v7i2.759

Çelik, Ö. & Razı, S. (2021). Developing an academic integrity policy writing assistant for K12 schools European Conference on Academic Integrity and Plagiarism (ECAIP), Online. https://academicintegrity.eu/conference/proceedings/2021/book_of_abstracts2021.pdf

Foltýnek, T. & Glendinning, I. (2015). Impact of Policies for Plagiarism in Higher Education Across Europe: Results of the Project. *Acta Universitatis Agriculturae et Silviculturae Mendelianae Brunensis, 63*(1), 207-216. https://doi.org/10.11118/actaun201563010207

Glendinning, I. (2023). Linking quality, standards and integrity. In S. E. Eaton (Ed.), *Handbook of Academic Integrity* (2nd ed., pp. 1-10). Springer Nature Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-079-7_117-1

Grigg, G. A. (2010). Plagiarism in higher education: *Confronting the policy dilemma*. [University of Melbourne]. Melbourne.

May 23rd, 2024 at 15h00 / 23 mai 2024 à 15 h 00

Analyzing First-Year University Student Plagiarism Cases

Jim Hu, Thompson Rivers University, Canada

Plagiarism is a serious issue among first-year post-secondary students in many countries (e.g., Craig & Dalton, 2013; Singh & Ganapathy, 2018), including Canada (Chaudhuri et al, 2021). Indeed, at one Canadian university, first-year students have consistently committed more academic integrity offenses than upper-level students (TRU Academic Integrity Committee, 2022). Therefore, research is needed to investigate: 1) what type of plagiarism is the most prevalent among first-year students, 2) why the students plagiarize, and 3) what measures the institution can take to prevent plagiarism. This paper presentation reports on a study analyzing 111 cases of plagiarism of first-year students at a Canadian university during 2021-2022 and 2022-2023. Plagiarism can be categorized as a) complete plagiarism, b) direct plagiarism, c) indirect plagiarism, d) self-plagiarism, and e) translation. The study found that ESL students committed most of the plagiarism cases and that while a few cases were complete plagiarism, by far most involved direct plagiarism with students copying from multiple online sources. Furthermore, based on student responses to plagiarism allegations, the researchers identified social, cultural, emotional, and academic causes. Most of the responses cited academic challenges, resulting in unintentional plagiarism. The findings indicate that many first-year ESL students do not understand, or misunderstand, plagiarism (see Hu & Yu, 2023). The researchers recommend that first-year students complete well-designed mandatory modules to help them understand and avoid plagiarism. While information about institutional policies is helpful, students need guided and extended practices followed by teacher feedback (Hu, 2019) to master the skills of using online sources appropriately. Session participants leave inspired by the study findings and empowered by effective prevention strategies.

Bibliography

Chaudhuri, A., Barrantes, X. C., & Lu, N. (2021). Remediation: Understanding academic integrity [Paper presentation]. *Canadian Symposium on Academic Integrity* (online), Thompson Rivers University, Kamloops, BC. https://canadianaisymposium2021.sched.com/

Crag, R. & Dalton, D. (2013). Understanding first year undergraduate student perception on copyright and plagiarism: Development of platform for a culture of honest inquiry and the academic construction of knowledge. Plagiarism Across Europe and Beyond – Conference Proceedings (pp. 103-114). https://academicintegrity.eu/conference/proceedings/2013/Craig_Understanding.pdf

Hu, J. (2019). Simultaneous oral-written feedback approach (SOWFA): ESL students' preferred writing response. *Journal of Response to Writing, 5*(2), 5-45. https://journalrw.org/index.php/jrw/issue/view/10

Hu, J. & Yu, W. (2023). What are ESL students' academic integrity challenges, and how can universities help? *International Journal of TESOL Studies, 5*(3), 107-125. https://www.tesolunion.org/journal/lists/folder/5MjUuaMmQy/

Singh, M.K.M. & Ganapathy, M. (2018). Understanding plagiarism from the lens of first year tertiary level students. *Pertanika Journal of Social Science and Humanities, 26*, 159-177. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/322518798_Understanding_Plagiarism_from_the_Lens_of_First_Year_Tertiary_Level_Students

Thompon Rivers University Academic Integrity Committee (2022). Report to the Senate. Thompson Rivers University, Kamloops, BC.

May 23rd, 2024 at 15h00 / 23 mai 2024 à 15 h 00

Understanding Academic Integrity Through Reddit
Thomas Lancaster, Imperial College London, UK

This session will consider how the Reddit online discussion communities can be used to develop a wider understanding of academic integrity. Using Reddit, people post about their academic integrity challenges, frustrations and successes in a manner that is largely anonymous and often unguarded. Discussions can be posted by faculty, students, and those directly outside of the educational system. Reviewing those discussions can allow a much more nuanced understanding of academic integrity to be developed than can be gained through research methods such as surveys that are commonly used within this field. The exact content of the presentation will be reviewed to make sure that it is timely, something essential in a field where many discussions focus around the implications of generative artificial intelligence, an ever-changing situation. It is anticipated that the presentation will include case studies of discussions, will showcase the range of topics discussed, and will illustrate the mismatch between student and staff understanding and opinions on academic integrity. Discussions on Reddit can be as varied as a student looking to hire a contract cheating provider, to an academic looking to redevelop their assessment methods to make them less susceptible to the misuse of artificial intelligence tools, to a student looking for support when they claim to have been falsely accused of academic misconduct. The presentation will also include examples of academic integrity research using Reddit that have been conducted alongside student partners. This will illustrate the range of research techniques that can be employed using Reddit and may provide ideas for attendees who want to consider alternative approaches to investigating academic integrity related issues. Although the focus of this session will be on Reddit, many of these ideas are also applicable to investigations on other online platforms and social media services.

Bibliography (N/A)

May 23rd, 2024 at 15h00 / 23 mai 2024 à 15 h 00

Introducing the ENAI Academic Integrity Game Evaluator (EAIGE): A Tool for Assessing Gamified Approaches to Ethics Education

Zeenath Reza Khan, University of Wollongong in Dubai, UAE; Jarret M. Dyer, College of DuPage, USA; Sonja Bjelobaba, Uppsala University, Sweden; Lorna Waddington, University of Leeds, UK; & Shiva Sivasubramaniam, University of Derby.

The ENAI Academic Integrity Game Evaluator (EAIGE) represents a pivotal advancement in the realm of ethics education, particularly within the context of gamification and game-based learning. Developed by the ENAI Gamification working group, EAIGE is the culmination of extensive literature surveys, review rubric testing, and rigorous evaluation processes.

Gamification and game-based learning serve as powerful pedagogical tools, offering immersive experiences that engage students in ethical dilemmas and foster critical thinking skills (Anderson et al., 2009; Whitton, 2012; Cojocariu and Boghian, 2014, Khan el et., 2021a). However, with an array of such games and modules available, educators often face the challenge of discerning which ones best suit their instructional objectives (Khan et al., 2021b).

EAIGE addresses this challenge by providing a systematic framework for evaluating the efficacy and suitability of gamified approaches to ethics education (All et al., 2014; Stewart, 2015; "Brainpop Educators", 2015; "California State University", 2007; Gilliver-Brown & Ballinger; 2017; "Union-Endicott Central School District", 2021). Drawing from insights gained through the development and testing of the UOW Age of Integrity game (Khan et al, 2023), EAIGE offers a comprehensive set of criteria for assessing effectiveness, engagement, and alignment with learning outcomes of gamified interventions. The rubric was created as an evaluation tool online that does not store any data but rather allows users to grade a game on 20 constructs and receive a score. Based on expert feedback, the score is then checked against a spectrum to determine its efficacy e.g. "according to your scoring, the game has been evaluated at a total score of 55. This means that the game has scored below an acceptable range for effectiveness and appropriateness. Reevaluate and rethink using the game!" Any score that is >=20 and <= 60, will receive this message. Any score above 60, will receive an "appropriate and effective" message.

This poster presentation will introduce EAIGE (https://www.academicintegrity.eu/wp/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/site.html) and highlight its utility in guiding faculty and academics in the selection and implementation of gamified ethics education tools. By empowering educators with a standardized evaluation tool, EAIGE aims to enhance the quality and impact of ethics instruction, ultimately fostering a culture of integrity within academic communities.

Bibliography

All, E. Nunez Castellar, P., & Van Looy, J. (2014). Measuring effectiveness in digital game-based learning: A methodological review. *International Journal of Serious Games, 2*(1), 3–20. http://dx.doi.org/10.17083/ijsg.v1i2.18

Anderson, O. B., Anderson, N. M., & Taylor, A. T. (2009). *New Territories in Adult Education: Game-Based Learning for Adult Education,* http://www.adulterc.org/Proceedings/2009/proceedings/anderson_etal.pdf

Cojocariu, V. and Boghian, I. (2014). *Teaching the Relevance of Game-based Learning to Preschool and Primary Teachers*, Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 142(2014). 640-646. ISSN 1877-0428. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042814046072?via%3Dihub

Brainpop Educators. (2015). *Educational video game evaluation rubric.* http://educators.brainpop.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/Game-Rubric-Editable-2015-1.pdf

California State University. (2007). *Educational electronic games rubric.* https://www.csus.edu/indiv/k/kaym/rubric/edgamesrubric.html

Gilliver-Brown, K., & Ballinger, D. (2017). 'The integrity games': An interactive story education approach to teaching academic integrity. *ATLAANZ Journal 2*(1), 68-81.

Khan, Z. R., Dyer, J., Bjelobaba, S., Gomes, S. F., Henek Dlabolova, D., Sivasubramaniam, S., Biju, S. M., Hysaj, A., & Harish, P. (2021a). Initiating count down - gamification of academic integrity. *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 17*(6), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-020-00068-0

Khan, Z. R., Sivasubramaniam, S. ., Gomes, S. F. ., Bjelobaba, S., Razi, S. ., Waddington, L. ., & Ribeiro, L. . (2021b). Gamification of Academic Integrity: Reviewing an Evaluation Tool. *Canadian Perspectives on Academic Integrity, 4*(2), 58–61. https://doi.org/10.11575/cpai.v4i2.74207

Khan, Z. R., Reddy, M., Ike, T. C., Dyer, J., Razi, S., Bjelobaba, S., Sivasubramaniam, S., Rogrson, A., & Waddington, L. (2023). *Sharing Experiences: Development of A Game-Based Module To Raise Awareness On Avoiding Plagiarism*. Parallel Session Presentation at 9h European Conference on Ethics and Integrity (pp189-192). University of Derby. UK.

Stewart, C. (2015). *Creating rubrics for evaluating digital educational games.* Vancouver Island University Blogs. https://wordpress.viu.ca/cstewart/2015/04/28/creating-rubrics-for-evaluating-digital-educational-games/

Union-Endicott Central School District. (2021). *Create-a-game assessment rubric*. https://www.uek12.org/Downloads/Project%20Rubric.pdf

Whitton, N. (2012). The place of game-based learning in an age of austerity. *Electronic Journal of E-Learning, 10*(2), 249-256, https://academic-publishing.org/index.php/ejel/article/view/1630/1593

May 23rd, 2024 at 15h00 / 23 mai 2024 à 15 h 00

Process Over Product: Working with Students and Faculty to Prevent Plagiarism and Unauthorized Use of AI

Dana Capell, Erin Stewart-Eves, & Devon Stilwell, Trent University, Canada

Scholars of writing and communications have long established the importance of conceptualizing writing as a process necessary for/essential to good writing and plagiarism prevention (Conference on College Composition and Communication, 2015; Dartmouth Writing Teaching Program, 2023; Fulkerson, 1990; Sommers, 1979). Pre-writing, drafting, and revision strategies support students' creativity and engagement with ideas they write about; they also help protect against the unintentional plagiarism that results from poor notetaking as well as the intentional plagiarism that is enabled when students can easily copy text into a final draft. While this focus on writing as a process offers a happy mix of good pedagogy with plagiarism prevention, many faculty continue to solely assess the product of the students' writing by requiring submission of only the final draft. This exclusive focus on the final draft discourages students from investing in the writing process and the practices that help prevent unintentional plagiarism. It is especially problematic in the age of AI Generators, which create polished prose instantly, allowing students to avoid the iterative process of drafting and making it impossible for instructors to establish the provenance of final drafts. This presentation focuses on an effort at Trent University to refocus both faculty and students on the value of process over product. It is our contention that, in the context of AI, students must redouble their efforts to track their writing process and faculty must reward these efforts within their assessment scheme. Faculty-facing Education Developers have developed resources to support faculty in tracking students' prewriting and drafting activities; meanwhile, Academic Skills instructors have continued to work directly with students to help guide them toward good pre-writing and drafting practice. Throughout the talk, Academic Skills Instructors and Education Developers will provide specific examples of resources that prioritize process over product in student writing and that uphold standards of academic integrity.

Bibliography

Conference on College Composition and Communication. (2015). Principles for the Postsecondary Teaching of Writing. CCCC Position Statement. https://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/postsecondarywriting

Dartmouth Writing Teaching Program. (2023). Teaching writing as a process. https://writing.dartmouth.edu/teaching/first-year-writing-pedagogies-methods-design/teaching-writing-process

Fulkerson, R. (1990). Composition theory in the Eighties: Axiological consensus and paradigmatic diversity. College Composition and Communication, 41(4), 409–429. doi:10.2307/357931. ISSN 0010-096X.

Sommers, N. I. (1979). The need for theory in composition research. College Composition and Communication, 30 (1), 46–49. doi:10.2307/356749. ISSN 0010-096X.

May 23rd, 2024 at 15h15 / 23 mai 2024 à 15 h 00

Adversarial techniques to evade AI content detectors

Mike Perkins, Jasper Roe, Binh Vu Hai, Darius Postma, James, McGaughran, Don Hickerson, & Huy Khuat Quang, British University Vietnam, Vietnam

Following an explosion of interest in Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) tools after the release of OpenAI's ChatGPT, attention has turned to the educational implications of automatically generated, human-like text. Concerns of academic integrity were raised regarding how to ensure the authenticity of student submissions in open assessments, with claims made that traditional work, such as essays and reports, are no longer secure and reliable methods of assessment.

Following this concern, a flurry of products which claim to be able to make an accurate diagnosis of whether textual output was written by a human or a GenAI tool became available and are being used by educators worldwide to determine whether a submission may violate the principles of academic integrity. Such usage presents serious questions, particularly when empirical research has demonstrated problems in the ability of these detectors to make accurate judgements on whether a submission contains AI-generated content (Anderson et al., 2023; Chaka, 2023; Elali & Rachid, 2023; Elkhatat et al., 2023; Liang et al., 2023; Orenstrakh et al., 2023; Perkins et al., 2023; Weber-Wulff et al., 2023).

Although a small number of studies (Weber-Wulff et al., 2023; Perkins et al., 2023 have explored the accuracy of detection software when GenAI output is subjected to either manual manipulation or prompting techniques designed to bypass detection tools, it is not yet clear which of these techniques is effective. Given the emerging body of literature which suggests that AI detectors lack accuracy even when not subjected to adversarial techniques, this study contributes to a lack of clarity as to whether GenAI text detectors are viable for ensuring assessment security, academic integrity, and student equity.

Our study contributes to this by presenting the results of tests (n=805) exploring the accuracy of seven popular AI detection services when provided with content from three leading GenAI tools, which were then subjected to techniques designed to obfuscate that the text was produced by GenAI tools. We found that AI detectors have an average accuracy rating of only 39.5% when the content is not subject to any manipulation. Importantly, for the human-written control samples, only 67% of the tests were accurate, leading to significant concerns regarding false accusations from these tools. When obfuscating techniques were used, major reductions in accuracy (1.5%-42.1%) were observed, with an average accuracy of 22.14%.

In terms of AI detectors, Copyleaks was the most accurate tool for both non-manipulated (73.9%), and manipulated GenAI content (58.7%), with GPTKit being the least accurate (6%/4.5%). Regarding obfuscation techniques that led to drops in accuracy, requesting spelling errors (27% accuracy reduction), and asking for output in the style of a non native speaker (24% accuracy reduction) were the most effective adversarial techniques for reducing the ability of AI text detectors to accurately determine the level of GenAI content present.

Bibliography

Anderson, N., Belavy, D. L., Perle, S. M., Hendricks, S., Hespanhol, L., Verhagen, E., & Memon, A. R. (2023). AI did not write this manuscript, or did it? Can we trick the AI text detector into generated texts? The potential future of ChatGPT and AI in Sports & Exercise Medicine manuscript generation. *BMJ Open Sport & Exercise Medicine, 9*(1), 1-4. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjsem-2023-001568

Chaka, C. (2023). Detecting AI content in responses generated by ChatGPT, YouChat, and Chatsonic: The case of five AI content detection tools. *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, *6*(2), 94-104. https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2023.6.2.12

Elali, F. R. & Rachid, L. N. (2023). AI-generated research paper fabrication and plagiarism in the scientific community. *Patterns*, *4*(3), 1-4. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patter.2023.10070

Elkhatat, A. M., Elsaid, K., & Almeer, S. (2023). Evaluating the efficacy of AI content detection tools in differentiating between human and AI-generated text. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, *19*(1), 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-023-00140-5

Liang, W., Yuksekgonul, M., Mao, Y., Wu, E., & Zou, J. (2023). GPT detectors are biased against non-native English writers. *Patterns, 4*(7), 1-4. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2304.02819

Orenstrakh, M. S., Karnalim, O., Suarez, C. A., & Liut, M. (2023). *Detecting LLM-Generated Text in Computing Education: A Comparative Study for ChatGPT Cases*. Cornell University. http://arxiv.org/abs/2307.07411

Perkins, M. (2023). Academic Integrity considerations of AI Large Language Models in the post-pandemic era: ChatGPT and beyond. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, *20*(2), 1-24. https://doi.org/10.53761/1.20.02.07

Perkins, M., Roe, J., Postma, D., McGaughran, J., & Hickerson, D. (2023). Detection of GPT-4 Generated Text in Higher Education: Combining Academic Judgement and Software to Identify Generative AI Tool Misuse. *Journal of Academic Ethics, 22,* 89-113. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-023-09492-6

Weber-Wulff, D., Anohina-Naumeca, A., Bjelobaba, S., Foltýnek, T., Guerrero-Dib, J., Popoola, O., Šigut, P., & Waddington, L. (2023). *Testing of Detection Tools for AI-Generated Text*. Cornell University. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2306.15666

May 23rd, 2024 at 15h00 / 23 mai 2024 à 15 h 00

Changing cultures of integrity at Queen's University and the University of Manitoba: The analysis of historical documentation using advanced text-mining techniques

Lydia Scholle-Cotton & Brenda M. Stoesz, Queen's University, Canada

Queen's University and the University of Manitoba, akin to many Canadian universities, trace their origins to religious foundations with a focus on ministry education. Over the years, these institutions have grown substantially and have gradually distanced themselves from their initial religious affiliations. Today, these universities boast a diverse range of academic programs spanning law, medicine, arts, sciences, engineering, business, and more. Examining these historical shifts can reveal conflicts and tensions related to academic integrity that have persisted within Canadian universities over the last several decades. Gaining a comprehensive understanding of current integrity culture in higher education from past events is imperative (see Eaton & Hughes, 2022; Gallant, 2007). Some researchers have delved into academic integrity policies at Canadian universities (Stoesz & Eaton, 2022; Stoesz et al., 2019) and quality assurance processes (Thacker & McKenzie, 2022) to uncover the prevailing culture of academic integrity within higher education. In this study, we took a different approach to unearthing the transformations in the integrity culture within two Canadian universities. We conducted a comprehensive analysis of archived university senate meeting notes and other archived documents from Queen's University and the University of Manitoba using advanced text-mining techniques. This involved utilizing natural language processing (NLP) and data mining algorithms to systematically analyze the content contained within the archived documents. Through this approach, we uncovered significant themes and concepts and the ebb and flow of integrity-culture within two Canadian universities as they evolved from their religious foundations to become diverse, multifaceted institutions. Providing an overview of the changing perceptions, susceptibility, and attitudes toward integrity in historical documentation contributes to the growing body of literature on academic integrity culture. Furthermore, the study findings may have implications for leadership as they craft policies that align with the evolving integrity landscape, ultimately fostering a culture of honesty and trust.

Bibliography

Eaton, S. E., & Christensen Hughes, J. (2022). Academic integrity in Canada: Historical perspectives and current trends. In Academic integrity in Canada: An enduring and essential challenge (pp. 3-24). Springer International Publishing.

Gallant, T. B. (2007). The complexity of integrity culture change: A case study of a liberal arts college. The Review of Higher Education, 30(4), 391-411.

Stoesz, B. M., & Eaton, S. E. (2022). Academic Integrity Policies of Publicly Funded Universities in Western Canada. Educational Policy, 36(6), 1529–1548. https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904820983032

Stoesz, B. M., Eaton, S. E., Miron, J., & Thacker, E. J. (2019). Academic integrity and contract cheating policy analysis of colleges in Ontario, Canada. International Journal for Educational Integrity, 15(1), Article 1. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-019-0042-4

Thacker, E. J., & McKenzie, A. (2022). Using quality assurance frameworks to support an institutional culture of academic integrity at Canadian universities. In Academic Integrity in
Canada: An Enduring and Essential Challenge (pp. 519-534). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

****

May 24th, 2024 at 9h00 / 24 mai 2024 à 9 h 00

Community Values and Plagiarism Prevention

Lauren Fitzgerald, Paul Glassman, & David Puretz, Yeshiva University, USA

Yeshiva University, the first and largest American university under Orthodox Jewish auspices, provides, through its dual undergraduate curriculum of religious and secular studies, a unique context that informs pedagogical choices. Offering an emphasis on knowledge as a social endeavor, religious instruction privileges collaborative textual analysis of the Talmud, which contains accumulative analysis, positioned as marginalia on each page, framing the core text. In fall 2023, Yeshiva University librarians and two faculty members collaborated on a pedagogical experiment in their classrooms to examine their ideas on plagiarism prevention and conscientious use of artificial intelligence. Our presentation will report on this collaboration and offer a pedagogical perspective for cultivating a community of practice that values ethical use of information. Yeshiva University librarians centered their pedagogy on two components of the Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education: "Authority Is Constructed and Contextual" and "Scholarship as Conversation." Employing these two frames, librarians introduced lateral reading—consulting additional sources to establish trustworthiness —and reinforced a Talmudic method of textual analysis that students, as members of a religious community, already value. The experiment engaged two undergraduate courses, both of which provided opportunities to explore how communities value information. Along with discussing academic integrity, AI, and Talmudic commentary, students in Authorship: Plato to Artificial Intelligence experimented with annotation both to track reading-as-idea-generation and to circumvent AI commenting apps such as Claude. Writing for the Workplace: Technical Communication, is rooted in knowledge transfer theory and, accordingly, emphasizes collaborative writing. It invites students to apply insights from their religious studies and community practices to teamwork-oriented coursework and future professional scenarios. Our collaborative experiment opened the way for faculty and librarians to work together on complex academic integrity issues. We will offer a reflection of and prototype for involving students in practices that embrace students' life experiences and shared community values.

Bibliography

Association of College and Research Libraries (2015). *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education*. https://www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org.acrl/files/content/issues/infolit/framework1.pdf

Anson, C. (2011). Fraudulent Practices: Academic Misrepresentations of Plagiarism in the Name of Good Pedagogy. *Composition Studies, 39*(2), 29-43.

Breakstone, J., Smith, M., Connors, P., Ortega, T., Kerr, D., & Wineburg, S. (2021). Lateral reading: College students learn to critically evaluate internet sources in an online course. *Harvard Kennedy School Misinformation Review, 2(*1). https://doi.org/10.37016/mr-2020-56

Botman, S. (2023, January 10). How Faith-Based Colleges Can Challenge Technological Misuse. *First Things.* https://www.firstthings.com/web-exclusives/2023/01/how-faith-based-colleges-can-challenge-technological-misuse

Dean, J. & Humphreys, A. (2023, July 11). Students Need to Learn How to Read Scholarly Articles: Here's How Technology Can Help. *The Scholarly Kitchen*. https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2023/07/11/guest-post-students-need-to-learn-how-to-read-scholarly-articles-heres-how-technology-can-help/

Fountain, T. K. & Fitzgerald, L. (2008). "'Thou Shalt Not Plagiarize'? Appeals to Textual Authority and Community at Religiously Affiliated and Secular Colleges. In R. Moore Howard & A. Robillard (Eds.), "Thou Shalt Not Plagiarize"? Appeals to Textual Authority and Community at Religiously Affiliated and Secular Colleges," *Pluralizing Plagiarism* (pp. 101-123). Heinemann.

Moore Howard, R. & Robillard, A. (2008). *Pluralizing Plagiarism: Identities, Contexts, Pedagogies*. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook Heinemann.

Lim, F. V. & Toh, W. (2020). How to teach digital reading? *Journal of Information Literacy*, *14*(2), 24-43. https://doi.org/10.11645/14.2.2701

Poorvu Center for Teaching and Learning (n.d.). *Transfer of Knowledge to New Contexts*. Yale University. https://poorvucenter.yale.edu/TransferKnowledge

Rodgers, D. M. (2009). The Use of the Talmudic Format for the Presentation of Qualitative Research. *Symbolic Interaction, 32*(3), pp. 260–281. https://core.ac.uk/reader/71965380

Wouk, H. (1974). Why Daf Yomi? Talmud Study. *Shema Yisrael Magazine*, Ohr Somayach International in the Summer. https://ohr.edu/yomi/wouk/yomid.pdf

May 24th, 2024 at 9h00 / 24 mai 2024 à 9 h 00

Barriers to supporting integrity: Understanding the relationship between international students' metastereotypes and academic support seeking

Maya Rarog, Matthew Quesnel, & Brenda M. Stoesz, University of Manitoba, Canada

International students are disproportionately reported for academic misconduct, with studies revealing a complex network of associated factors that are integral to interpreting these findings (Sanni-Anibire et al., 2021). English language and academic writing proficiency, access to technological resources, and student-teacher relationships constitute several key factors that influence this reported occurrence of academic misconduct (Bista, 2011). These and other challenges (e.g., cultural and financial) international students face adjusting to post-secondary education impact their academic success (Andrade, 2006; Bastien et al., 2018; Tas, 2013). Consequently, universities offer numerous support services important to international students gaining the skills and resources necessary for success in their studies. Students may be apprehensive about using these resources if they believe that domestic students, staff, and faculty have negative perceptions of international students (i.e., negative metastereotypes; Vorauer et al., 1998). Our study aimed to investigate this relationship between international students' metastereotypes regarding how their group is perceived by Canadian students, staff, and faculty and their support seeking behaviour. More specifically, this study investigated (a) whether international students' metastereotypes and comfort in utilizing university support services and seeking help from their instructors and fellow students are positively associated, and (b) what traits and characteristics international students believe they are judged on. Participants were international students taking introductory psychology at the University of Manitoba. Participants completed an online survey measuring metastereotypes, their identity as international students, support-seeking intentions and experiences, and apprehension around intercultural communication. The findings from this study may guide the development of interventions that mitigate negative metastereotypes and promote support seeking, thus reducing reports of academic misconduct, and fostering academic success among international students.

Bibliography

Andrade, M. S. (2006). International students in English-speaking universities: Adjustment factors. *Journal of Research in International Education, 5*(2), 131–154. https://doi.org/10.1177/1475240906065589

Bastien, G., Seifen-Adkins, T., & Johnson, L. R. (2018). Striving for success: Academic adjustment of international students in the U.S. *Journal of International Students, 8*(2), 1198–1219. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1250421

Bista, K. (2011). Academic dishonesty among international students in higher education. In J. Miller & J. Groccia (Eds.), *To Improve the Academy*: Vol. 30. Resources for faculty,

instructional, and organizational development (pp.159-172). Jossey-Bass. http://dx.doi.org/10.3998/tia.17063888.0030.016

Sanni-Anibire, H., Stoesz, B. M., Gervais, L., & Vogt, L. (2021). International students' knowledge and emotions related to academic integrity at Canadian postsecondary institutions. *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 17*(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-021-00088-4

Tas, M. (2013). Promoting diversity: Recruitment, selection, orientation, and retention of international students. *Journal of International Education and Leadership, 3*(2), 1–46.

Vorauer, J. D., Main, K. J., & O'Connell, G. B. (1998). How do individuals expect to be viewed by members of lower status groups? Content and implications of meta-stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*(4), 917–937. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.75.4.917

May 24th, 2024 at 9h00 / 24 mai 2024 à 9 h 00

Bridging Academia and Global Sustainability: An approach to develop comprehensive rubric for the mapping of academic integrity to UN SDGs

Zeenath Reza Khan, University of Wollongong in Dubai, UAE; Ajrina Hysaj, University of Wollongong in Dubai, UAE; **Sarah Elaine Eaton, University of Calgary, Canada**; Sonja Bjelobaba, Uppsala University, Sweden; Shiva Sivasubramaniam, University of Derby, UK; & Ng Fong Chiu, UOW Malaysia KDU Penang University College, Malaysia

The AIKUN project, funded by the UOW Small Grants Scheme in 2022, embarked on a journey beyond the conventional scope of academic integrity. Our aim was to delve into an expansive exploration that mapped the six fundamental values of academic integrity as key competence to United Nations' 17 Sustainable Development Goals (UN SDGs). Initially conceived to align just these values with the UN SDGs, our study yielded a range of dimensions, culminating in the development of a comprehensive rubric for the actual mapping process. This rubric transcends the mere alignment of values to SDGs, incorporating a multifaceted approach that encompasses ethical considerations relevant to academia, essential skills such as academic writing, citation, and synthesis, diverse academic disciplines, and roles, nuanced contextual factors including gender, geography, religion, culture, and history, as well as various approaches, strategies, and applications aimed at upholding integrity standards.

The methodology employed in crafting this rubric was grounded in the expertise of a diverse panel of academic and research experts spanning nations including Canada, the United Kingdom, countries of the European Union such as Sweden, as well as Turkey, Malaysia, the United Arab Emirates, Australia, and the United States. Leveraging the expert method deemed most suitable for educational science studies, as evidenced by prior research (Bayona-Ore et al., 2018; Bogner et al., 2009; Cuhls, 2005; Cohen et al., 2007), our approach ensured a rigorous and comprehensive exploration of the constructs underpinning academic integrity vis-à-vis the UN SDGs.

Several assumptions were made by the panel:

- Assumption 1: It is insufficient for integrity and ethics to be part of the "hidden curriculum". Ethics and integrity must be explicitly stated in school curricula.
- Assumption 2: There are multiple and complementary values frameworks that can be used to promote academic integrity.

The list of constructs we developed were:

- Ethical values relevant in the academia ((honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility, and courage - not comprehensive + Indigenous principles, virtues)
- Skills (eg. academic writing, acknowledgement, citations, paraphrasing, synthesising, reflecting)
- Areas/Academic discipline/Roles (which stakeholders and areas of study)
- Contexts (gender/geography/religion/culture/history)

- Approaches (methods that help to uphold values, or teach skills)
- Strategies (top down/governmental/regulatory/statutory)
- Applications (practices that will help to achieve skills identified e.g. pedagogical considerations in teaching academic writing)

This poster presentation will explain the methodological underpinnings of our endeavour, showcasing how each construct was meticulously selected and applied to map academic integrity as a key competence contributing to the UN 17 SDGs. Through this holistic approach, we aim to underscore the interconnectedness of academic integrity with broader societal goals, paving the way for informed pedagogical practices and policy interventions in fostering integrity within educational ecosystems.

Bibliography

Bayona-Ore, L., Zavala, R. F., & Cruz, M. L. (2018). *Expert opinion process: applications in education*. In Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Education Technology and Computers (ICETC '18). Association for Computing Machinery.

Bogner, A., Littig, B., & Menz W. (Eds.). (2009). *Interviewing experts: ECPR research methods*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education* (6th ed.). Routledge.

Cuhls, K. (2005). The Delphi method. In K. Cuhls (Ed.), *Delphi surveys: Teaching material for UNIDO foresight seminars* (pp. 93 – 112). United Nations Industrial Development Organization.

May 24th, 2024 at 09h00 / 24 mai 2024 à 09 h 00

Ethical issues of using generative AI in research practice

Sonja Bjelobaba, Uppsala University, Sweden; Debora Weber-Wulff, HTW Berlin, Germany; de Lorna Waddington, University of Leeds, UK; Sabuj Bhattacharyya, Institute for Stem Cell Science and Regenerative Medicine, India; Mike Perkins, British University Vietnam; Tomáš Foltýnek, Masaryk University, Czechia, Olumide Popoola, Queen Mary University of London, UK

Although Large Language Models have been around for several years, with the first version of the Generative Pretrained Transformer (GPT) by OpenAI released in 2018 (Radford et al., 2018), it was not until November 2022, with the release of OpenAI's ChatGPT that many educators became aware of the potential application of AI tools in academia. While the release of ChatGPT was followed by an explosion of other AI-based applications, it was ChatGPT which caused the main hype around AI in higher education (Hosseini, Rasmussen & Resnik, 2023).
While many of these new applications have been designed to support and expedite with and expedite research, many researchers are not aware of the potential ethical problems (Bender et al., 2021) that can arise with the use of such tools during the research process (Hosseini, Rasmussen & Resnik, 2023).

The use of AI tools in the research process, from idea generation to publication, presents both potential benefits and ethical challenges. Pinzolits (2023) provides an overview and basic categorization of selected AI tools designed for academia in general. Several papers identify various ways how these tools can be used in research, including summarizing literature and identifying source material (Roe and al., 2023), identifying rewires for academic work (Solomon et al., 2023), thematic analysis in qualitative research (Perkins & Roe, 2023), generating titles, locating data sources, and identifying gaps in research (Hutson; 2022; Nguyen-Trung et al., 2023). Ayling & Chapman (2021) highlights the need for practical frameworks to assess and mitigate the ethical risks of AI systems. Hine (2021) underscores the importance of effective ethical governance, particularly in university settings, to ensure that AI research is conducted in an ethical manner. These studies collectively underscore the importance of ethical considerations in the use of AI tools in the research process, and the need for robust frameworks and governance mechanisms to ensure their responsible use.

The authors, all members of the same research group, have tested a range of generative AI tools in order to provide a typology of applications created for research and highlight the variety of such tools. When researchers do not know what is out there and what the related ethical issues are, it limits the prospects for the ethical use of such tools.
Databases of AI tools such as Futurepedia (https://www.futurepedia.io/) and There is an AI for that (https://theresanaiforthat.com/) broadly categorize AI tools made with researchers in mind under categories such as "research", "data analysis", "academic research", "writing", etc.

However, there is a need to further distinguish different types of such tools. In this presentation, we will explore the potential of these tools to support the research process, categorized according to the various stages from the initial idea to the final publication. For each research phase, we will highlight the potential ethical issues raised by the use of generative AI tools and propose measures to mitigate related risks. We will also discuss whether and how the use of generative AI tools should be disclosed.

For example, ChatGPT may be useful in generating a good project name with a meaningful acronym, but there might be ethical problems if it is used to write the content of a research paper or a research proposal. AI-based translation tools can help non-native speakers write more fluently (Bowker, 2020), but it should be made clear that such a tool was used (Hosseini, Resnik & Holmes, 2023).

The broader ethical problems of using AI tools in research will be discussed. A good example is using AI tools for literature reviews: the inability of such tools to assess the credibility of the source and hence distinguish between legitimate and predatory papers potentially risks harming science in general.

Bibliography

Ayling, J. & Chapman, A (2022). Putting AI ethics to work: are the tools fit for purpose? *AI Ethics, 2*, 405–429. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-021-00084-x

Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A., & Shmitchell, S. (2021). *On the Dangers of Stochastic Parrots: Can Language Models Be Too Big?* Proceedings of FAccT '21. On the Dangers of Stochastic Parrots: Can Language Models Be Too Big? "1F99C (acm.org)

Bowker, L. (2020). Chinese speakers'use of machine translation as an aid for scholarly writing in English: a review of the literature and a report on a pilot workshop on machine translation literacy. *Asia Pacific Translation and Intercultural Studies, 7*(3), 288-298. https://doi.org/10.1080/23306343.2020.1805843

Hine, C. (2021). Evaluating the prospects for university-based ethical governance in artificial intelligence and data-driven innovation. *Research Ethics, 17*(4), 464-479. https://doi.org/10.1177/17470161211022790

Hosseini, M., Rasmussen, L. M., & Resnik, D. B. (2023). Using AI to write scholarly publications. *Accountability in Research*, 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1080/08989621.2023.2168535

Hosseini, M., Resnik, D. B., & Holmes, K. (2023). The ethics of disclosing the use of artificial intelligence tools in writing scholarly manuscripts. *Research Ethics, 19*(4), 449-465. https://doi.org/10.1177/17470161231180449

Hutson M. (2022). Could AI help you to write your next paper? *Nature, technology feature, 611,* 192–193. https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-022-03479-w

Nguyen-Trung, K., Saeri, A. K., & Kaufman, S. (2023). *Applying ChatGPT and AI-powered tools to accelerate evidence reviews*. https://osf.io/pcrqf/download

Pinzolits, R. F. J. (2023). AI in academia: An overview of selected tools and their areas of application. *MAP Education and Humanities, 4,* 37-50. https://doi.org/10.53880/2744-2373.2023.4.37

Perkins, M. & Roe, J. (2023). *Academic publisher guidelines on AI usage: A ChatGPT supported thematic analysis*. F1000Research. https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.142411.1

Radford, A., Narasimhan, K., Salimans, T., & Sutskever, I. (2018). *Improving Language Understanding by Generative Pre-training*. [Online]. https://s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/openai-assets/research-covers/language-unsupervised/language_understanding_paper.pdf

Roe, J., Renandya, W. A., & Jacobs, G. M. (2023). A Review of AI-Powered Writing Tools and Their Implications for Academic Integrity in the Language Classroom. *Journal of English and Applied Linguistics*, *2*(1), 22-30. https://doi.org/10.59588/2961-3094.1035

Solomon, D. H., Allen, K. D., Katz, P., Sawalha, A. H., & Yelin, E. (2023). Artificial Intelligence, Authorship, and Medical Publishing. *ACR Open Rheumatol, 75*(6), 288–289. https://doi.org/10.1002/acr.25113

May 24th, 2024 at 09h00 / 24 mai 2024 à 09 h 00

Academic Integrity and Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education (HE) Contexts: A Rapid Scoping Review

Beatriz Moya & Sarah Eaton, University of Calgary

Artificial Intelligence (AI) recent developments challenge higher education. While concerns around unauthorized AI use that could impact the validity of assessments are most pressing, attention to AI's potential for more inclusive teaching and learning environments has also been highlighted. Exploring AI from an academic integrity perspective has become a priority. To contribute timely and evidence-based recommendations, we conducted a rapid scoping review focusing on this question: What is known about academic integrity and AI in higher education involving faculty, students, teaching assistants, academic support for students, and educational developers? We followed the Updated Reviewer Manual for Scoping Reviews from the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) and the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews Meta-Analysis for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) reporting standards. Five databases were searched. The eligibility criteria included higher education stakeholders of any age and gender engaged with AI in the context of academic integrity from 2007 through November 2022 and available in English. The search retrieved 2223 records, of which 14 publications with mixed methods, qualitative, quantitative, randomized controlled trials, and text and opinion studies met the inclusion criteria. We identified two main categories: bounded and unbounded ethical implications. The bounded ethical implications referred to those in which educational stakeholders shared some agreement, and the unbounded ones revealed nuanced perspectives. Among the bounded ones, we identified the potential of AI to support untraceable cheating, the likely repercussions of AI fabrications, and the issues of the propagation of biases with AI tools. We found four unbounded ethical implications, which we framed as questions: Is writing with AI plagiarism? Where do we draw the acceptability line with AI? Who is the author when writing with AI? Can students show evidence of learning with AI? This review can inform educational stakeholders in decision-making processes involving AI integration.

Bibliography

Alonso, A. N. (2022). Online translators in online language assessments. CALL-EJ, 23(3), 115-135. http://callej.org/journal/23-3/Alonso2022.pdf

Anson, C. M. (2022). AI-based text generation and the social construction of "fraudulent authorship": A revisitation. Composition Studies, 50(1), 37-46.

Aromataris, E., & Munn, A. (2020). JBI manual for evidence synthesis. JBI. https://doi.org/10.46658/JBIMES-20-01

Australian Academic Integrity Network (AAIN). (2023). AAIN generative artificial intelligence guidelines. https://www.teqsa.gov.au/sites/default/files/2023-04/aain-generative-ai-guidelines.pdf

Dans, E. (2019, February 6). Meet Bertie, Heliograf and Cyborg, the new journalists on the block. Forbes. https://www.forbes.com/sites/enriquedans/2019/02/06/meet-bertie-heliograf-and-cyborg-the-new-journalists-on-the-block/?sh=669bf965138d

Dawson, P. (2020). E-Cheating, assessment security and artificial intelligence. In P. Dawson (Ed.), Defending assessment security in a digital world (pp. 83-97). Routledge. http://doi.org/10.4324/9780429324178

Delisio, L. A., & Butaky, C. A. (2019). UDL and assistive technology: Utilizing technology beyond mere accessibility. In W. W. Murawski & K. L. Scott (Eds.), What really works with Universal Design for Learning (pp. 157-172). Corwin.

Dignum, V. (2021). The role and challenges of education for responsible AI. London Review of Education, 19(1), 1-11.

Ducar, C., & Schocket, D. H. (2018). Machine translation and the L2 classroom: Pedagogical solutions for making peace with Google Translate. Foreign Language Annals 51(4), 779-795.

European Union. (2022). Ethical guidelines on the use of artificial intelligence (AI) in teaching and learning for educators. https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/d81a0d54-5348-11ed-92ed-01aa75ed71a1/language-en

Foltýnek, T., Bjelobaba, S., Glendinning, I, Khan, Z.R., Santos, R. Pavletic, P., & Kravjar, J. (2023). ENAI Recommendations on the ethical use of Artificial Intelligence in Education. International Journal for Academic Integrity, 19, 12. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-023-00133-4

Fyfe, P. (2022). How to cheat on your final paper: Assigning AI for student writing. AI & Society. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00146-022-01397-z

Gero, K. I., et al. (2022). Sparks: Inspiration for science writing using language models. DIS '22: Designing Interactive Systems Conference, Association for Computing Machinery, Inc. https://arxiv.org/abs/2110.07640

Groves, M., & Mundt, K. (2021). A ghostwriter in the machine? Attitudes of academic staff towards machine translation use in internationalised Higher Education. Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 50. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2021.100957

Hemsley, B., et al. (2023, January 18). Will AI tech like ChatGPT improve inclusion for people with communication disability. The Conversation. https://theconversation.com/will-ai-tech-like-chatgpt-improve-inclusion-for-people-with-communication-disability-196481

Keith, T. (2023). Combating Academic Dishonesty, Part 6: ChatGPT, AI, and Academic Integrity. Academic Technology Solutions. https://academictech.uchicago.edu/2023/01/23/combating-academic-dishonesty-part-6-chatgpt-ai-and-academic-integrity/

Khan, Z. R. (2023). Artificial intelligence content generators in education for schools and universities: A good practice guide, European Network for Academic Integrity Working Group Centre for Academic Integrity in the UAE. University of Wollongong in Dubai. https://academicintegrity-uae.com/category/faculty- resources/

ICAI (2021). The Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity. https://academicintegrity.org/resources/fundamental-values

Merine, R., Purkayastha, S. (2022). Risks and benefits of AI-generated text summarization for expert level content in graduate health informatics. 2022 IEEE 10th International Conference on Healthcare Informatics (ICHI), Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Inc. https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/9874678/

Mindzak, M. (2020, February 17). What happens when a machine can write as well as an academic? University Affairs. https://www.universityaffairs.ca/opinion/in-my-opinion/what-happens-when-a-machine-can-write-as-well-as-an-academic/

Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E. A., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J. M., Hrobjartsson, A., Lalu, M. M., Li, T., Loder, E. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., McGuiness, L. A., Stewart, L. A., Thomas, J., Tricco, A.C., Welch, V. A, Whiting, P., & Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ, 372(71). https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71

Popenici, S. A. D., & Kerr, S. (2017). Exploring the impact of artificial intelligence on teaching and learning in higher education. Research and Practice in Technology Enhanced Learning, 12(22). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41039-017-0062-8

Roe, J., & Perkins, M. (2022). What are automated paraphrasing tools and how do we address them? A review of a growing threat to academic integrity. International Journal for Educational Integrity, 18(1). https://edintegrity.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1007/s40979-022-00109-w

Tauginienė, L., Gaižauskaité, I., Glendinning, I., Kravjar, J., Ojsteršek, M., Ribeiro, L., Odiņeca, T., Marino, F., Cosentino, M., Sivasubramaniam, S., Foltýnek, T. Glossary for Academic Integrity. https://www.academicintegrity.eu/wp/wp-content/uploads/2023/02/EN-Glossary_revised_final_24.02.23.pdf

Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA). (2023). Artificial intelligence. https://www.teqsa.gov.au/guides-resources/higher-education-good-practice-hub/artificial-intelligence

May 24th, 2024 at 09h00 / 24 mai 2024 à 09 h 00

Ethical Considerations in Teacher Education

David Pugalee, University of Derby, UK

This work explores how ethical reasoning can be a cornerstone for developing undergraduates practice that encompasses not only academic integrity but a broader way of thinking that informs their professional lives. There are core practices that cut across STEM disciplines and support a framework for computational thinking across the disciplines. These include reasoning with data, making and adapting models, engaging in problem solving, and utilizing a systems thinking approach (Weintrop et al., 2018). Missing from many approaches with university students is a grounding in ethical inquiry. Through support from the National Science Foundation, Ethical Reasoning in Computational Thinking is designed to engage undergraduate teacher education STEM majors in exploring how ethics can ground their work through ethical inquiry. These critical perspectives are especially important given the rapid evolution of artificial intelligence and other technological advances that requires rethinking conceptions of academic integrity. The creative work from this project, grounded in STEM contexts, focuses on learning outcomes that intersect with ethical reasoning which facilitates a culture of academic integrity and fosters related practices in academia and professional practices as educators in schools. This approach extends thinking about social justice and equity within a broader framework of ethical reasoning. This critical approach undergirds work in both content and pedagogical skills and knowledge for the students. These efforts reflect the atmosphere of academic integrity – honesty, fairness, trust, respect, and mutual responsibility. The work of this project moves academic integrity into the fabric of humanity by exploring the development of ethical reasoning.

Bibliography

Cobb, P., Confrey, J., diSessa, A., Lehrer, R., & Schauble, L. (2003). Design experiments in education research. *Educational Researcher, 32*(1), 9–13. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X032001009

Ernest, P (2018). The ethics of mathematics: Is mathematics harmful? P. Ernest (Ed.), ICME-13 Monographs, 187–216. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-77760-3_12

Freire, P. (1970/2005). Pedagogy of the oppressed (M.B. Ramos, Trans). New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Gutstein, E. (2006). *Reading and writing the world with mathematics: Toward a pedagogy for social justice*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203112946

Kohlberg, L. (1983). *Moral stages: A current formulation and a response to critics*. Karger Press.

Nurenberg, D. (2011). What does injustice have to do with me? A pedagogy of the privileged. *Harvard Educational Review, 81*(1), 50–64. https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.81.1.50456q442p161473

Register, J., Stephan, M., & Pugalee, D. (2021). Ethical reasoning in mathematics: New directions for didactics in U.S. mathematics education. *Mathematics, 9*, 799. https://doi.org/10.3390/math9080799

Shor, I. (1993). Education is politics: Paulo Freire's critical pedagogy. In Leonard, P. & McLaren, P. (Eds.), *Paulo Freire: A critical encounter* (p. 25-35). Routledge Press.

Skovsmose, O. (2021). Mathematics and crises. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10649-021-10037-0

Stephan, M., Register, J., Reinke, L., Robinson, C., Pugalenthi, P., & Pugalee, D. (2021). People use math as a weapon: Critical mathematics consciousness in the time of COVID-19. *Educational Studies in Mathematics, 108*(3), 513-532.

May 24th, 2024 at 10h45 / 24 mai 2024 à 10 h 45

Developing Academic Integrity-Compliant Regulations and Policies on the Use of Generative AI in HE

Dimitar Angelov, Coventry University, UK

Research question: What academic and research integrity concerns should higher education institutions (HEIs) and/or other stakeholders consider when drafting policies and regulations on the use of generative AI for teaching and research purposes? The role of AI in education came into the spotlight with the launch of ChatGPT in November 2022, which sent shockwaves across tertiary-level education providers internationally. In the UK, eight out of the 24 top universities, which form the elite Russell Group, are now prohibiting the use of ChatGPT; amongst these are Cambridge, Oxford, Bristol, Edinburgh and Manchester (Wood 2023). However, a more nuanced response has been favoured by others – most notably University College London (UCL), which has developed a publicly available policy that talks explicitly about ChatGPT's pedagogical benefits, predominantly as a writing development tool (UCL, 2023). The adoption of such a nuanced approach follows a recognition of the potential that ChatGPT has for teaching and learning (QAA 2023; JISC 2023). Perhaps the most positive response to ChatGPT has come from Deakin University in Australia, which aims to embrace all generative AI tools as part of its teaching and learning strategy (Deakin, 2023). Based on an analysis of existing sector and institutional rules and recommendations, as well as theoretical scholarship into AI-assisted academic practices, the proposed chapter will present an overview of the current scholarly and public debates on the use of generative AI in higher education, in the UK and other English-speaking countries, with the view to developing a set of guidelines on the ethical considerations that HEIs and other stakeholders need to bear in mind when seeking to regulate AI-informed teaching and research.

Bibliography

Deakin University (2023). The Deakin University response to ChatGPT. Deakin University CRICOS. https://dteach.deakin.edu.au/2023/02/the-deakin-university-response-to-chatgpt/

Webb, M. (2022). *AI in tertiary education: A summary of the current state of play.* https://nationalcentreforai.jiscinvolve.org/wp/2023/02/14/considerations-on-wording-ai-advice/#comments

Quality Assurance Agency (2023). *The rise of artificial intelligence software and potential risks for academic integrity: A QAA briefing paper for higher education providers.* https://www.qaa.ac.uk/docs/qaa/members/the-rise-of-artificial-intelligence-software-and-potential-risks-for-academic-integrity.pdf?sfvrsn=ebb0a981_6

University College London (2023) AI, education and assessment: staff briefing #1. https://www.ucl.ac.uk/teaching-learning/assessment-resources/ai-education-and-assessment-staff-briefing-1#key%20actions

Wood, P. (2023). *Oxford and Cambridge ban ChatGPT over plagiarism fears but other universities choose to embrace AI bot*. https://inews.co.uk/news/oxford-cambridge-ban-chatgpt-plagiarism-universities-2178391

May 24th, 2024 at 10h45 / 24 mai 2024 à 10 h 45

Academic Integrity through the Narratives of Chilean Academic Integrity Leaders: Visions of the Future from the Global South

Beatriz Moya & Sarah Eaton, University of Calgary

The academic integrity field seeks to advance the equity, diversity, inclusion, decolonization, and indigenization agenda; however, it has been slow in incorporating Global South voices in mainstream research, and the euro-centric perspectives on academic integrity in policy and practice are still prevalent in higher education. These perspectives might have contributed to keeping long-lasting beliefs that students from some cultures might be more prone to cheating and maintaining an over-leniency to non-racialized groups in academic misconduct investigations. Recognizing that this field is now entering an era where its role in promoting social justice is expanding, we propose that Chilean academic integrity educational leaders' perspectives have the potential to enrich the academic integrity international dialogue in new ways. Framed as an interpretive Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) narrative inquiry, we explored Chilean leaders' meaning-making through the stories of their envisioned leadership roles. These narratives, emerging from an interpretive stance, could help gain insight into situated and nuanced academic integrity perspectives grounded in the Global South. We implemented 18 interviews with Chilean academic integrity educational leaders. Participants included four senior administrators, five faculty members, six staff members, and three students. The research was approved by the university's Research Ethics Board. The in-person and online (via conference platform) one-hour interviews provided a space for research participants to narrate their visions of the future of their academic integrity roles through stories, allowing researchers to gain insight into how they made meaning of various events, people, and themselves. Using narrative thematic analysis, we found these leaders' interest in identifying the best strategies to promote individual ethical decision-making supported by institutional collective efforts. These leaders hope to impact Chilean society, contributing to expanding academic integrity by attending to its developmental elements and spanning institutional boundaries through interinstitutional collaboration.

Bibliography

Beasley, E. M. (2016). Comparing the demographics of students reported for academic dishonesty to those of the overall student population. *Ethics & Behavior, 26*(1), 45–62. https://doi.org/10.1080/10508422.2014.978977

Bertram Gallant, T. (2008). *Academic integrity in the twenty-first century: A teaching and learning imperative*. San Francisco.

Gallant, T. B. (2016). Systems Approach to Going Forward: Introduction. In T. Bretag (Ed.), *Handbook of academic integrity* (1st ed., pp. 975–977). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-098-8_81

Bretag, T. (2013). Short-cut students: Fostering academic integrity in students. Global Corruption Report: Education.

Bretag, T. (2016). Defining academic integrity: International perspectives - Introduction. In T. Bretag (Ed.), *Handbook of academic integrity* (1st ed., pp. 3–6). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-098-8

Bretag, T., Harper, R., Burton, M., Ellis, C., Newton, P., Rozenberg, P., ... van Haeringen, K. (2019). Contract cheating: A survey of Australian university students. *Studies in Higher Education, 44*(11), 1837–1856. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2018.1462788

Brinkmann, S. (2018). The interview. In K. Denzin, Norman & S. Lincoln, Yvonna (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research* (5th edition, pp. 576–599). SAGE Publications.

Charmaz, K. (2004). Premises, principles, and practices in qualitative research: Revisiting the foundations. *Qualitative Health Research, 14*(7), 976–993. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732304266795

Chase, S. (2005). Narrative inquiry: Multiple lenses, approaches, voices. In maturity. In K. Denzin, Norman & S. Lincoln, Yvonna (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research* (3rd ed., 651–679). SAGE Publications.

Chase, S. (2018). Narrative inquiry: Toward theoretical and methodological maturity. In K. Denzin, Norman & S. Lincoln, Yvonna (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research* (5th ed., 546–560). SAGE Publications.

Clandinin, D. J. (2013). Engaging in narrative inquiry. Left Coast Press. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315429618

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). Research methods in education (8th ed.). Routledge.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches. SAGE Publications. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13398-014-0173-7.2

Creswell, J. W. (2018). Educational research: Planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research. Pearson.

Crotty, M. (1998). The Foundations of Social Research: Meaning and perspective in the research Process (1st ed.). SAGE Publications.

De Maio, C. & Dixon, K. (2022) Promoting academic integrity in institutions of higher learning: What 30 years of research (1990-2020) in Australasia has taught us. *Journal of College and Character, 23*(1), 6–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/2194587X.2021.2017972

Hannah, S. T. & Lester, P. B. (2009). A multilevel approach to building and leading learning organizations. *Leadership Quarterly, 20*(1), 34–48. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.11.003

Hubball, H. & Clarke, A. (2010). Diverse methodological approaches and considerations for SoTL in higher education. *The Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 1*(1). https://ojs.lib.uwo.ca/index.php/cjsotl_rcacea/article/view/6876

Hutchings, P. (2000). Approaching the scholarship of teaching and learning. In P. Hutchings (Ed.), *Opening lines: Approaches to the scholarship of teaching and learning* (pp. 1–10). The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Josselson, R. (2011). Narrative research: Constructing, deconstructing, and reconstructing story. In J. Wertz, K. Charmaz, L.M. McMullen, R. Josselson, R. Anderson, & E. McSpadden. *Five ways of doing qualitative analysis* (pp. 224-242). Guilford Press.

Josselson, R. (2013). *Interviewing for qualitative inquiry: A relational approach*. The Guilford Press.

Kamberelis, G., Dimitriadis, G., & Welker, A. (2018). Focus group research and / in figured worlds. In K. Denzin, Norman & S. Lincoln, Yvonna (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research* (5th ed., pp. 692–716). SAGE.

Kartch, F. (2017). Narrative interviewing. In M. Allen (Ed.), *The Sage Encyclopedia of Communication Research Methods* (pp. 1073–1075). SAGE.

Kenny, N., Watson, G. P. L., & Desmarais, S. (2016). Building sustained action: Supporting an institutional practice of SoTL at the University of Guelph. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 146*, 87–94. https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.20191

Kreber, C. (2013). The transformative potential of the scholarship of teaching. *Teaching and Learning Inquiry, 1*(1), 5–18. https://doi.org/10.20343/teachlearninqu.1.1.5

Lincoln, Y. S., Lynham, S. A., & Guba, E. G. (2018). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions and emerging confluences. In K. Denzin, Norman & S. Lincoln, Yvonna (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative research* (5th ed., pp. 108-150). SAGE Publications.

Lindstrom, G. E. (2022). Accountability, relationality and Indigenous epistemology: Advancing an Indigenous perspective on academic integrity. In S. E. Eaton & J. C. Hughes (Eds.), *Academic integrity in Canada* (pp. 125–139). Springer International Publishing. https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-030-83255-1_6

Merriam, S. & Tisdell, E. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (Fourth). Jossey-Bass.

Miller-Young, J., Anderson, C., Kiceniuk, D., Mooney, J., Riddell, J., Schmidt Hanbidge, A., Ward, V., Wideman, M., & Chick, N. (2017). Leading Up in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. *The Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 8*(2). https://doi.org/10.5206/cjsotl-rcacea.2017.2.4

Miller-Young, J., & Yeo, M. (2015). Conceptualizing and communicating SoTL: A framework for the field. *Teaching and Learning Inquiry, 3*(2), 37–53. https://doi.org/10.20343/teachlearninqu.3.2.37

Minichiello, A. (2016). Examining academic integrity in the postmodern: Undergraduates' use of solutions to complete textbook-based engineering coursework. In S. Marx (Ed.), *Qualitative research in STEM: Studies of equity, access, and innovation* (pp. 119-146).

Poitras Pratt, Y., & Gladue, K. (2022). Re-defining academic integrity: Embracing Indigenous Truths. In S. E. Eaton & J. C. Hughes (Eds.), *Academic integrity in Canada* (pp. 103–123). Springer International Publishing. https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-030https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-030-83255-1_583255-1_5

Poole, G., & Simmons, N. (2013). Contributions of the scholarship of teaching and learning to quality enhancement in Canada. In R. Land & G. Gordon (Eds.), *Enhancing quality in higher education international perspectives* (1st ed., pp. 278-298). Routledge

Rettinger, D., & Bertram Gallant, T. (2022). Thirty years of active academic integrity research and engagement: What have we learned? *Journal of College and Character, 23*(1), 92–95. https://doi.org/10.1080/2194587x.2021.2017976

Riessman, C.K. (2005). Narrative Analysis. In N. Kelly, C. Horrocks, K. Milnes, B. Roberts, D. Robinson (Eds.), *Narrative, memory and everyday life* (pp. 1-7). University of Huddersfield.

Riessman, C. K. (2008). *Narrative methods for the human sciences*. Sage Publications.

Riessman, C. K. (2011). What's the difference about narrative inquiry? Cases, categories. In D. Silverman, *Qualitative research* (3rd edition, pp. 310–330). SAGE Publications.

Roxå, T. (2011). *Understanding strong academic microcultures – An exploratory study* (Issue May).

Roxå, T., & Mårtensson, K. (2009). Significant conversations and significant networks-exploring the backstage of the teaching arena. *Studies in Higher Education, 34*(5), 547–559. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070802597200

Roxå, T., & Mårtensson, K. (2012). How effects from teacher-training of academic teachers propagate into the meso level and beyond. In E. Simon & G. Pleschová (Eds.), *Teacher development in higher education: Existing programs, program impact, and future trends*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203096826

Roxå, T., & Mårtensson, K. (2014). Higher education commons–a framework for comparison of midlevel units in higher education organizations. *European Journal of Higher Education, 4*(4), 303–316. https://doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2014.924861

Roxå, T., & Mårtensson, K. (2015). Microcultures and informal learning: a heuristic guiding analysis of conditions for informal learning in local higher education workplaces. *International Journal for Academic Development, 20*(2), 193–205. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144X.2015.1029929

Roxå, T., Mårtensson, K., & Alveteg, M. (2011). Understanding and influencing teaching and learning cultures at university: A network approach. *Higher Education, 62*(1), 99–111. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-010-9368-9

Scotland, J. (2012). *Exploring the philosophical underpinnings of research: Relating ontology and epistemology to the methodology and methods of the scientific, interpretive, and critical research paradigms*. English Language Teaching. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n9p9

Simmons, N. (2016). Synthesizing SoTL institutional initiatives toward national Impact. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 146, 95–102. https://doi.org/10.1002/tl

Simmons, N., & Taylor, K. L. (2019). Leadership for the scholarship of teaching and learning: Understanding bridges and gaps in practice. *The Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 10*(1). https://doi.org/10.5206/cjsotl-rcacea.2019.1.7995

Taylor, K. L., Kenny, N. A., Perrault, E., Mueller, R. A., Taylor, K. L., Kenny, N. A., Perrault, E., & Mueller, R. A. (2021). Building integrated networks to develop teaching and learning: The critical role of hubs. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144X.2021.1899931

Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA). (2017). Good practice note: Addressing contract cheating to safeguard academic integrity (Issue October). https://www.teqsa.gov.au/latest-news/publications/good-practice-note-addressinghttps://www.teqsa.gov.au/latest-news/publications/good-practice-note-addressing-contract-cheating-safeguard-academiccontract-cheating-safeguard-academic

Thacker E. J., & McKenzie, A. (2022). Using quality assurance frameworks to support an institutional culture of academic integrity at Canadian universities. In S. E. Eaton & J. C. Hughes (Eds.), *Academic integrity in Canada: An enduring and essential challenge* (pp. 519–534). Springer. https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-030-83255-1_27

Verwood, R., & Poole, G. (2016). The role of small significant networks and leadership in the institutional embedding of SoTL. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 146*, 79–86. https://doi.org/10.1002/tl

Webb, A.S. (2020). Riding the fourth wave: An introduction to the scholarship of teaching and learning. In R. Plews & M. Amos (Eds.), *Evidence-based faculty development through the scholarship of teaching and learning* (pp. 1-19). IGI Global.

Williams, A. L., Verwood, R., Beery, T. A., Dalton, H., McKinnon, J., Strickland, K., Pace, J., & Poole, G. (2013). The power of social networks: A model for weaving the scholarship of teaching and learning into institutional culture. *Teaching and Learning Inquiry, 1*(2), 49- 62. https://doi.org/10.20343/teachlearninqu.1.2.49

Ziebland, S. (2013). Narrative interviewing. In S. Ziebland, A. Coulter, J. D. Calabrese, L. Locock (Eds.), *Understanding and using health experiences: Improving patient care* (pp. 38–49). Oxford Academic.

May 24th, 2024 at 10h45 / 24 mai 2024 à 10 h 45

Studying the effectiveness and usability of an online authorship tool in verifying and detecting AI-generated content

Anika Budhiraja, Brenda M. Stoesz, & Matthew Quesnel, University of Manitoba, Canada

In the contemporary digital landscape, where the boundaries between human-generated and artificial intelligence (AI)-)-generated content are increasingly blurred, the need for accurate authorship verification has become paramount. This research aimed to assess the effectiveness of the Auth+ software application that is designed to discern authorship and detect AI-generated content through authorization tests. The study was anchored in the concept of "cognitive offloading," where individuals rely on external tools to aid their cognitive processes to unload cognitive demands influenced by many mechanisms including academic stress (Risko & Gilbert, 2016). The research used a mixed-methods strategy, combining a survey and an experiment, to evaluate Auth+'s capabilities. In a 2 (Response: human, genAI) x 2 (Study: repeated measures design), first-year university students participated in 4 different conditions: (1) participant-written response to a question and 5 min of study time, (2) AI-generated content (using ChatGPT) and 5 min of study time, (3) participant-written content that was not studied, and (4) AI-generated content that was not studied. Participants then uploaded each of the documents to Auth+ and answered questions generated by the software about the uploaded document. In conditions where participants wrote the responses themselves, their authorship verification scores were higher than in conditions where AI-generated content was uploaded, but this depended on whether it was studied. The research also explored the impact of stress on authorship verification scores and user experience. By empirically examining the performance of 'Auth+' in distinguishing between human and AI-generated content and its impact on cognitive processes, this research contributes valuable insights to the fields of digital authorship, AI ethics, and cognitive psychology. The outcomes of this study could inform the continued development of verifying authorship of written documents and facilitate a deeper understanding of the implications of outsourcing cognitive processes in the digital era.

Bibliography

AlAfnan, M. A., Dishari, S., Jovic, M., & Lomidze, K. (2023). ChatGPT as an educational tool: opportunities, challenges, and recommendations for communication, business writing, and composition Courses. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Technology, 3*(2),60-68. https://doi.org/10.37965/jait.2023.0184

Peres, R., Shreier, M., Schweidel, D., & Sorescu, A. (2023). On ChatGPT and beyond: How generative artificial intelligence may affect research, teaching, and practice. *International Journal of Research in Marketing, 40*(2), 269-275. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijresmar.2023.03.001

Rexha, A., Kröll, M., Ziak, H., & Kern, R. (2018). Authorship identification of documents with high content similarity. *Scientometrics, 115*(1), 223–237. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-018-2661-6

Risko, E. F. & Gilbert, S. J. (2016). Cognitive offloading. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 20*(9), 676–688. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2016.07.002

Weber-Wulff, D., Bjelobaba, S., Foltýnek, T., Guerrero-Dib, J., & Waddington, L. (2023). Testing of Detection Tools for AI-Generated Text. *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 19*(6). https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-023-00146-z

May 24th, 2024 at 10h45 / 24 mai 2024 à 10 h 45

Portrait des connaissances sur le plagiat d'une communauté universitaire : résultats d'analyse

Cynthia Potvin, Université de Moncton, Canada

Depuis quelques décennies, les technologies de l'information et de la communication (TIC) s'immiscent en enseignement, engendrant autant des opportunités que des défis (UNESCO, 2023a). Alors que l'avènement de l'Internet dans les années 1990 semblait révolutionnaire (Niel et Roux, 2010), les outils et programmes maintenant disponibles pour aider à la tâche de rédaction laissent craindre le pire : qu'en est-il de leur utilisation éthique par les étudiant.e.s lors de la rédaction de leurs travaux académiques ? Face à cette « peur du plagiat » (Paivandi et Espinosa, 2013), cette question est des plus légitimes et est directement liée à l'enseignement et aux balises que reçoivent les étudiant.e.s en salle de classe. En effet, les systèmes éducatifs, tout type confondu, ont un rôle à jouer afin que les apprenant.e.s développent les compétences (numériques, UNESCO, 2023b) du XXIe siècle. Dans cette communication éclair, je projette de dresser un bref portrait des connaissances sur le plagiat des répondant.e.s d'un questionnaire administré à l'hiver 2023 à mon université dans le cadre du projet de recherche du Partenariat universitaire sur la prévention du plagiat (PUPP). Je me concentrerai sur les données en liens avec les connaissances sur le plagiat des questionnaires administrés aux étudiant.e.s d'une part et, d'autre part, ceux administrés au corps professoral et enseignant. Pour ce faire, je présenterai brièvement les grands volets de l'étude et le contexte dans lequel se trouve mon institution d'enseignement supérieur. Je traiterai ensuite les résultats de l'analyse quantitative des questions liées aux connaissances sur le plagiat. Je conclurai que l'utilisation éthique des TIC par les étudiant.e.s universitaires doit répondre à certains préceptes bien définis préalablement en salle de classe.

Bibliographie

Niel, X. et Roux, D. (2010). Introduction. La révolution internet. *Les 100 mots de l'internet* (p. 3-10). Presses Universitaires de France.

Paivandi, S. et Espinosa, G. (2013). Les TIC et la relation entre enseignants et étudiants à l'université. *Distances et médiations des savoirs, 4*. https://journals.openedition.org/dms/425

UNESCO (2023a). Global Education Monitoring Report 2023: Technology in education – A tool on whose terms? Paris, UNESCO. https://doi.org/10.54676/UZQV8501

UNESCO. (2023b). Résumé du rapport mondial de suivi sur l'éducation 2023 : Les technologies dans l'éducation : Qui est aux commandes ? Paris: UNESCO. https://doi.org/10.54676/SKCZ3602

May 24th, 2024 at 10h45 / 24 mai 2024 à 10 h 45

La sanction du plagiat - démarquer le rôle de l'enseignant de celui du comité de discipline

Nicholas Jobidon, École nationale d'administration publique, Canada

Les enseignants sont habituellement situés à la première ligne de défense dans la lutte contre le plagiat : ce sont eux qui décident si un dossier doit ou non faire l'objet d'une plainte à l'organe disciplinaire de l'institution. Évidemment, la préparation d'une plainte, le témoignage à un comité de discipline et, dans bien des cas, le suivi de la décision du comité (par exemple, par la réévaluation ou l'administration d'une autre évaluation à l'étudiant traîné en discipline) peuvent représenter un travail important de la part de l'enseignant. En fonction du règlement qu'ils doivent appliquer, ceux-ci pourraient préférer gérer le problème « à l'interne », par exemple en informant l'étudiant de l'offense académique qui lui est reprochée et en lui retirant des points lors d'une évaluation, en le dirigeant vers les ressources utiles, ou même simplement en évitant tout conflit en faisant la sourde oreille au problème.

Quoique plusieurs règlements en matière de plagiat soient muets sur cette question, elle demeure toujours applicable. Certaines institutions tentent d'adopter une approche plus directe en encadrant cette pratique à même le règlement de manière à distinguer les rôles des enseignants eux-mêmes par rapport à celui des comités de discipline. La difficulté devient alors centrale : comment démarquer ces rôles? La réponse doit tenir compte de divers critères dont les rôles institutionnels des divers acteurs universitaires (dont, bien sûr, les enseignants et les étudiants), la liberté académique des enseignants (notamment quant à leur gestion de classe), l'équité envers les étudiants, de même que le contexte plus général du contrat universitaire liant ces derniers à leur institution.

Bibliography

Bergadaà, M. (2015). *Le plagiat académique : comprendre pour agir*. L'Harmattan.

Hébert, M-H. & Fontaine, S. (2022). Et si les cas de plagiat et de tricherie étaient liés à la nature des activités d'évaluation? *Revue internationale sur le numérique en éducation et communication, 9*(9), 148–151. https://doi.org/10.52358/mm.vi9.265

Guibert, P. & Michaut, C. (2011). Le plagiat étudiant. *Éducation Et Sociétés, 28*(2), 149–149. https://doi.org/10.3917/es.028.0149

Darde, J.-N. (2012). Enseignants-chercheurs, recherche et plagiat. *Mouvements, 71*(3), 128–128. https://doi.org/10.3917/mouv.071.0128

Boubée, N. (2019). Qu'est-ce qui détermine les étudiants à plagier : l'infrastructure informatique de google ordinaire ou la « commodité »? *Revue Internationale Des Technologies En Pédagogie Universitaire, 16*(2), 56–68. https://doi.org/10.18162/ritpu-2019-v16n2-06

Hamilton, M. & Wolsky, K. (2022). “The Barriers to Faculty Reporting Incidences of Academic Misconduct at Community Colleges”, dans S. E., Eaton & J., Christensen Hughes (Eds.). *Academic integrity in Canada: an enduring and essential challenge* (Ser. Ethics and integrity in educational contexts, volume 1). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-83255-1

May 24th, 2024 at 10h45 / 24 mai 2024 à 10 h 45

Countering unethical publishing and dissemination practices (Round Table)

Irene Glendinning, Coventry University, UK

Scholarly researchers and publishers of academic materials are prime targets for a range of very lucrative money-making scams and fraud, including predatory publishing, journal cloning and hijacking, fake academic conferences, authorship for sale and peer review fraud. These practices affect the quality, reliability and integrity of what gets published and otherwise disseminated, which can have very serious consequences for scientific progress. Those taken in by the scams, encompassing anyone from early career researchers to more experienced academics, not only waste money (whether self-funded or using research funding), but also may face adversity in their later career progression. An essential approach for countering the ongoing success of this disreputable global industry is the provision of education for those likely to be targeted with bogus or misleading offerings. Accordingly, a round table is proposed by members of the European Network for Academic Integrity (ENAI) working group Ethical Publishing and Dissemination (EPAD), with the mission "to reduce the impact of disreputable publishers and fraudulent academic events". Background materials and examples will be presented to both inform participants and facilitate discussions, based on the following topics:

• Understanding the range of unethical and fraudulent practices affecting the quality of academic publishing and dissemination
• Appreciating reasons and motivations for the rise in these disreputable practices
• Finding ways of improving the quality and reducing the impact of fraud and misrepresentation in academic publishing and dissemination EPAD working group members welcome any conference participant who is interested in this topic to join us for our round table and to contribute to the discussions.

Bibliography

Abalkina, A. (2021). Unethical Practices in Research and Publishing: Evidence from Russia. *The Scholarly Kitchen*, February 4th, 2021. Retrieved on April 20th, 2022. https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2021/02/04/guest-post-unethical-practices-in-research-and-publishing-evidence-from-russia/?informz=1

Beall's list. (n.d.). https://beallslist.net/

COPE (n.d.). Publication Guidelines. Committee on Publication Ethics. https://publicationethics.org/guidance/Guidelines

Eaton, S. E. (2018). Avoiding Predatory Journals and Questionable Conferences: A Resource Guide. Canada [University of Calgary]. https://prism.ucalgary.ca/bitstream/handle/1880/106227/Eaton%20-%20Avoiding%20Predatory%20Journals%20and%20Questionable%20Conferences%20-%20A%20Resource%20Guide.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Grove, J. (2021). Hijacked Journals 'siphon millions of dollars' from research. Times Higher Education, 30th August 2021. Retrieved on April 20th, 2021. https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/hijacked-journals-siphon-millions-dollars-research

May 24th, 2024 at 13h15 / 24 mai 2024 à 13 h 15

Reimagining writing and learning: What students say about Generative AI

Alyson King, Ontario Tech University, Canada

Our research focuses on the following research question: What are the challenges and opportunities associated with teaching writing in the time of Generative AI (GAI), such as ChatGPT, a powerful large language model that is impacting the way we communicate? With the advent of AI-driven large language models, students and instructors now have access to sophisticated writing tools that generate text, and many students are using them to complete written assignments. As a result, AI writing tools are helping to re-shape the conversation on teaching and learning in undergraduate education. We take a bounded case study approach (Baxter & Jack, 2015) to explore and understand the perspectives and insights of students in Faculty of Social Science and Humanities classes to explore their responses and reflections on GAI tools in the context of education and their lived experiences more broadly. Using a survey with open-ended questions, we will explore student responses to the use and misuse of large language model (LLM) text generators such as ChatGPT. The intent is to move beyond simplistic banning of these tools to explore the ways in which LLMs can be used to teach students to write in both ethical and critical ways. In other words, since LLMs are now pervasive in society, how can we ensure that students develop the critical thinking skills that traditional writing assignments were intended to do and use these tools ethically and thoughtfully?

Our research project builds on an examination of the critical development of our undergraduate writing curriculum, our "way-finding" process, and the important pedagogical considerations that allow us to enact the curriculum in sensitive and meaningful ways. We will draw on decolonizing pedagogy (Battiste, 2013; Dion, 2022) to help address how to navigate this new landscape of writing instruction. This research project aims to address the critical need to adapt writing instruction to the evolving technological landscape, specifically the presence GAI large language models. By exploring decolonizing pedagogical approaches, we can strike a balance between leveraging the benefits of AI tools and nurturing students' essential writing skills. The insights gained from this research will provide educators with practical strategies to navigate the challenges and harness the opportunities presented by ChatGPT and other similar tools, ensuring the continued development of effective communication skills in the digital age.

Bibliography

Battiste, M. (2013). *Decolonizing education: nourishing the learning spirit*. Purich Publishing Limited.

Baxter, P. & Jack, S. (2015). Qualitative Case Study Methodology: Study Design and Implementation for Novice Researchers. *The Qualitative Report, 3*(4), 544-559. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2008.1573

Dion, S. D. (2022). *Braided Learning: Illuminating Presence through Art and Story*. Purich Books.

May 24th, 2024 at 13h15 / 24 mai 2024 à 13 h 15

Student Attitudes Towards AI-Generated Text Detection

Jasper Roe, James Cook University, Singapore &
Mike Perkins, British University Vietnam, Vietnam

The academic world is often known for its slow pace, but recent events have shown that universities can make rapid and significant changes when needed. For instance, they quickly adopted emergency online learning and embraced new technologies like generative artificial intelligence to enhance education. Student-centric values and a focus on prioritizing students' needs have been core principles for universities when making changes to their teaching, learning, and assessment approaches. However, the introduction of Large Language Models (LLMs) and Generative AI has raised questions about these principles and the traditionally slow pace of change in academia. The rapid release of AI-generated text detection software by educational technology companies highlights this concern. Such detectors aim to identify the text produced by LLMs such as ChatGPT, which is capable of producing complex, human-like text (Fui-Hoon Nah et al, 2023; Chan 2023). Despite LLMs being relatively new and their implications in academia still evolving, text-detection products were immediately offered and presumably used by some higher education institutions (HEIs). Early experiences with these tools have shown that they are highly inaccurate, unreliable, and may disproportionately affect certain student groups. As a result, students have several concerns about GenAI's influence on their own education (Chan & Hu, 2023). Early research has shown that there are differing levels of trust in GenAI among different student groups (Amoozadeh et al., 2023) and that there is disagreement on the acceptability of GenAI in writing between students and teachers (Barrett & Pack, 2023). In this study, we report on a large-scale, multi-campus survey to assess student and faculty attitudes towards the use of GenAI tools in education and assessment.

Bibliography

Amoozadeh, M., Daniels, D., Nam, D., Chen, S., Hilton, M., Ragavan, S. S., & Alipour, M. A. (2023). Trust in Generative AI among students: An Exploratory Study. Cornell University. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2310.04631

Barrett, A. & Pack, A. (2023). Not quite eye to AI: student and teacher perspectives on the use of generative artificial intelligence in the writing process. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *20*(1), 59.

Chan, C. K. Y. & Hu, W. (2023). Students' Voices on Generative AI: Perceptions, Benefits, and Challenges in Higher Education. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2305.00290

Chan, C. K. Y. (2023). A comprehensive AI policy education framework for university teaching and learning. *International journal of educational technology in higher education*, *20*(1), 38.

Fui-Hoon Nah, F., Zheng, R., Cai, J., Siau, K., & Chen, L. (2023). Generative AI and ChatGPT: Applications, challenges, and AI-human collaboration. *Journal of Information Technology Case and Application Research*, *25*(3), 277-304. https://doi.org/10.1080/15228053.2023.2233814

May 24th, 2024 at 13h15 / 24 mai 2024 à 13 h 15

Perceptions of teaching staff and students on how academic integrity is embedded and upheld in postgraduate taught education

Natasha Croome, Imperial College London, UK

Introduction: Across the higher education sector globally there have been increasing concerns on the rise of academic misconduct cases and the influx of new digital tools (such as artificial intelligence). The educational literature champions institutions focusing on embedding academic integrity rather than just punishing academic misconduct. However, few studies have explored views of the main stakeholders on this topic.

Methods: Eleven participants (six teaching staff and five students) participated. All were purposively sampled across four postgraduate taught courses. Each participant completed an online semi-structured interview which was then transcribed verbatim and anonymised. All data was then analysed using thematic analysis.

Results: Across the data set, five themes were identified. Staff emphasised the importance and purpose of academic integrity including how it helps develop students' academic and professional identities. However, both staff and students noted there was misunderstanding of the term, which negatively impacts the consistent implementation of relevant policies. Both stakeholders reflected upon how digital tools impacted, both positively and negatively, students' learning. Staff and students also noted the reasons affecting relationship building, both within and across the main stakeholders, thus impacting the embedding of academic integrity. Additionally, both stakeholders highlighted reasons (such as workload) as to why academic integrity is not currently front and centre within postgraduate taught education.

Discussion: The results of this study support the literature on developing an educative policy that emphasises the importance of academic integrity. It is essential for higher education institutions to develop a consistent definition of academic integrity to reduce misunderstanding. In addition, academic integrity should be embedded within courses' curriculum rather than just discussed at induction. Institutions should also create an academic integrity community of practice where staff and students can better understand policies and have a voice with regard to these.

Bibliography

Cullen, C. S. (2022). Pivoting from punitive programs to educational experiences: Knowledge and advice from research. *Journal of College and Character, 23*(1), 48-59. https://doi.org/10.1080/2194587X.2021.2017973

King, M. R. & ChatGPT (2023). A conversation on artificial intelligence, chatbots, and plagiarism in higher education. *Cellular and Molecular Bioengineering. 16*, 1-2. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12195-022-00754-8

Lancaster, T. & Lau, C. (2022). *Improving Academic Integrity Policies at UK Universities*. Advance HE Teaching and Learning Conference 2022. UK.

Löfström, E., Trotman, T., Furnari, M. & Shephard, K. (2015). Who teaches academic integrity and how do they teach it? *Higher Education. 69*, 435-448. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-014-9784-3

International Center for Academic Integrity (2021). *The Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity*. Clemson University.

Macfarlane, B., Zhang, J. & Pun, A (2014). Academic integrity: a review of the literature. *Studies in higher education, 39*(2), 339-358. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2012.709495

McNeill, L. (2022) Changing "Hearts" and Minds: Pedagogical and Institutional Practices to Foster Academic Integrity. In S. E., Eaton & J., Christensen Hughes (Eds.). *Academic Integrity in Canada. Ethics and Integrity in Educational Contexts (*pp. 487–503). Springer.

Parnther, C. (2020). Academic misconduct in higher education: A comprehensive review. *Journal of Higher Education Policy And Leadership Studies, 1*(1), 25-45. https://doi.org/10.29252/johepal.1.1.25

Sullivan, M., Kelly, A., & McLaughlan, P. (2023). ChatGPT in higher education: Considerations for academic integrity and student learning. *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching, 6*(1). https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2023.6.1.17

Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (2023a). *Academic Integrity Charter.*

May 24th, 2024 at 13h15 / 24 mai 2024 à 13 h 15

Conceptualising governance assurance of academic integrity

Irene Glendinning, Coventry University, UK

Governors of higher education institutions have a fiduciary duty to uphold the reputation of their institutions and maintain the integrity of the academic mission. Governors provides stewardship over the exercise of power, the use of resources and the achievement of objectives. Academic dishonesty has been recognised as a significant threat to a universities reputation and one that requires significant resources, expertise, leadership and will to address. Despite the clear relationship between academic honesty, institutional reputation and good governance, very little has been said about the role of governing bodies in overseeing the institutionalisation of academic integrity and what effective monitoring would entail. This paper presents work in progress to address this gap.

Three key questions underpin the authors engagement with the governance of academic integrity:
1. What does a mature, fit for purpose institutional strategy need to incorporate?
2. What kind of reporting would enable governing bodies to interrogate the institutionalisation of academic integrity in the organisations they are accountable for?
3. To what extent is their consensus amongst experts on the key components of a mature academic integrity strategy and the governance assurance that sits alongside it?

The authors present conceptual work that has already been developed to address the first two questions and a proposed methodology to respond to the third.

Bibliography

Andrews, S. & Glendinning, I. (2024). Governing Academic Integrity: Conceptualizing the Assurance and Efficacy of Strategies and Outcomes. In S. E., Eaton (Eds). *Second Handbook of Academic Integrity. Springer International Handbooks of Education.* Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-54144-5_185

Gluszek, E. (2021). Use of the e-Delphi Method to Validate the Corporate Reputation of Management Maturity Model (CR3M). *Sustainability, 13(*21), 1-28. https://doi.org/10.3390/su132112019

Kirby, N. (2022). Institutional Integrity: Its Meaning and Value. *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice, 25*(4), 1-26. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10677-022-10330-8

May 24th, 2024 at 13h15 / 24 mai 2024 à 13 h 15

Professional Peer Pressure: The Plagiarism Policy and Praxis Paradox

Linda Harwood, Selkirk College, Canada

Addressing student plagiarism consistently and fairly remains a significant challenge in higher education. While extensive research has explored the factors contributing to student plagiarism, limited attention has been paid to the behavior of faculty members in reporting instances of academic dishonesty. My recent doctoral study, which employed the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) as a theoretical framework, aimed to bridge this gap by examining the impact of subjective norms on faculty reporting of college student plagiarism.

The TPB suggests that human intention to perform a behavior is influenced by attitude, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control. In this study, I focused on the often-overlooked category of subjective norms, which includes the perceived social pressure and expectations related to a specific behavior – in this case, reporting (or not reporting) student plagiarism. My research expanded the scope of subjective norms to encompass the influence of administrators, professional peers, and School Chairs on faculty reporting decisions.

Using a mixed-methods approach, I surveyed members of a single institution in western Canada and conducted interviews with faculty members who taught in multiple School contexts, referred to as "peripatetic faculty." My findings demonstrated that subjective norms significantly impact faculty reporting behavior in different School contexts. Faculty members construct and are influenced by descriptive and injunctive norms within each academic unit, shaping their behavioral intentions and actions.

This research has substantial implications for higher education institutions and academic policymakers. To enhance academic integrity and align reporting practices with ethical and educational goals, I recommended a five-point plan of targeted interventions to promote equitable and consistent institutional responses to student plagiarism, fostering a culture of academic integrity within and across Schools.

Bibliography

Harwood, L. (2023). *The impact of subjective norms upon faculty reporting of student plagiarism: A theory of planned behaviour approach.* University of Liverpool.

May 24th, 2024 at 13h15 / 24 mai 2024 à 13 h 15

Studying the effectiveness and usability of an online authorship verification tool

Kezia Wong, Brenda M. Stoesz, & Matthew Quesnel, University of Manitoba, Canada

Contract cheating is a form of academic misconduct that involves the submission of someone else's work presented as one's own (Clarke & Lancaster, 2006). With the increasing use and capabilities of technology, contract cheating has become an increasing concern within postsecondary institutions (Ashan et al., 2022). The Auth+ software has the marketed ability to discriminate between work that was written by a student and work that was not by quizzing students on their submissions (Sikanai, 2023). The primary goal of this study was to examine the effectiveness of the Auth+ software in identifying contract cheating. 36 undergraduate students at a research-intensive university were recruited to participate in this study. This study followed a within-subjects design consisting of 4 experimental conditions followed by a survey. In the research lab setting, participants wrote 1-2 paragraph responses to four questions and either studied or did not study their responses. Participants then uploaded what they had written or the writing of another participant to Auth+ and answered questions generated based on the uploaded document. Finally, participants filled out a survey to collect information on their experiences using the software and completed a test of their working memory. The results of this study are expected to provide evidence for the reliability and validity of the results produced by Auth+ software and support for the administration of it in the classroom setting. Results will be discussed in terms of the potential for Auth+ software to both deter and identify contract cheating.

Bibliography

Ahsan, K., Akbar, S., & Kam, B. (2022). Contract cheating in higher education: A systematic literature review and future research agenda. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 47*(4), 523-539. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1931660

Clarke, R. & Lancaster, T. (2006). Eliminating the successor to plagiarism: Identifying the usage of contract cheating sites. Paper Presented at the Second International Plagiarism Conference. https://doi.org/10.1.1.120.5440

Sikanai. (2021). Auth+. https://www.sikanai.com/auth-plus/