

COMPARE OF FINE ARTS TEACHER CANDIDATES' AND CLASSROOM TEACHER CANDIDATES' ACADEMIC DISHONESTY TENDENCIES

Işıl Güneş MODIRI
isilmodiri@gmail.com

Abstract: The education contains a long process. During this long process negative behaviors can be seen in students along with positive ones. One of these undesirable behaviors is “academic dishonesty” that comprises behaviors as cheating and plagiarism. It is accepted that fine arts teacher candidates are different from other teaching programs’ candidates because of their artistic moods and don’t give importance to the lessons that are based on written evaluation as much as art lessons that are based on artistic performance. In this study has been quest an answer for question of “Is there any difference between academic dishonesty tendencies of fine arts teacher candidates and classroom teacher candidates?”. The 2nd grade students (n=44+33+60=137) that study in the Music and Art Education programs and Classroom Education program of Karadeniz Technical University, constitute the universe of the study. This research is a survey. As a data collection tool, for determine of students’ academic dishonesty tendencies, “Academic Dishonesty Tendencies Scale” that has been improved by Eminoğlu (2009) has been used. Obtained data has been statistically analyzed by SPSS software program. At the end of study, the difference of academic dishonesty tendencies between fine arts teacher candidates and classroom teacher candidates have been determined, compared and some suggestions have been made according to the research results..

Key Words: *Music Education, Art Education, Fine Arts Education, Classroom Teaching, Academic Dishonesty*

Introduction

Education, with its simplest definition is the ‘change of behavior’ process (Kılıçoğlu, 2007:15). In that case, the outcomes of an education system are students' behaviors. When these behaviors are examined, it is observed that some of these behaviors are desired but insufficient while some are no desired (Baykul, 2000). One of the no desired behaviors is academic dishonesty which includes cheating and plagiarism.

Plagiarism; also referred to by names of looting and piracy. Translate and display for the voluntary an idea, invention, research results or apart of research products even a copy of all or part of the books that belong to someone else without indicating a source is called plagiarism (TÜBA, 2005).

Cheating is defined in the Turkish Dictionary of Turkish Linguistic Society (1997) as “copy of an artistic work or a script” and “a prepared paper to be peeked during an examination in contravention of the rules” while the act of cheating is defined as “peeking a resource to answer the questions in contravention of the rules” generally in written tests (cited: Eminoğlu ve Nartgün, 2009b).

According to Tansel (2012), academic dishonesty consists of the following formats:

"1 Quoting a sentence or group of sentences from a published source, without showing the source with quotation marks.

2. Express of an idea of a sentence or group of sentences in their own words and phrases, without showing the source.

3. Submit a semester thesis was written before to the faculty instructor.

4. Making write someone a semester thesis for money or for free to charge.

5. Download on the Internet or buy with the money, the term thesis from thesis writing sites. "

By examining various studies, has been seen that cheating especially in written exams increases day by day. In 1941, Drake found that 23% of college students reported cheating. Goldsen (1960) reported rates of 38% in 1952 and 49% in 1960. By the 1980s, Jendrek (1989) estimated the typical rate between 40 and 60%. By 1992, she found that 74% of college students engaged in cheating (Jendrek, 1992). Even more recently, researchers have reported rates as high as 90% (Graham, Monday, O'Brien, & Steffen, 1994). Exponential academic dishonesty behaviors displayed by students is a very important problem. Because academic dishonesty affects the individual's forthcoming behaviors and the level of reaching to the aims that educational institutes determined (Harding and others., 2003).

Brown and Howel (2001) investigated the effect of reading a carefully prepared statement about the plagiarism to the undergraduate students on the prevalence of plagiarism among students. They have found that it's an effective way reading students of such a statement about plagiarism to change their impression about how the academic rules violation are serious. The result of this study is the following. Educational institutions must prepare statements on plagiarism. These statements must define academic dishonesty, must give the rules of avoid and explain the methods of punishment. The Brown and Howell study indicated pronouncements of this kind, reduces the likelihood of plagiarism (Tansel, 2012).

Of course, students are not the only cheaters. Others may be adults whom that learnt and embraced cheating in the years that they were students. What Straw (2002) calls 'the P-word' is common in many fields, including journalism (Lieberman, 1995), politics (Perin, 1992) and science (Vandervoort, 1995).

What can be the reasons of academic dishonesty that is such a prevalent? According to Kibler (1993), it is very hard to determine the causes of appealing students to the academic dishonesty. Although there are a lot of decisive factors that exist form past generations, there are also plenty of reasons related our own existing social and political situation. These factors are three: a) characteristic specialties of cheaters b) situational factors that students decide whether to cheat and c) situational factors that compel students to give copy (cited: Aluede, Omoregie ve Osa-Edoh, 2006).

Researches about cheating in Turkey, haven't been done very much so far. Selçuk (1995), Kūlahçı (1996), Dirik (1997), Yıldırım (1998) and Tan (2001)'s researches were achieved. In these researches among the reasons of cheat it is shown the following: to education based on rote and abstract understanding, negative teacher attitudes, to gain no habits of studying, personality disorders, cheating becomes a habit, crowded classes, inadequate practices, the fear of getting low marks (Semerci, 2003).

In other researches the reasons of academic dishonesty have been sorted as below:

Perception of students everything on internet as a community property and a lot of new generation students' unawareness of plagiarism and moral rights' meaning (Bricault, 1998, cited: Moeck, 2002), perception of students the cheating as an acceptable thing in the community and finding hard to reject of copy demands from their friends (Schulman, 1998, cited: Moeck, 2002), ambition of mark and by its pressure, hope of making satisfied the parents (Wein, 1994, cited: Moeck, 2002), think of academically acceptance by way of getting high marks (Aubrecht, 1990, cited: Moeck, 2002), think of losing energy and time by work on lessons that aren't directly related with students' future profession, think of slightness of the lessons that they aren't related with the field (Harris 2001, cited: Moeck, 2002).

It is more important the academic tendencies of teacher candidates that will become teachers and bring up students in the close future from other profession groups. Because the teacher, is the basic element of education and it is impossible expect from the teacher who is already is a cheater, bringing up honest individuals. In the light of these information, the question of " is there any differences between academic dishonesty tendencies of classroom teacher candidates that will become the first teachers of some students and fine arts teacher candidates that will become art or music teachers in the future?" constitutes the problem of this study.

2. AIM

The main purpose of this study is; to determine of differences between fine arts department students' (that study in art education and music education programs) and Classroom teacher students' academic dishonesty tendencies, compare and to make some evaluations with respect to obtained results.

3. METHOD

3.1. Study Groups

This research is a survey. The 2nd grade students that study in the Art Education (33 students) and Music Education programs (44 students) of Fine Arts Education Department and classroom Education program (60 students) of Elementary Education Department at Fatih Education Faculty, Karadeniz Technical University (totally 137 students), constitute this research's study group.

3.2. Data Collection

In the study, for collecting data firstly literature search was conducted. By taking help from the obtained data in consequence of the literature search, a scale has been determined for apply to the study group. For measurement of fine arts students' and classroom education students' academic dishonesty tendencies, a scale consists of 22 topics and 4 sub dimensions improved by Eminoğlu, E. has been used. Quinary likert type scale has been used as answer options in the scale.

3.3. Analysis of Data

The data have been obtained from application of academic dishonesty scale, have been put into the process of analysis. For examining of the study group answers towards topics formed the scale, descriptive frequency measurements have been done and tables have been formed. As a result of

Levene test has been done related to obtained data, has been observed that variances were homogeny as regards of total points and sub factors.

Table1. Test of Homogeneity of Variances (Levene)

	Levene Statistics	df1	df2	p
Total Points	1.04	2	134	.354
Cheating Trend	.77	2	134	.461
Dishonesty in Studies Such as Home works and Projects	.42	2	134	.653
Dishonesty in Researches and Reporting	.46	2	134	.629
Dishonesty Regarding Citation	2.64	2	134	.075

Regarding to Table 1, it is understood that variances were homogeny as regards of total points and sub factors. $p > .05$

4. FINDINGS

4.1. Examining of Mean of Scores Regarding Sub Factors

In this section, a table took place giving the mean of scores towards sub factors of the answers of Department of Drawing, Department of Music and Department of Classroom Teaching.

Table2. Mean of Scores Regarding Sub Factors

Sub Factors	Department	N	Mean
Cheating Trend	Music	44	15.27
	Drawing	33	16.51
	Classroom Teaching	60	13.21
	Total	137	14.67
Dishonesty in Studies Such as Home works and Projects	Music	44	18.97
	Drawing	33	17.87
	Classroom Teaching	60	16.95
	Total	137	17.82
Dishonesty in Researches and Reporting	Music	44	11.72
	Drawing	33	10.18
	Classroom Teaching	60	10.06
	Total	137	10.62
Dishonesty Regarding Citation	Music	44	16.90
	Drawing	33	16.00
	Classroom Teaching	60	16.13
	Total	137	16.35
Total Score	Music	44	62.88
	Drawing	33	60.57
	Classroom Teaching	60	56.36
	Total	137	59.47

4.2. Differences of Scores Between Music, Drawing and Classroom Teaching Students' Regarding Academic Dishonesty Tendencies

In this section, study groups' academic dishonesty scores based on departments they are studying in have been examined with One Way Variance Analysis (One-Way ANOVA) and obtained data has been summarized in Tablo3.

Accordingly, there is meaningful difference on "Cheating Trends" scores ($F_{(2,134)} = 6.18, p < .05$) of teacher candidates based on departments they are studying in. For understanding the source of difference, the Bonferroni test has been done and it is understood that Department of Drawing Students' cheating trends scores ($\bar{X} = 16.51$), are meaningfully higher than scores of Classroom Teaching Students' scores ($\bar{X} = 13.21$).

Also it is found meaningful difference on "Dishonesty in Researches and Reporting" scores ($F_{(2,134)} = 3.31, p < .05$) of teacher candidates based on departments they are studying in. As a result of

Bonferroni test, Department of Music Students' Dishonesty in Researches and Reporting scores ($\bar{X} = 11.72$), are meaningfully higher than scores of Classroom Teaching Students' scores ($\bar{X} = 10.06$) and it was found as the source of difference.

It is found meaningful difference on Total Academic Dishonesty Tendency scores ($F_{(2,134)} = 3.09, p < .05$) of teacher candidates based on departments they are studying in. This difference stems from

the meaningfully highness of Department of Music Students' scores ($\bar{X} = 62.88$) from Classroom Teaching Students' scores ($\bar{X} = 56.36$).

It is found no meaningful difference between Drawing, Music and Classroom Teaching students' scores as regards Academic Dishonesty Tendencies other sub factors as "Dishonesty in Studies Such as Home works and Projects" ($F_{(2,134)} = 2.13, p > .05$) and "Dishonesty Regarding Citation" ($F_{(2,134)} = .55, p > .05$)

Tablo3. Differences of Scores Between Music, Drawing and Classroom Teaching Students' Regarding Academic Dishonesty Tendencies (ANOVA)

Source of Variance		Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares	df	F	p
Cheating Trend	Between Groups	255.06	127.53	2	6.18	.003
	Within Groups	2761.15	20.60	134		
	Total	3016.21		136		
Dishonesty in Studies Such as Home works and Projects	Between Groups	104.45	52.22	2	2.13	.122
	Within Groups	3275.34	24.44	134		
	Total	3379.79		136		
Dishonesty in Researches and Reporting	Between Groups	78.64	39.32	2	3.31	.039
	Within Groups	1589.37	11.86	134		
	Total	1668.01		136		
Dishonesty Regarding Citation	Between Groups	20.61	10.30	2	.55	.573
	Within Groups	2472.57	18.45	134		

	Total	2493.18		136		
Total Score	Between Groups	1131.73	565.86	2	3.09	.049
	Within Groups	24538.42	183.12	134		
	Total	25670.16		136		

*Sub-Factors of Academic Dishonesty Scale

By examining the Table 3; meaningful differences have been observed between answers according to sub factors of “**Cheating Trend**” $F(2,134)=6.18$, “**Dishonesty in Researches and Reporting**” $F(2,134)=3.31$ and “**Total Scores**” $F(2,134)=3.09$ within groups and between groups.

5. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

In this research study groups’ academic dishonesty tendency scores based on departments the students are studying in have been examined with One Way Variance Analysis (One-Way ANOVA). Accordingly, it is found meaningful difference on “**Cheating Trends**” scores ($F_{(2,134)} = 6.18, p < .05$) of teacher candidates based on departments they are studying in. For understanding the source of difference, the Bonferroni test has been done and it is understood that **Department of Drawing Students’** cheating trends scores ($\bar{X}=16.51$), are meaningfully **higher than** scores of **Classroom Teaching Students’** scores ($\bar{X}=13.21$).

Also it is found meaningful difference on “**Dishonesty in Researches and Reporting**” scores ($F_{(2,134)} = 3.31, p < .05$) of teacher candidates based on departments they are studying in. As a result of

Bonferroni test, **Department of Music Students’** Dishonesty in Researches and Reporting scores ($\bar{X}=11.72$), are meaningfully **higher than** scores of **Classroom Teaching Students’** scores ($\bar{X}=10.06$) and it was found as the source of difference.

It is found meaningful difference on **Total Academic Dishonesty Tendency** scores ($F_{(2,134)} = 3.09, p < .05$) of teacher candidates based on departments they are studying in. This difference stems from

The meaningfully **highness** of **Department of Music Students’** scores ($\bar{X}=62.88$) from **Classroom Teaching Students’** scores ($\bar{X}=56.36$).

It is found no meaningful difference between Drawing, Music and Classroom Teaching students’ scores as regards Academic Dishonesty Tendencies other sub factors as “Dishonesty in Studies Such as Home works and Projects” ($F_{(2,134)} = 2.13, p > .05$) and “Dishonesty Regarding Citation” ($F_{(2,134)} = .55, p > .05$)

When the results of the study are considered generally and that the dominance of academic dishonesty is on the future fine arts teachers, it is a known fact that even though they are students in the Department of Fine Arts which gives basic music and art education, they are future teachers who are about to step in the holy profession. For this reason, detailed research should be made regarding why the students choose to act in the way they do and both individual and institutional efforts should be made to overcome the issue. Furthermore, teacher candidates should be enlightened about how these actions could degenerate the next generations in the years to come.

References

- Aluede, O., Omoregie, E.O ve Osa-Edoh, G.I. (2006). Academic dishonesty as a contemporary problem in higher education: How academic advisors can help. *Reading Improvement*, 43, No:2, 97-106.
- Baykul, Y. (2000). *Eğitimde ve Psikolojide Ölçme: Klasik Test Teorisi ve Uygulaması*. ÖSYM Yayınları. Cem Web Ofset. Ankara
- Drake, C. A. (1941). Why students cheat. *Journal of Higher Education*, 12, 418-420
- Eminoğlu, E. , Nartgün. Z. (2009a) Üniversite öğrencilerinin akademik sahtekarlık eğilimlerinin ölçülmesine yönelik bir ölçek geliştirme çalışması, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Bolu
- Eminoğlu, E. , Nartgün. Z. (2009b) Üniversite öğrencilerinin akademik sahtekarlık eğilimlerinin ölçülmesine yönelik bir ölçek geliştirme çalışması, *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6:1, 217
- Graham, M. A., Monday, J., O'Brien, K., & Steffen, S. (1994). Cheating at small colleges: An examination of student and faculty attitudes and behaviors. *Journal of College Student Development*. 35, 255-260.
- Goldsen, R. K. (1960). *What college students think*, Princeton, NJ: D. Van Nostrand.
- Harding, T. S. ve Diğerleri. (2004). Does academic dishonesty relate to unethical behaviour in professional practice? An exploratory study. *Science And Engineering Ethics*, 10, 311-324.
- Jendrek, M. P. (1989). Faculty reactions to academic dishonesty. *Journal of College Student Development*, 30, 401-406
- Jendrek, M. P. (1992). Students' reactions to academic dishonesty. *Journal of College Student Development*, 33, 260-273
- Moeck, Pat Gallagher. "Academic Dishonesty: Cheating Among Community College Students," *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, volume:26, 2002, pp. 479-491.
- Kılıçoğlu, M. (2007). *Aktif Öğrenme İçin Etkili Öğretmen*, İstanbul: Morpa Kültür Yayınları.
- Semerci, Ç. (2003). Kopya Çekmeye İlişkin Tutum Ölçeği, *Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*,

13: 1, 227-234

Straw, D. (2002) The plagiarism of generation 'why not?', Community College Week, 8 July, 14 (24), pp. 4-7.

Lieberman, T. (1995) Plagiarise, plagiarise, plagiarise ...only be sure to always call it research, Columbia Journalism Review, 34 (2), pp. 21-26.

Perin, N. (1992) How I became a plagiarist, American Scholar, 61 (2), pp. 257-260.

Tansel, A. (2012) İktisat Eğitimi ve Bilimsel Aşırma Üzerine, <http://www.tek.org.tr>

Tüba (Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi). (2000). Bilimsel araştırmalarda etik ve sorunları. Ankara: TÜBA.

Vandervoort, F. (1995) Can scientific integrity be taught? Science Teacher, 62 (4), pp. 38-42.

