

5th International Conference Plagiarism Across Europe and Beyond
3rd International Conference Shaping Ethics in Academia and Society

19-21 June 2019
Vilnius, Lithuania

SURVEYING ACADEMIC INTEGRITY: METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES AND LESSONS LEARNED

European Network for Academic Integrity

Erasmus+ Strategic Partnerships project 2016-1-CZ01-KA203-023949

Inga Gaizauskaite, Shivadas Sivasubramaniam, Irene Glendinning, Salim Razi,
Sonja Bjelobaba, Veronika Kralikova & Zeenath Reza Khan

WORKSHOP

Introduction

WORKSHOP STRUCTURE

Introduction of survey working group

Introduction of workshop content

Splitting participants into 3 workshop groups

Work in groups

Wrap up

AIM

The aim of the workshop is to highlight potential (selected) methodological and ethical issues via mutual discussion by participants and presenters.

Informed consent

What are the considerations that need to be explored when producing "information for participants" for questionnaire-based survey?

What may be the potential challenges for obtaining informed consent when surveying academic integrity?

Risk assessment

How can we assess the overall risks by comparing the potential risks and the probability of that happening during the research period?

What potential risks are there in surveys on academic integrity?

Questionnaire validity and reliability

What makes survey questions „good“ and valid?

What potential questionnaire validity problems have you encountered when surveying aspects of academic integrity?

Survey questions as measurement tools

Consider measurement error

- Observed score vs. actual score

Possible reasons of measurement error

- Respondent
- Researcher
- Instrument

Establish

- Validity
- Reliability

Validity

*(mainly based on
Colton & Covert, 2007)*

“Validity describes the extent to which we measure what we purport to measure” (Colton & Covert, 2007, p. 65).

Categories of validity:

- Face validity
- Construct validity
- Content validity
- Criterion validity
- Predictive validity
- Multicultural validity

Ways to Establish Validity

*(mainly based on
Colton & Covert, 2007)*

QUALITATIVE

- Read the relevant literature.
- Consult experts.
- Develop a table of specifications.
- Inductive approach (experts match items with construct).

QUANTITATIVE

- Convergent and discriminant validity (e.g., multi-trait multi-method matrix)
- Prie-test items.
- Item analysis (internal consistency reliability, item response theory).
- Factor analysis.

Reliability

*(mainly based on
Colton & Covert, 2007)*

“Reliability is the extent to which an instrument produces the same information at a given time or over a period of time” (Colton & Covert, 2007, p. 65).

Ways to establish reliability (Colton & Covert, 2007):

- Eyeballing
- Percentage and proportion agreement
- Approaches using a statistical test of correlation
- Test-retest reliability
- Parallel forms reliability
- Internal consistency reliability

Example

Validity of the data – number of responses, gender, level of study

Huge challenge – **translations**

Respondents didn't know the **terms** used in questionnaire

Example of the question: Have you ever bought work (with money) from any of the following types of sites, to submit to your university as your own work?

- Essay mills (sites that sell pre-written essays)
- Peer-sharing sites (sites which ask the user to upload an essay or resource before they can download something)
- Essay bidding sites (sites where the user uploads their requirements for work and available writers bid to undertake the work at competing prices)
- Contract essay sites (sites which offer the reader bespoke essays to their specific requirements and timeframes)



Example

Unfinished questions – **Aren't we missing something?** In some cases, more than 50% of questionnaires were unfinished

The trickiest question?

When did they stop answering?

3rd question: *Have you ever seen or heard of any services selling work/assignments to students?*

	1. Personal behaviours	2. Other students' behaviours	3. Outcomes for cheating	4. Demographics
Sweden	64%	90%	94%	99%
Australia	68%	90%	96%	99%
Chile	68%	89%	95%	100%
Serbia	64%	84%	94%	99%
Czechia	65%	85%	93%	99%
Romania	61%	85%	95%	99%



Wrap up

Each group presents three key points

Survey group members provide their comments

THANK YOU

[HTTP://WWW.ACADEMICINTEGRITY.EU/WP/SURVEY-WORKING-GROUP/](http://www.academicintegrity.eu/wp/survey-working-group/)

Reference

Colton, D. & Covert, R. W. (2007). *Designing and Constructing Instruments for Social Research and Evaluation*. Wiley.