

TOPICAL SCIENTIFIC ISSUES

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30525/2592-8813-2024-3-28>

MYTHS OF ACADEMIC (MIS)CONDUCT AND INTEGRITY

ARTEM ARTYUKHOV

DSc in Economics, PhD in Engineering, Associate Professor

Sumy State University

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-1112-6891

artyukhovartem83@gmail.com

This article critically examines common myths surrounding academic integrity, addressing oversimplified narratives that limit understanding of its complexity. By drawing upon recent research and evidence-based practices, the article aims to provide a nuanced perspective on the realities of academic misconduct, explore the multifaceted nature of ethical challenges in academia, and highlight the shared responsibilities of stakeholders in promoting a culture of integrity. The analysis debunks myths such as the assumption that plagiarism is the sole form of misconduct, that technology primarily facilitates cheating, and that academic integrity violations are limited to students. Instead, it underscores the breadth of academic misconduct, the dual role of technology as both a challenge and a tool for fostering integrity, and the pivotal influence of faculty and institutional practices on student behavior. The discussion also emphasizes the importance of inclusive academic integrity policies, which account for cultural and systemic factors, and the need for proactive approaches such as education, clear communication, and ongoing stakeholder collaboration to address misconduct effectively. This study highlights the dynamic nature of academic integrity, which is evolving with technological advancements and diverse educational practices. It identifies gaps in current approaches, such as inconsistent faculty engagement and inadequate attention to systemic inequities, and proposes future research directions. These include exploring the intersection of academic integrity with equity and inclusion, evaluating the long-term efficacy of interventions, and addressing emerging challenges such as the ethical use of generative AI. By fostering informed and evidence-based dialogue, the article aims to contribute to developing strategies that uphold ethical standards and support the academic community in adapting to an ever-changing educational landscape.

Key words: Academic integrity, academia, myths, reality.

Introduction. Academic integrity is a cornerstone of higher education, fostering a culture of honesty, trust, and ethical scholarship. However, misconceptions about academic misconduct abound, often hindering effective prevention and intervention efforts. This article critically examines common myths surrounding academic integrity, drawing upon existing research and best practices. By debunking these myths and highlighting the realities of academic misconduct, we aim to foster a more nuanced understanding of this complex issue and inform the development of more effective strategies for promoting ethical behavior within the academic community.

The prevailing discourse on academic integrity is often dominated by narratives that oversimplify the issue. For example, the myth that plagiarism is the sole form of academic misconduct neglects the diverse ethical challenges faced by students, faculty, and researchers today. Similarly, the assumption that technology primarily facilitates cheating overlooks the potential of technology to enhance academic integrity through tools like plagiarism detection software and online resources.

This article will explore a range of common myths, including misconceptions about the prevalence and nature of academic misconduct, the role of technology, the effectiveness of different interventions, and the responsibilities of various stakeholders. By critically examining these myths and presenting evidence-based realities, we aim to contribute to a more informed and nuanced understanding of academic integrity and inform the development of more effective strategies for promoting ethical conduct within higher education.

Analysis of recent research and publications. Academic integrity is a critical component of higher education, encompassing the ethical standards and principles that govern academic conduct. Despite its importance, numerous myths surround the concept, leading to misunderstandings and misapplications of integrity policies (Gueirrisi, 2020; Macfarlane, 2020).

Academic integrity is a commitment to honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility in scholarly work (Marais, 2022). It serves as the foundation for trust and credibility within academic communities, influencing educational outcomes and professional conduct in the workforce (Manullang et al., 2022). However, the perception of academic integrity often leans towards a negative portrayal, emphasizing violations such as plagiarism and cheating rather than fostering a positive understanding of ethical scholarship (Dodonova et al., 2024).

One prevalent myth is that academic dishonesty is a modern phenomenon exacerbated by technological advancements. However, research indicates that cheating and dishonesty have existed throughout history, albeit in different forms (Stoesz, 2022). The rise of online education has indeed introduced new challenges, but it has also provided opportunities for innovative assessment methods that can enhance academic integrity (Jha et al., 2021). Another common misconception is that academic integrity issues primarily concern students. In reality, faculty and institutional practices significantly influence the academic integrity landscape. Studies show that many professors do not systematically teach about academic integrity, often leaving students without adequate guidance on ethical academic practices (Peters et al., 2019; Ransome & Newton, 2017). This lack of instruction can confuse students regarding what constitutes academic misconduct (Löfström et al., 2014).

Effective academic integrity policies are essential for promoting ethical behavior in educational settings. However, students poorly understand many policies, leading to unintentional violations (Stoesz, 2022). Research suggests that policies should emphasize the values of academic integrity and provide clear guidance on the consequences of misconduct, avoiding a punitive approach that fosters a climate of fear (Stoesz, 2022; Bretag et al., 2011). Moreover, the teaching of academic integrity is often inconsistent. Faculty members may feel unqualified to teach these principles or may not see it as their responsibility (Miron et al., 2021). This inconsistency can result in a fragmented understanding of academic integrity among students, who may be aware of extreme examples of dishonesty but lack the skills to navigate more nuanced situations (Simón et al., 2014).

Cultural differences also play a significant role in perceptions of academic integrity. For instance, Indigenous perspectives on academic integrity challenge Western-centric notions, emphasizing relationality and community over individualistic approaches to knowledge (Lindstrom, 2022; Pratt & Gladue, 2022). This observation highlights the need for a more inclusive definition of academic integrity that recognizes diverse epistemologies and practices. Furthermore, issues of equity, diversity, and inclusion are increasingly relevant in discussions about academic integrity. Research indicates that certain student groups, including international students and students of color, may face disproportionate scrutiny regarding academic misconduct (Eaton, 2022). Addressing these disparities is crucial for creating a fair and just academic environment.

The myths surrounding academic integrity often obscure the complex realities students and institutions face. By addressing these misconceptions and emphasizing the shared responsibility of students and faculty, educational institutions can foster a culture of integrity that benefits all stakeholders. Ongoing education, clear and transparent policies, and an inclusive approach to academic integrity are essential for promoting ethical scholarship in higher education.

The aim of the article. This article aims to create a list of myths about academic integrity and their debunking.

Results and discussion. In this section, myths about academic integrity are divided into three groups.

General issues.

Myth: academic integrity violations and academic misconduct are only about plagiarism.

Reality: academic misconduct encompasses a wide range of behaviors, including fabrication of data, falsification of research, unauthorized collaboration, self-plagiarism, improper use of intellectual property, etc.

Myth: academic integrity is only about preventing cheating.

Reality: a broader perspective emphasizes fostering a culture of ethical scholarship, promoting honest and responsible research practices, and supporting students in developing their intellectual potential.

Myth: plagiarism is the only serious form of academic misconduct.

Reality: data fabrication, research falsification, and unauthorized collaboration are equally serious forms of academic misconduct with significant consequences.

Myth: self-plagiarism is not a serious issue.

Reality: reusing your work without proper citation is a form of plagiarism and can have academic consequences.

Myth: changing a few words in a copied text is not plagiarism.

Reality: paraphrasing without proper attribution is still plagiarism.

Myth: citing sources in a bibliography is enough to avoid plagiarism.

Reality: proper in-text citation and quotation practices are required to give credit where it's due.

Myth: citations are only needed for direct quotes.

Reality: all borrowed ideas, paraphrased content, and data require proper attribution.

Myth: lack of scientific novelty, practical significance, and low quality of written work is a violation of academic integrity

Reality: if the work is completed without violating academic integrity, then its quality, the presence or absence of scientific novelty, and practical significance are determined by the expert community.

Myth: punishment is the most effective way to address academic misconduct.

Reality: a more effective approach focuses on prevention through education, awareness campaigns, and creating a supportive learning environment.

Myth: academic integrity only applies to written work.

Reality: academic integrity applies to all forms of scholarly work, including presentations, performances, and research data.

Myth: technologies make it easier to cheat.

Reality: technologies can present challenges, but they also offer tools and strategies for detecting and preventing academic misconduct, such as content uniqueness-checking software, online proctoring systems, and digital watermarking.

Myth: using GenAI tools always constitutes cheating.

Reality: using these tools is permissible when aligned with institutional guidelines and when they do not involve deception or dishonesty.

Myth: using similarity or uniqueness-checking software (often called “anti-plagiarism” programs or plagiarism checkers) guarantees that plagiarism will be detected.

Reality: while similarity-checking software is useful for identifying potential plagiarism, it does not catch instances of dishonesty. Only experts must still apply their judgment when interpreting similarity reports.

Myth: academic integrity is only relevant in formal academic settings.

Reality: the principles of academic integrity extend beyond the classroom and are essential for personal and professional success in all areas of life.

Myth: academic integrity is only relevant during assessments.

Reality: academic integrity extends beyond exams and assignments; it encompasses all aspects of academic life, including research practices, collaboration, and professional conduct.

Myth: all forms of assessment are equally prone to cheating.

Reality: certain assessment types may be more susceptible to dishonesty than others.

Myth: academic integrity violations are easily detectable.

Reality: many violations go unnoticed due to the subtlety of some forms of cheating, such as collaboration on assignments, the use of unauthorized resources, fabrication, or falsification.

Myth: addressing academic dishonesty is a one-time effort.

Reality: maintaining a culture of academic integrity requires ongoing effort, including regular reviews and updates of policies, continuing education and training, and continuous evaluation of the effectiveness of academic integrity initiatives.

Myth: academic integrity is only relevant to traditional academic disciplines and F2F learning

Reality: the principles of academic integrity apply to all fields of study and professional programs, online learning, and distance education.

Myth: online learning promotes academic dishonesty.

Reality: while online environments can present unique challenges, they also offer opportunities for innovative assessment methods to enhance integrity. The effectiveness of online learning in maintaining academic integrity depends on the design of the courses and assessments.

Myth: academic integrity is a static concept that does not evolve.

Reality: academic integrity is a dynamic concept that evolves with changes in technology and educational practices.

Myth: academic integrity is less important in specific fields.

Reality: academic integrity is crucial across all academic disciplines.

Myth: academic integrity isn't essential for fields outside of academics.

Reality: academic integrity is foundational to professional success and ethical behavior in any field.

Myth: the consequences of academic dishonesty are minor.

Reality: academic dishonesty can have severe repercussions, including expulsion, loss of reputation, and long-term impacts on career opportunities.

Myth: minor violations don't matter.

Reality: even minor infractions can impact learning outcomes and institutional culture.

Myth: academic integrity is a personal choice that does not affect others.

Reality: violations of academic integrity can undermine the value of degrees and the reputation of institutions, affecting all stakeholders.

Myth: reporting someone else's dishonesty is betraying them.

Reality: reporting dishonesty helps maintain a fair academic environment and upholds the value of academic achievements.

Policy.

Myth: addressing academic integrity is the university's sole responsibility.

Reality: collaboration with external stakeholders, such as parents and community members, is crucial for creating a broader societal understanding of the importance of academic integrity.

Myth: academic integrity policies are just formalities.

Reality: effective academic integrity policies are essential for fostering a culture of honesty and accountability. They provide clear guidelines for acceptable behavior and outline the consequences of violations.

Myth: academic integrity policies are universal.

Reality: academic integrity policies and practices vary by institution, culture, and area of knowledge.

Myth: academic integrity policies are primarily intended to punish violators.

Reality: the primary goal of academic integrity policies is to promote ethical behavior, provide guidance, and create a supportive academic environment.

Myth: zero-tolerance policies are most effective.

Reality: educational approaches and prevention strategies often work better than punitive measures.

Myth: no further action is needed once an institution has an academic integrity policy.

Reality: policies must be actively enforced and regularly reviewed to ensure they remain effective and relevant to current challenges in academia.

Myth: academic integrity policies should be overly complex and restrictive.

Reality: clear and concise policies that are easy to understand and apply are more effective than overly complex ones.

Myth: academic integrity policies stifle creativity.

Reality: clear guidelines promote original thinking and innovation.

Myth: Honor Codes eliminate academic dishonesty.

Reality: Honor Codes can promote a culture of integrity but are not foolproof. Their effectiveness depends on the commitment of all stakeholders in academia to uphold the principles outlined in the Honor Codes.

Stakeholders in academia.

Myth: all stakeholders in academia are aware of and understand the consequences of academic misconduct.

Reality: many stakeholders in academia may not fully understand the severity of the consequences of academic misconduct, such as disciplinary action, academic probation, or even expulsion.

Myth: all students are inherently dishonest.

Reality: many students adhere to academic integrity principles and implement academic integrity practices, and the perception of widespread dishonesty can undermine genuine efforts to promote ethical behavior. Also, students who engage in academic misconduct may face personal challenges, academic pressures, or lack a clear understanding of ethical expectations.

Myth: academic integrity principles only apply to students and are solely the responsibility of students.

Reality: academic integrity principles apply to everyone involved in the academic process and require a collective effort from all stakeholders, including students, faculty, staff, researchers, administrators, and the institution. Institutions are responsible for clearly communicating and explaining academic integrity policies to students.

Myth: faculty are uniformly strict about academic integrity.

Reality: faculty attitudes toward academic integrity can vary widely. Some may adopt a more lenient approach, while others may impose harsh penalties, leading to inconsistencies in enforcement that can confuse students.

Myth: once caught, stakeholders in academia always repeat violations.

Reality: many stakeholders in academia learn from their mistakes when given proper support and education.

Myth: group work eliminates integrity concerns.

Reality: collaborative work still requires clear guidelines and individual accountability.

Myth: if I don't get caught, it's not cheating.

Reality: cheating is defined by the act itself, not by the likelihood of being caught. Engaging in dishonest practices undermines the educational process and can have serious consequences if discovered.

Myth: cheating is more common among international students.

Reality: stereotypes about international students being more prone to cheating are unfounded. Academic integrity issues affect all student demographics, and many international students are committed to upholding ethical standards.

Myth: sharing answers with a classmate isn't cheating if they're struggling.

Reality: sharing answers is a form of cheating and undermines the learning process for both students.

Conclusions and prospects for further research. The analysis reveals a significant gap between the perceived realities and the complexities surrounding academic integrity. Many prevalent myths perpetuate misconceptions about the nature and scope of academic misconduct, leading to ineffective responses and potentially exacerbating the issue. The myth that academic integrity solely concerns students, for instance, overlooks the crucial role of faculty, staff, and the institution in fostering

an ethical environment. Similarly, the assumption that plagiarism is the only form of academic misconduct can close our eyes to other serious violations like data fabrication and research falsification.

Furthermore, the analysis highlights the need for a nuanced understanding of the factors contributing to academic misconduct. While some may attribute it solely to individual dishonesty, research suggests that various factors, including pressure to succeed, lack of understanding of ethical guidelines, and personal challenges, can influence student behavior. Recognizing these complexities is crucial for developing effective interventions that address the root causes of academic misconduct.

The role of technology in academic integrity is another critical aspect. While technology can facilitate cheating, it also offers valuable tools for promoting and maintaining academic integrity. Plagiarism detection software, online proctoring systems, and digital learning platforms can be leveraged to support ethical practices and enhance the learning experience. However, using these technologies responsibly and ethically is crucial, ensuring that they do not inadvertently create barriers to learning or exacerbate existing inequalities.

The findings of this analysis open several directions for further research. Future studies should explore the intersection of academic integrity with equity, diversity, and inclusion issues, focusing on how systemic barriers influence perceptions and practices of ethical behavior. Additionally, longitudinal research is needed to evaluate the long-term effectiveness of educational interventions, policy implementations, and technological tools in promoting academic integrity. Investigating the role of faculty training and institutional support in fostering consistent teaching of ethical principles would also provide valuable insights.

Moreover, as academic integrity is a dynamic concept that evolves alongside technological and pedagogical advancements, ongoing research must address emerging challenges, such as the ethical use of generative artificial intelligence tools in academic contexts. Examining how institutions can strike a balance between leveraging technology and maintaining the authenticity of the learning experience will be critical in shaping the future of academic integrity.

In conclusion, fostering a culture of academic integrity requires a multifaceted and collaborative approach that recognizes the diverse challenges faced by academic communities. By addressing prevailing myths, acknowledging systemic inequities, and leveraging evidence-based strategies, institutions can create environments that prevent misconduct and promote ethical behavior as a cornerstone of academic and professional success. Continued research and dialogue on this subject are essential for ensuring the relevance and effectiveness of academic integrity practices in an ever-changing educational landscape.

Acknowledgment. The research is prepared in the frame of the project “AICE – With Academic Integrity to EU Values: Step by Step to Common Europe” (project number ERASMUS-JMO-2021-HEI-TCH-RSCH-101048055). Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or EACEA. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.



References:

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

2. Dodonova, V., Dodonov, R., Voinarovska, L., Chornomordenko, D., Pavlov, Y., Binkivska, K., & Lobanchuk, O. (2024). Promoting Sustainable Education through Academic Integrity: The Habitus and Socialization Nexus. *European Journal of Sustainable Development*, 13(2), 209. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.14207/ejsd.2024.v13n2p209>
3. Eaton, S. E. (2022). New priorities for academic integrity: equity, diversity, inclusion, decolonization and Indigenization. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 18(1). Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-022-00105-0>
4. Gueirisi, N. (2020). Mad and disabled realities within academic integrity at the university level of education. Bachelor of Social work thesis. Ryerson University. 81 p. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.32920/25417372.v1>
5. Jha, M., Simon, Bilgin A., Berretta R., Bilgin A., Sheard J., Herath Jayarathna L., Leemans S.J.J., Myers, T. (2021). Adaptability of academic integrity procedures and practices in the COVID-19-accelerated transition to online assessment. In Gregory, S., Warburton, S., & Schier, M. (Eds.), *Back to the Future – ASCILITE '21. Proceedings ASCILITE 2021 in Armidale* (pp. 299–303). Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.14742/ascilite2021.0142>
6. Lindstrom, G. E. (2022). Accountability, Relationality and Indigenous Epistemology: Advancing an Indigenous perspective on academic integrity. In *Springer eBooks* (pp. 125–139). Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-83255-1_6
7. Löfström, E., Trotman, T., Furnari, M., & Shephard, K. (2014). Who teaches academic integrity and how do they teach it? *Higher Education*, 69(3), 435–448. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-014-9784-3>
8. Macfarlane, B. (2020). Myths about students in higher education: separating fact from folklore. *Oxford Review of Education*, 46(5), 534–548. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2020.1724086>
9. Manullang, R., Agusti, I. S., Yuni, R., & Putra, P. D. (2022). Academic Integrity Through Administration, Interaction, and Satisfaction with Distance Learning at Universitas Negeri Medan. *Advances in Economics, Business and Management Research/Advances in Economics, Business and Management Research*. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.2991/aebmr.k.220104.019>
10. Marais, I. E. (2022). *Institutionalisation of academic integrity: Experiences at a distance education university in South Africa during COVID-19*. <https://www.ajol.info/index.php/cristal/article/view/240804>
11. Miron, J., Eaton, S. E., McBreaity, L., & Baig, H. (2021). Academic Integrity Education across the Canadian higher education landscape. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 19(4), 441–454. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-021-09412-6>
12. Peters, M., Boies, T., & Morin, S. (2019). Teaching Academic Integrity in Quebec Universities: Roles professors adopt. *Frontiers in education*, 4. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2019.00099>
13. Pratt, Y. P., & Gladue, K. (2022). Re-Defining Academic Integrity: Embracing Indigenous truths. In *Springer eBooks* (pp. 103–123). Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-83255-1_5
14. Ransome, J., & Newton, P. M. (2017). Are we educating educators about academic integrity? A study of UK higher education textbooks. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(1), 126–137. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2017.1300636>
15. Simon, Cook, B., Sheard, J., Carbone, A., & Johnson, C. (2014). Academic integrity perceptions regarding computing assessments and essays. *ICER '14: Proceedings of the tenth annual conference on International computing education research*, 107–114. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1145/2632320.2632342>
16. Stoesz, B. M. (2022). Understanding provincial and territorial academic integrity policies for elementary and secondary education in Canada. In *Springer eBooks* (pp. 141–161). Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-83255-1_7