Violations of and threats to academic integrity in online English language teaching

Özgür Çelik[1]

Thomas Lancaster[2]

[1] Balıkesir University, Turkey / Contact: ozgurcelik@balikesir.edu.tr

[2] Imperial College London, UK / Contact: thomas@thomaslancaster.co.uk

Abstract

The move to online teaching has brought with it fresh opportunities for students to violate academic integrity. This paper considers such violations from within the domain of online English language teaching, although many of the ideas presented are applicable to other disciplines. The paper reports on a two-part study conducted at a university in Turkey. In the first part, qualitative data collected from students and staff through an online survey form were used to identify a new way of categorizing academic integrity violations. This provided three such categories, namely; exam-related, assignment-related, and online session-related violations. In the second part of the study, 462 students completed a survey related to their attitudes towards both academic integrity violations and the associated threats that may lead to these violations. Although the results revealed students generally presenting a commitment to the fundamental values of academic integrity, many students showed willingness to engage with machine translation software to prepare answers at times when they were expected to be working unaided. The findings underline a need for further consideration about how students are taught and assessed with integrity in an online environment. They also suggest that nuanced discussions about academic integrity need to take place between students and English language teachers.

APA Citation

Çelik, Ö., & Lancaster, T. (2021). Violations of and threats to academic integrity in online English language teaching. *The Literacy Trek, 7*(1), 34-54. https://doi.org/10.47216/literacytrek.932316

Introduction

Academic integrity is fundamental to teaching, learning, and research (Bretag, 2016). It acts as a blueprint in the advance of knowledge by promoting honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and courage, which are the fundamental values of academic integrity as positioned by the International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI, 2021). Based on the ICAI recommendations, it seems essential to frame educational planning

around these values. A whole community commitment to these values plays a significant role in preventing academic integrity violations.

Academic integrity violations pose a significant threat to the value of education given that some students tend to attempt to breach academic integrity. The reasons for this are complex, with one prominent study suggesting that violating academic integrity is related to the inability of students to persevere with learning (Amigud & Lancaster, 2019).

The choice of teaching methods and modalities also seem to influence if students choose to violate academic integrity or not. Following the outbreak of COVID-19, an increase in academic integrity violations was observed (Lancaster & Cotarlan, 2021). This increase appears to relate closely to the widespread international movement to emergency remote teaching.

Different from open education, emergency remote teaching encompasses delivering the face-to-face course design in an online environment and providing instant education support in extraordinary situations (Hodges et al., 2020). The mismatch between the course design and the delivery environment can be a major reason for academic integrity violations. In emergency remote teaching, instructors use or adapt their face-to-face course designs for online education. However, since the pedagogical characteristics of face-to-face and online classes are different (Wuensch et al., 2006), improper adaptations may lead to academic integrity violations, especially in exam security, assessments, assignments, and participation. Therefore, it is crucial to identify violations and threats to academic integrity in online teaching.

During the 1970s, communication and interaction became central to language learning and teaching, and since the mid-1990s, the use of digital tools in distance language teaching has been integrated into pedagogy (Stickler et al., 2020). Since then, technology has become an indispensable part of online language teaching. With the emergence of computer-assisted language learning (CALL) and mobile-assisted language learning (MALL), foreign language teaching pedagogy has evolved around digital tools. CALL and MALL refer to the use of a variety of technology for language learning and teaching purposes (Chapelle, 2010). Therefore, it can be claimed that switching from face-to-face education to emergency remote teaching has

been less 'painful' for foreign language classes due to their technological preparedness. Nevertheless, the utilization of a wide variety of digital tools may provide students with access to methods of violating academic integrity in online foreign language classes that were not previously available to them.

Identifying the threats that lead to academic integrity violations in online foreign language classes can provide valuable insights for teachers and course designers. This paper proposes that pitfalls in the adaptation of face-to-face course design to emergency remote teaching can be mitigated by taking proactive measures towards academic integrity violations. This study presents the results of a two-part study conducted with students and teachers at a public university in Turkey.

Within this scope, the aim of this study is twofold: first, it aims to identify violations of and threats to academic integrity in online English teaching classes. Second, by using this data, it aims to measure students' attitudes towards academic integrity when a threat is involved in online English teaching classes. The research questions are as follows:

- RQ1 - What are the academic integrity violations in online English language teaching?

- RQ2 - What are the threats to academic integrity in online English language teaching?

- RQ3 – What are students' attitude levels when a threat is involved?

Background

The European Network for Academic Integrity defines academic integrity as "compliance with ethical and professional principles, standards, practices and a consistent system of values that serve as guidance for making decisions and taking actions in education, research, and scholarship" (Tauginienė et al., 2018, p. 8). Furthermore, ICAI proposes six fundamental values of academic integrity that are honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and courage (ICAI, 2021). Within this scope, academic integrity encompasses a strict commitment to these fundamental values in all academic works and settings and for all stakeholders.

A violation refers to the breach of good practice occurring from questionable, unlawful or unethical behavior (Tauginienė et al., 2018). In an academic setting, some of the violations include, but are not limited to, plagiarism, contract cheating, fabrication, falsification, and cheating. Similarly, a threat is a possibility that may lead on to a violation when not prevented. Academic integrity violations and threats have always been a serious concern for educators. With emergency remote teaching, these concerns increased because the violations seemed to be becoming more visible and widespread. In a study conducted by Wiley (2020), the majority of teachers raised concerns about academic integrity violations in the online environment. In the literature, these violations are mainly centered around the type of violation such as plagiarism, fabrication, contract cheating, etc. (Akbulut et al., 2008; Blau et al., 2021).

Exam security has been a core problem in online education, especially in shifting to emergency remote teaching. Cheating in online exams is reported to have been considerably increased during the pandemic (Lederman, 2020; Newton, 2020). The implementation of assessments designed for face-to-face delivery into emergency remote teaching mode can be considered a problem that violates exam security. Adopting a summative assessment by using verbatim test bank questions (Golden & Kohlbeck, 2020), presenting exam questions in a similar order for all participants (Li et al., 2021), absence of an exam honor code (Corrigan-Gibbs et al., 2015), and unproctored exams (Dendir & Maxwell, 2020) can lead students to cheat in online exams. Further, the study of Bilen and Matros (2020) shows that grading on a curve in online exams increases cheating incidents because it creates a sense of competition among students, and they may feel they have to cheat to do better than the class average to pass the class. Another significant academic integrity problem is the students' attitudes towards cheating in online exams. The comparative study of Burgason et al. (2019) reveals that the majority of online students consider utilizing notes and books and accessing information during an exam as 'trivial' cheating when compared to face-to-face students. Therefore, when identifying threats to academic integrity in online teaching, it may be a good idea to measure students' attitudes towards violations.

Contract cheating, which takes place when a student employs a third party to complete assessed work for them, is another serious academic integrity violation (Clarke & Lancaster, 2006). There has been a sharp increase worldwide in requests posted to contract cheating services since the pandemic (Lancaster & Cotarlan, 2021). By taking advantage of the pandemic, contract cheating services have increased their marketing tactics and made themselves more accessible for students (Seeland et al., 2020). To understand why contract cheating dramatically increased during the pandemic, it is necessary to determine why students engage in contract cheating. In their study, Rundle et al. (2019) propose three main reasons why students refrain from contract cheating; namely, a sense of morals, perception of norms, and a motivation to learn. It can be argued that emergency remote teaching lacks control mechanisms for these three reasons. Similarly, in their large-scale study, Bretag et al. (2019) identified three variables that lead students to contract cheat: dissatisfaction with the teaching and learning environment, the perception that there are lots of opportunities to cheat, and speaking a first language other than English. From a similar perspective, in their integrative study, Curtis and Clare (2017) see having opportunity as a threat that leads students to contract cheating. It is evident that due to the problems of emergency remote teaching, contract cheating services have marketed more heavily to students, who, in return, have found more opportunities for contract cheating.

One of the key strategies recommended in the literature for enacting academic integrity relies on the consideration of assessment design. As Morris (2018) states, re-designing assessments is one way to minimize academic misconduct. Assessment design in online education is different from face-to-face education, and educators should design the assessments considering the online teaching pedagogy (Vonderwell et al., 2007) because deficiencies in assessment design in online education can lead to significant academic integrity violations. For instance, a summative assessment may not pose a threat to academic integrity in face-to-face education. However, in online education, summative-only assessments may cause academic integrity violations. In their experimental study, Fask et al. (2014) investigated cheating in online and face-to-face classes. They administered a summative final exam to face-to-face and online groups. The results revealed that online testing facilitated cheating more than face-to-face testing. Similarly, the study of Harmon et al. (2010) pointed out that summative exams (multiple choice) in online education have greater cheating risk when

compared to face-to-face education. From another perspective, some studies provide evidence that authentic assessments help mitigate academic integrity violations in online education (Ellis et al., 2020; ICAI, 2016; Sotiriadou Logan et al., 2020). Therefore, it is essential to choose an appropriate assessment design to prevent academic integrity violations in online education.

Bretag et al. (2019) found that the use of a first language other than English is one of the main reasons for academic integrity violations, especially contract cheating. The study of Bista (2011) confirms that academic misconduct is more prevalent among non-native English-speaking students and proposes reasons for this, which include students' previous learning style, English language proficiency, cultural unfamiliarity, student-teacher relationship, and availability of educational resources. The study of Perkins et al. (2020) also finds evidence that improving students' English writing proficiency reduces plagiarism cases. Similarly, many studies explore the relationship between a poor level of English and academic integrity violations, specifically plagiarism (Bretag; 2007; Goh, 2015; Perkins et al., 2018). Moreover, the use of machine translation in foreign language classes as a form of academic misconduct was discussed in some papers (Clifford et al., 2013; Groves & Mundt, 2021). Evidently, investigating academic integrity violations in online English teaching has clear implications on the quality of foreign language education. However, academic integrity violations in online English classes have never been explored. From this perspective, this study aims to address this gap in the literature by identifying violations and threats to academic integrity and revealing students' attitudes.

Method

Research design

This study employs the exploratory mixed-method design. Creswell and Clark (2009) define exploratory mixed method design as a two-phase design in which the results of the first method (qualitative) can help develop or inform the second method (quantitative). "This design is based on the premise that exploration is needed for one of several reasons: Measures or instruments are not available, the variables are unknown, or there is no guiding framework or theory (Cresswell & Clark, 2009, p.

75). In this respect, this study explored the violations and threats in the first phase (qualitative) and measured the students' attitudes based on the exploration made in the first phase (quantitative).

Participants

The study was conducted at a public university in Turkey. The participants were university students who took both synchronous and asynchronous online English classes and teachers from various universities who taught online English classes during the emergency remote teaching process after the outbreak of Covid-19. Student participants were selected through convenient sampling from the research setting. Freshmen students took only synchronous compulsory English classes. However, upper-grade students took a compulsory asynchronous English course last year and an elective synchronous English course this year. Teacher participants were selected from 5 different universities through snowballing technique. All teachers had experience in synchronous and asynchronous English teaching. A total of 102 students and 20 teachers participated in the first part of the study. In the second part of the study, the attitude questionnaire was administered to 462 university students. In total, 564 students and 20 teachers contributed to the study.

Procedure

Data Collection

The study was designed in two parts. The first part aimed to identify the violations and threats to academic integrity in online English classes. To do this, qualitative data were collected through an online survey form at the onset of the study from 102 university students and 20 teachers. The survey asked participants to address open-ended questions about the violations and threats to academic integrity they witnessed, heard, or knew about in online English classes. In the second part of the study, a Likert-type questionnaire was developed by utilizing the content analysis results. The items were generated by blending threats with violations to enable the exploration of how student attitudes towards academic integrity change when a threat is involved. Students were asked to rate each item on a Likert-type scale with five points (Never (5), Rarely (4), Sometimes (3), Usually (2), Always (1)). 462 students returned responses.

Data Analysis

Using MAXQDA software, content analysis was undertaken on the responses collected through the online survey form, and the violations and threats to academic integrity in online English classes were identified. To do this, all potential violations articulated by the participants were coded. Then, it was observed that students associate violations with certain threats. Therefore, a thematic analysis was undertaken around "threats" theme, and threats to academic integrity were identified. Next, emerging themes were identified as exam-related, assignment-related, online-session related, and other violations and threats. In the next stage, violations and threats were categorized based on the emerging themes above. In the second part of the study, the results of the questionnaire were analyzed descriptively using Jamovi software by taking the mean scores of the responses.

Results

RQ1 - What are the academic integrity violations in online English language teaching?

In order to reveal the potential academic integrity violations in online English language teaching, a rigorous content analysis was conducted on the qualitative data collected. Using the MAXQDA software, all potential violation incidences were coded. Content analysis revealed that academic integrity violations in online English language teaching clustered under three main categories as exam-related violations, assignment-related violations and violations related to online session participation. Table 1 shows the content analysis results.

Table 1. Potential Academic Integrity Violations in Online English Classes

Category	Violations
Exam-Related Violations	Providing account credentials to a friend who has good English level to take the exam on behalf of them
	Asking for answers to questions by connecting to a friend who has good English knowledge with remote connection software
	Making video conversation with people with good English knowledge to learn the answers to the questions during the exam
	Requesting answers by sending screenshots of questions to instant messaging groups
	Surfing the internet to find out the answers of the questions
	Taking the exam with a friend who is good at English

	Using a print or online dictionary to look up the meaning of unknown words during the exam
	Using translation software to understand instructions and questions during the exam
	Getting help from family members in the exam.
Assignment-Related Violations	Paying contract cheating websites to get the homework done
	Taking a friend's homework and changing some parts of it
	Asking a person with good English to do homework
	Getting substantial help from a person with good English
	Writing the homework in the native language and translating it into English using translation software
	Submitting an assignment previously submitted in another lesson by translating it into English
	Submitting an assignment previously submitted by a friend in another lesson in their native language by translating it into English
	Translating the homework created by compiling the sources in the native language and submitting it
	Claiming credit for work in a group project when work was done by others
Online Session Related Violations	Participating in a live lesson from one device and doing other activities (playing a game, surfing internet etc)
	Answering the questions asked by the teacher using translation software
	Asking a friend or family member with a good level of English to attend the lesson on behalf of them
	Not answering the teacher's questions by using technical problems as excuses
	Disrupting the normal operation of the live session
	Not attending the class or leaving the session by pretexting technical problems

As can be seen in Table 1, nine violation incidences were identified for exams, nine incidences for assignments and six incidences for online sessions.

RQ2 - What are the threats to academic integrity in online English language teaching?

During the coding process, it was noticed that participants associated the academic integrity violations with some threats. Therefore, the threats that may lead students to violate academic integrity were identified and categorized, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Potential Threats to Academic Integrity in Online English Classes

Categories	Threats
Exam-Related Threats	Making multiple-choice-only exams
	Keeping exam duration very short
	Asking too difficult questions in exams
	Unproctored exams
	Overstress and high level of anxiety
	Very long and complex questions
	Unclear and complex exam instructions
Assignment-Related Threats	Assigning students with too challenging tasks that are beyond their level
	Not monitoring plagiarism in assignments
	Overloading students claiming that 'you are already at home'
	Not giving feedback to student assignments
	Not scoring the assessments on time
	Assigning all the class with the same task every year and not updating it
	Keeping deadline very short
Online-Session Related Threats	Live lessons taking too long
	Using a communication style that interrupts mutual communication during online lessons (by the teacher)
	Not doing the lesson on the day and time agreed (by the teacher)
	Not informing students on time that live session will not be done or postponed
	Interruption of the course by teacher because of domestic issues
	Not starting the live sessions on time
	Uploading the recording of a previous session rather than making a live session
Others	Technical problems that arise because of the lacks in the digital literacy of teachers
	Not responding messages or e-mails of students or responding too late
	Solely focusing on product evaluation rather than process evaluation
	Too soft or too tough teachers
	Not guiding students about adhering to academic integrity
	Ignoring misconduct and misbehaviour

Table 2 presents the potential threats in exams (n = 7), assignments (n = 7), online sessions (n = 7) and other threats (n = 6). In total, 27 potential threats were identified under four categories.

RQ3 – What are the students' attitude levels when a threat is involved?

In order to see what students' attitudes towards academic integrity are when a threat is involved, a Likert-type scale was created by blending threats with violation incidents. Table 3 shows the mean score of students' attitude levels for each category.

Table 3. Mean Scores of Students' Attitude Level

	Exams	**Assignments**	**Online Sessions**
N	461	460	460
M	4.28	4.43	4.45
Mdn	4.50	4.63	4.67
SD	0.74	0.62	0.63

As Table 3 shows, students say they have a high attitude level ($M > 4.00$) regarding online sessions ($M = 4.45$, $SD = 0.63$), assignments ($M = 4.43$, $SD = 0.62$) and exams ($M = 4.28$, $SD = 0.74$) respectively. To enable a more detailed understanding of the violations in each category, the mean scores of each item were checked. Table 4 shows the mean scores of exam-related violations.

Table 4. Item Mean Scores of Exam-Related Attitudes

	E1	**E2**	**E3**	**E4**	**E5**	**E6**	**E7**	**E8**
N	461	461	460	459	459	460	460	460
M	4.79	4.73	4.44	4.32	4.17	3.46	3.84	4.51
Mdn	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	5
SD	0.65	0.75	1.02	1.08	1.11	1.28	1.23	1.00

*E1: I believe that it is OK to give my account credentials to a friend who has good English level to take the exam on behalf of me if the exams are not proctored. **E2**: I believe that it is OK to ask for answers by connecting to a friend who has good English knowledge with remote connection software. In this way, I feel less excited and better reflect my potential.

E3: Online exam questions are too difficult and beyond our level. So I believe that it is OK to have a video conversation with my classmates to discuss the questions during the exam.

E4: During online exams, my friends send the answers to instant messaging groups. In such cases, the class GPA increases. So I believe that it is OK to get help via instant messaging groups so I won't be under the GPA average.

E5: In online exams, our teachers ask questions that are available on the internet. So I believe that it is OK to find the answers to the questions on the internet.

E6: Sometimes I can't understand the question when I don't know the meaning of a word. I believe that it is OK to look up the meaning of the words I don't know during the exam to understand the questions.

E7: Sometimes, questions can be very long and complex. In such cases, I believe that it is OK to translate the questions into my native language with translation software/websites.

E8: I believe that it is OK to get help from family members during online exams.

Table 4 shows that students are more likely to look up the meaning of a word when they do not understand the questions ($M = 3.46$, $SD = 1.28$) and to use translation software when they find the questions to be long and complex ($M = 3.84$, $SD = 1.23$). It is also clear that students refrain from giving their account credentials to their friends to take the exam on behalf of them ($M = 4.79$, $SD = 0.65$). Table 5 presents the students' assignment-related attitudes.

Table 5. Item Mean Scores of Assignment-Related Attitudes

	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6	A7	A8
N	457	456	456	458	459	459	459	459
M	4.70	4.80	4.67	4.09	3.67	4.75	4.13	4.65
Mdn	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5
SD	0.76	0.61	0.77	1.06	1.24	0.70	1.15	0.82

*A1: I don't know whether my assignments are really examined by my teachers because I never receive feedback. So I believe that it is OK to turn in someone's work after changing parts of it.

A2: Our teacher does not care whether we plagiarize. I believe that it is OK to use others' work.

A3: Our teacher assigns too much work. I believe that it is OK to get help from a friend with a good English level to turn in the assignments on time.

A4: I believe that it is OK to prepare my assignment by compiling text in my native language and translating it via translation software/websites when we are overloaded with assignments.

A5: When assignments are above my English level, I believe that it is OK to prepare the text in my native language and translate it via translation software/websites.

A6: Our teacher does not monitor who is doing what in group work. I believe that it is OK to ask my peers to do my part when I'm busy.

A7: When the topic of the assignment is the same, I believe that it is OK to turn in the work by translating an assignment that I had prepared before in my native language.

A8: When the deadline is too short, I believe that it is OK to ask my friends to do a part of my assignment or use their assignments.

In assignment related violations, students have a relatively high attitude level. As in the case of exams, students have lower attitude levels about using translation software in assignments (A4, A5, A7). However, they have a high attitude level about plagiarism (A1, A2) and substantial assistance (A3, A6, A8). Table 6 shows the online session related attitudes.

Table 6. Item Mean Scores of Online Session-Related Attitudes

	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6
N	460	457	460	460	459	459
M	3.90	4.48	4.89	4.69	4.36	4.39
Mdn	4	5	5	5	5	5
SD	1.12	0.91	0.46	0.80	1.01	1.12

*O1: Online classes take too long. I believe that it is OK to leave my device and deal with something else during a lesson.

O2: Our teacher is very strict during online lessons. I believe that when my teacher asks me a question, it is OK to use translation software/website to give a correct answer.

O3: Our teacher does not monitor whether we attend the class. When I am busy, I believe that it is OK to ask a friend who has a good English level to attend the lesson on my behalf and do the in-class activities.

O4: Our teacher can react badly when I answer incorrectly. I believe that it is OK not to answer by citing technical problems when s/he asks me a question.

O5: Our teacher does not monitor when we enter or leave online classes. I believe that it is OK to leave the lesson before the lesson is over when I have something important to do.

O6: Instead of doing a live lesson, our teacher opens a recording of a lesson s/he has done before. In such cases, I believe that it is OK not to attend the online session.

Among other categories, students have the highest attitude level in online sessions. However, some students feel that they can leave their device and deal with something else when the online classes take too long (M_{O1} = 3.90, SD_{O1} = 1.12). Students say they have a very high attitude level about asking a friend to attend the online lesson on behalf of them even if their teachers do not monitor attendance (M_{O3} = 4.89, SD_{O3} = 0.46).

Discussion

This study has sought to explore violations and threats to academic integrity and student attitudes towards academic integrity in online English classes. Academic integrity violations pose a threat to educational settings, and violations in digital environments have become more prevalent (Blau et al., 2021).

As a result of the content analysis from student and teacher responses, 23 potential violation incidents were identified and clustered under three categories, namely exam-related violations (*n* = 9), assignment-related violations (*n* = 9), and online session-related violations (*n* = 6). In the literature, the categorization of academic integrity violations is mainly based on the type of violation such as plagiarism, fabrication, contract cheating, etc. (Akbulut et al., 2008; Blau et al., 2021).

However, in this study, violations were classified based on their occurrence settings including exams, assignments, and online sessions.

During the content analysis, it was observed that students associate violations with certain threats. Therefore, a thematic analysis to explore potential threats that lead to academic integrity violations was conducted. Thematic analysis results yielded 27 threats in total across four categories: exam-related threats ($n = 7$), assignment-related threats ($n = 7$), online session-related threats ($n = 7$), and other threats ($n = 6$). Identifying threats to academic integrity is a valuable effort because recent years have witnessed the rise in proactive and preventive approaches on the promotion of academic integrity (Thomas & Scott, 2016). Therefore, recognizing the threats that lead to academic integrity violations can be the first step to develop proactive approaches to academic misconduct. Course designers can utilize the threats list to mitigate the occurrences of academic misconduct when planning exams and assignments. Also, policymakers can consider these threats to determine sanctions in institutional academic integrity policies.

A further aim of the study was to explore student attitudes towards academic integrity in online English language teaching classes. To do this, an attitude questionnaire was prepared by blending violations and threats because the content analysis showed that students associate violations with certain threats. The overall scores showed that students have a high attitude level in all categories. However, they have relatively lower attitude levels in exams and higher attitude levels in online sessions. With respect to exams, students have lower attitude levels about using translation software during an exam. The threats associated with this misconduct are difficult and complex questions. There are some misconceptions about the use of machine translation. The study of Groves and Mundt (2021) shows that even some teachers do not accept using machine translation as a form of academic misconduct.

Using machine translation is also a problem on assignments. In the study of Clifford et al. (2013), the majority of students admitted that they used machine translation on assignments to save time in language classes. The findings presented here also suggest that students have a lower attitude level about using machine translation on assignments. Mundt and Groves (2016) describe using machine

translation as a "double-edged sword" and suggest that institutions set guidelines for using machine translation services on assignments.

Students show the highest attitude level in the online session category. However, one question that has to be posed is if students leaving their devices during an online class to deal with something else is a form of academic misconduct. The results show that students do not consider this as such, but if continual attention is required, teachers may wish to avoid longer classes. Such lessons may bore students and lead them to violate academic integrity. The study of Osipov et al. (2015) validates that the ideal online lesson duration in foreign language classes is between 20-30 minutes because longer sessions make students feel tired, and they lose the desire to participate in the class actively.

Conclusion

The quick shift from face-to-face teaching to emergency remote teaching brought with it many problems regarding academic integrity in online classes. It seems largely agreed upon that online education is vulnerable to academic integrity violations in different ways to face-to-face teaching. This study is presented as the first analysis of its type in identifying potential violations and threats to online English language teaching, helping teachers to understand the risks and to put interventions into place.

As the study shows, most students aim to complete their course in accordance with the ICAI fundamental values of academic integrity, but some threats have emerged when English language teaching is completed online. To ensure that academic integrity continues to be maintained in the future, fresh approaches are needed. This conclusion proposes two such approaches.

First, a proactive stance to course design and assessment is needed. Re-designing assessments is an effective way to minimize academic misconduct (Morris, 2018). The same materials used in person will not necessarily translate online and may not engage students. Students feel that materials need to be prepared for them and value interaction with their teacher. It can be harder for them to keep attentive in an online setting, so shorter classes or alternative delivery strategies are necessary. Alongside this, consideration has to be paid to the risks inherent to major assessment

types, such as written assignments and exams. When such assignments are not supervised, students can be tempted to resort to contract cheating or to collude with their peers.

Second, students need to be part of the wider community of scholars and practitioners who are embracing and supporting academic integrity and included in the discussion about how they are taught and assessed. This study has identified grey areas, times when students may take shortcuts that are not acceptable in a learning setting but which may be in common use outside of the university. Teachers and students need to proactively work together to develop guidelines on such issues as student use of machine translation software to prepare answers and how far students can look up words they do not understand. Although many studies concur that machine translation is an effective tool for L2 writing (Correra, 2014; Garcia & Pena, 2011; Nino, 2008), the line between using machine translation as a support tool and as a form of academic misconduct deserves to be explored.

Finally, it is noted that although the focus of this study has been on online English language teaching, the findings and ideas are generally applicable to other disciplines. The framework of exam-related, assignment-related and online session-related violations and threats is presented as a framing device for researchers in other disciplines to use. The issue of having to learn and be assessed in English can also be difficult for students across the board. Bretag et al. (2019) identified students learning in a language other than their primary language as being a major driver of contract cheating. Considered alongside automated translation technologies and the various tools designed to help students improve their writing without necessarily understanding the underlying concepts, perhaps student writing support is needed across the board now even more than ever.

Notes on the contributors

Özgür Çelik is a TEFL instructor at Balikesir University, Turkey. His main research field is English language teaching, with a special focus on academic integrity. In his PhD thesis, he is investigating how creating a culture of academic integrity at K12 level schools contributes to students' EFL writing development. Additionally, he is developing an academic integrity policy writing tool for K12 level schools.

Thomas Lancaster (Ph.D.) is an experienced Computer Science academic, best known for research work into academic integrity, plagiarism and contract cheating. He has held leadership positions in several universities, with a specialty in student recruitment and keen interest in working in partnership with students. He works with several other organisations, including prominently as an Expert with the UK's Quality Assurance Agency (QAA). Currently, he is working as a Senior Teaching Fellow at Imperial College London.

References

Akbulut, Y., Sendag, S., Birinci, G., Kilicer, K., Sahin, M. C., & Odabasi, H. F. (2008). Exploring the types and reasons of Internet-triggered academic dishonesty among Turkish undergraduate students: Development of Internet-Triggered Academic Dishonesty Scale (ITADS). *Computers & Education, 51,* 463–473. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2007.06.003

Amigud, A., Lancaster, T. (2019). 246 reasons to cheat: An analysis of students' reasons for seeking to outsource academic work. *Computers & Education, 134,* 98-107. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.01.017

Bilen, E., & Matros, A. (2020). Online cheating amid COVID-19. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, *182*, 196-211. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3691363

Bista, K. K. (2011). Academic dishonesty among international students in higher education. *To Improve the Academy*, *30*(1), 159-172. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2334-4822.2011.tb00655.x

Blau, I., Goldberg, S., Friedman, A., & Eshet-Alkalai, Y. (2021). Violation of digital and analog academic integrity through the eyes of faculty members and students: Do institutional role and technology change ethical perspectives?. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, *33*(1), 157-187. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12528-020-09260-0

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.

Bretag, T. (2016). Defining academic integrity–international perspectives: Introduction. In T. Bretag (Ed), *Handbook of Academic Integrity* (pp. 3-5). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-098-8

Bretag, T., Harper, R., Burton, M., Ellis, C., Newton, P., Rozenberg, P., Saddiqui, S. & 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

Burgason, K.A., Sefiha, O., & Briggs, L.T. (2019). Cheating is in the eye of the beholder: An evolving understanding of academic misconduct. *Innovative Higher Education, 44*, 203-218. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-019-9457-3

Chapelle, C. (2010). The spread of computer-assisted language learning. *Language Teaching*, 43(1), 66. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0261444809005850

Clarke, R., & Lancaster, T. (2006). Eliminating the successor to plagiarism? Identifying the usage of contract cheating sites. In *Proceedings of 2nd international plagiarism conference,* 1-13. Northumbria Learning Press.

Clifford, J., Merschel, L., & Munné, J. (2013). Surveying the landscape: what is the role of machine translation in language learning?. @ *tic. revista d'innovació educativa*, (10), 108-121. https://doi.org/10.7203/attic.10.2228

Correa, M. (2014). Leaving the "peer" out of peer-editing: Online translators as a pedagogical tool in the Spanish as a second language classroom. *Latin American Journal of Content & Language Integrated Learning*, *7*(1), 1-20. https://doi.org/10.5294/laclil.2014.7.1.1

Corrigan-Gibbs, H., Gupta, N., Northcutt, C., Cutrell, E., & Thies, W. (2015). Deterring cheating in online environments. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction (TOCHI)*, *22*(6), 1-23. https://doi.org/10.1145/2810239

Creswell, J., & Plano Clark, V. (2009). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (p. 67). Sage.

Curtis, G. J., & Clare, J. (2017). How prevalent is contract cheating and to what extent are students repeat offenders? *Journal of Academic Ethics*, *15*(2), 115-124. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-017-9278-x

Dendir, S., & Maxwell, R. S. (2020). Cheating in online courses: Evidence from online proctoring. *Computers in Human Behavior Reports*, *2*, 100033. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbr.2020.100033

Ellis, C., van Haeringen, K., Harper, R., Bretag, T., Zucker, I., McBride, S., ... & Saddiqui, S. (2020). Does authentic assessment assure academic integrity? Evidence from contract cheating data. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *39*(3), 454-469. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2019.1680956

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

Garcia, I., & Pena, M. I. (2011). Machine translation-assisted language learning: writing for beginners. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *24*(5), 471-487. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2011.582687

Goh, E. (2015). Exploring underlying motivations behind extreme cases of plagiarism in tourism and hospitality education. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education*, *27*(2), 80-84. https://doi.org/10.1080/10963758.2015.1033101

Golden, J., & Kohlbeck, M. (2020). Addressing cheating when using test bank questions in online classes. *Journal of Accounting Education*, *52*, 100671. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaccedu.2020.100671

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*, 100957. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2021.100957

Harmon, O. R., Lambrinos, J., & Buffolino, J. (2010). Assessment design and cheating risk in online instruction. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, *13*(3).

Hodges, C., Moore, S., Lockee, B., Trust, T., & Bond, A. (2020). The difference between emergency remote teaching and online learning. *Educause Review*, *27*, 1-12.

International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI). (2016). Institutional toolkit to address contract cheating. http://integrity.fiu.edu/pdfs/Contract%20Cheating.pdf

International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI). (2021). *The fundamental values of academic integrity* (3rd ed.). https://www.academicintegrity.org/the-fundamental-values-of-academic-integrity/

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), 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-021-00070-0

Lederman, D. (2020). Is technology the best way to stop online cheating? No, experts say: better teaching is. *Inside Higher Ed*. https://www.insidehighered.com/digital-learning/article/2020/07/22/technology-best-way-stop-online-cheating-no-experts-say-better.

Li, M., Luo, L., Sikdar, S., Nizam, N. I., Gao, S., Shan, H., ... & Wang, G. (2021). Optimized collusion prevention for online exams during social distancing. *npj Science of Learning*, *6*(1), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41539-020-00083-3

Morris, E. J. (2018). Academic integrity matters: five considerations for addressing contract cheating. *International journal for educational integrity*, *14*(1), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-018-0038-5

Mundt, K., & Groves, M. (2016). A double-edged sword: the merits and the policy implications of Google Translate in higher education. *European Journal of Higher Education, 6*(4), 387-401. https://doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2016.1172248

Newton, D. (2020). Another problem with shifting education online: A rise in cheating. *The Washington Post*. https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/education/another-problem-with-shifting-education-online-a-rise-in-cheating/2020/08/07/1284c9f6-d762-11ea-aff6-220dd3a14741_story.html.

Niño, A. (2008). Evaluating the use of machine translation post-editing in the foreign language class. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *21*(1), 29-49. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588220701865482

Osipov, I. V., Prasikova, A. Y., & Volinsky, A. A. (2015). Participant behavior and content of the online foreign languages learning and teaching platform. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *50*, 476-488. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.04.028

Perkins, M., Gezgin, U. B., & Roe, J. (2018). Understanding the relationship between language ability and plagiarism in non-native English speaking business students. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, *16*(4), 317-328. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-018-9311-8

Perkins, M., Gezgin, U. B., & Roe, J. (2020). Reducing plagiarism through academic misconduct education. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, *16*(1), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-020-00052-8

Rundle, K., Curtis, G. J., & Clare, J. (2019). Why students do not engage in contract cheating. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *10*, 2229. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02229

Seeland, J., Stoesz, B. M., & Vogt, L. (2020). Preventing online shopping for completed assessments: Protecting students by blocking access to contract cheating websites on institutional networks. *Canadian Perspectives on Academic Integrity*, *3*(1), 55-69.

Sheard, J., & Dick, M. (2003). Influences on cheating practice of graduate students in IT courses: what are the factors? In *Proceedings of the 8th annual conference on Innovation and technology in computer science education* (pp. 45-49). ITiCSE https://doi.org/10.1145/961511.961527

Sotiriadou, P., Logan, D., Daly, A., & Guest, R. (2020). The role of authentic assessment to preserve academic integrity and promote skill development and employability. *Studies in Higher Education*, *45*(11), 2132-2148. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2019.1582015

Stickler, U., Hampel, R., & Emke, M. (2020). A developmental framework for online language teaching skills. *Australian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 3(1), 133-151. https://doi.org/10.29140/ajal.v3n1.271

Tauginienė, L., Gaižauskaitė, I., Glendinning, I., Kravjar, J., Ojsteršek, M., Ribeiro, L., Odiņeca, T., Marino, F., Cosentino, M., Sivasubramaniam, S., & Foltýnek, T. (2018). *Glossary for academic integrity. European Network for Academic Integrity.* http://www.academicintegrity.eu/wp/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/Glossary_revised_final.pdf

Thomas, J., & Scott, J. (2016). UK perspectives of academic integrity. In T. Bretag (Ed), *Handbook of academic integrity* (pp. 39-53). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-098-8

Vonderwell, S., Liang, X., & Alderman, K. (2007). Asynchronous discussions and assessment in online learning. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, *39*(3), 309-328. https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2007.10782485

Wiley. (2020). *Is student cheating on the rise? How you can discourage it in your classroom.* https://www.wiley.com/network/instructors-students/covid-19-

online-teaching-resources-1/is-student-cheating-on-the-rise-how-you-can-discourage-it-in-your-classroom

Wuensch, K. L., Aziz, S., Ozan, E., Kishore, M., & Tabrizi, M. (2006). Pedagogical characteristics of online and face-to-face classes. In *E-Learn: World Conference on E-Learning in Corporate, Government, Healthcare, and Higher Education* (pp. 2422-2429). Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE).