



# contract cheating and assessment design

## INFORMATION AND CONSENT

### Research Participant Information Statement and Consent Form (Teaching Staff Survey)

**Title of project:** Contract Cheating and Assessment Design: Exploring the Connection

**Ethics Protocol Number:** 0000035921

#### **Project leaders:**

Associate Professor Tracey Bretag

University of South Australia Business School

Tel: (08) 8302 0224

Email: [Tracey.Bretag@unisa.edu.au](mailto:Tracey.Bretag@unisa.edu.au)

Dr Rowena Harper

University of South Australia

Tel: (08) 8302 5556

Email: [Rowena.Harper@unisa.edu.au](mailto:Rowena.Harper@unisa.edu.au)

#### **Project manager:**

Ms. Sonia Saddiqui, University of South Australia

**Team members:**

Associate Professor Cath Ellis, University of New South Wales

Professor Phil Newton, Swansea University

Ms. Karen van Haeringen, Griffith University

Ms. Pearl Rozenberg, The University of Sydney

Dear Participant,

You are invited to participate in an **anonymous** survey for a research project entitled, *Contract Cheating and Assessment Design: Exploring the Connection*. Participation in this study is voluntary.

The research is funded by the Australian Government Office for Learning and Teaching (SP6-5283) and is led by Associate Professor Tracey Bretag and Dr Rowena Harper at the University of South Australia. Partner institutions for the project are The University of Sydney, The University of New South Wales, Griffith University, and Swansea University, UK.

The aim of the research study is to gather data that will help determine the extent to which authentic, programmatic assessment forms a useful part of broader teaching and learning frameworks to minimise contract cheating. The purpose of the survey you are invited to complete is to gather data that will help shed light on academic staff experiences regarding contract cheating. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

**Participation details**

By completing and submitting the survey, you are indicating that you have read and understood the Participant Information Statement and give your consent to be involved in this research. Participation in this study is completely voluntary and you may discontinue from completing the survey at any time. Please be advised that as the survey is completed online and anonymously, it is not possible to exclude survey responses that have already been submitted electronically. Participants who do not complete the whole questionnaire will not be included in the prize draw as participants will only be redirected to a separate prize draw section after they complete the questionnaire.

**All data collected is anonymous (non-identifiable). Participating universities will be de-identified. No participants or their universities will be named in the data, or in research reports and publications.**

No information which could lead to the identification of any individual will be released, unless required by law. In the event that any identifying material is submitted, the researcher will take every care to remove responses from any identifying material as early as possible.

Likewise, individuals' responses will be kept confidential by the researchers and not be identified in the reporting of the research. However, the researchers cannot guarantee the confidentiality or anonymity of material transferred by email or the internet.

All data collected will be electronic in format and will be securely stored by the Chief Investigators within their password-protected university servers for five years. Only members of the research team will have access to the survey data.

Details regarding the findings from this study will be available from the project website: <https://cheatingandassessment.edu.au/>

Survey participants who choose to provide a contact email address after completing the questionnaire will be entered into a prize draw to win one of two \$500 Apple Store vouchers.

**This project has been approved by the University of South Australia's Human Research Ethics Committee. If you have any ethical concerns about the project or questions about your rights as a participant please contact the Executive Officer of this Committee, Tel: +61 8 8302 3118; Email: vicki.allen@unisa.edu.au'.**

If you have complaints about either the study or the way it is being conducted, you should contact the Executive Officer of UniSA HREC in the first instance, email: humanethics@unisa.edu.au or tel: 8302 3118.

Kind regards,  
The Project Team

Yes, I consent to participate in this anonymous survey.

## **DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION**

. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

***All responses to this survey are anonymous.***

Q1. Please select your age group.

Q2. Please select your gender.

- Female
- Male
- Other
- Prefer not to say

Q3. Please select your country of birth.

Q3a. If you were born in Australia, do you identify as an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander?

- Yes
- No

Q3b. If you were not born in Australia, how many years have you been in Australia?

- Not applicable (I was born in Australia)
- 1 - 5 years
- 6 - 10 years
- 11 - 15 years
- 16 - 20 years

More than 20 years

Q4. What language do you mainly speak at home?

English

Mandarin

Italian

Arabic

Cantonese

Greek

Vietnamese

Spanish

Hindi

Tagalog

Other

Q5. Where is your main work location?

I mainly work from home

Metropolitan campus (city and suburbs)

Rural/regional campus

Transnational campus (outside Australia)

Q6. What discipline do you mainly teach?

- Architecture and Buildings
- Arts/Humanities
- Business and Commerce
- Creative Arts/Performance
- Earth & Environmental Sciences
- Education
- Engineering
- Health Sciences
- Information Technology
- Law
- Mathematics
- Media/Communication Studies
- Science
- Other

Q7. Which programs do you teach? Please select all that apply.

- Pathway/Foundation
- Undergraduate
- Postgraduate Coursework
- Postgraduate Research

Q8. What is your primary mode of teaching?

- Internal (face-to-face)
- External (online only)
- Blended (both face to face and online)

Q9. What is your employment type?

- Continuing
- Fixed-term contract
- Casual/sessional

Q10. How many years have you been employed in higher education?

- 1 – 5 years
- 6 – 10 years
- 11 – 15 years
- 16 – 20 years
- 21 – 25 years
- 26 – 30 years
- Over 30 years

Q11. What is your current level of employment?

- Non-academic classification
- Academic Level A
- Academic Level B



- Academic Level C
- Academic Level D
- Academic Level E
- Not sure

## **SECTION 1: EXPERIENCES WITH THIRD-PARTY CHEATING**

### *SECTION 1.*

#### EXPERIENCES WITH THIRD-PARTY CHEATING

This survey explores issues related to ‘third-party cheating’ in higher education assessment. This is where a student gets someone – a third party – to complete an assignment or exam for them. This third party might be a friend, family member, fellow student or staff member who assists the student as a favour. It might be a pre-written assignment which has been obtained from an assignment ‘mill’. The third party may also be a paid service advertised locally or online (also called ‘contract cheating’).

***All survey responses are anonymous.***

Q12. Have you ever suspected that an assignment was completed by a ‘third party’ and not the student who submitted it?

- Yes
- No

**Q12a. How many times** have you suspected that an assignment was completed by a 'third party' and not the student who submitted it?

- 1 - 2 times
- 3 - 5 times
- 6 - 9 times
- More than 10 times

**Q12b.** What type/s of assignment were involved? Please select all that apply.

- Report
- Essay
- Workplace/placement report
- Reflective task
- Learning journal or log
- Annotated bibliography/Literature review
- Portfolio
- Presentation
- Take-home exam
- Quiz/Multiple Choice Questions
- Programming task
- Creative/Design work
- Group assignment
- Research proposal

- Research thesis
- Other
- I don't remember

Q12c. What caused you to be suspicious? Please select all that apply.

- A high text match identified via text-matching software
- A low text match identified via text-matching software
- Educator's/assessor's knowledge of the student's academic ability
- Educator's/assessor's knowledge of the student's language ability
- Falsified or fictional references
- Assignment was 'off-topic'/didn't answer question
- Mismatch between assignment marks and exam marks
- Mismatch between performance on individual and group tasks
- Metadata showed different author from the student
- Tip from a student
- Tip from another person (not a student)

Q12d. What has been your typical response? Please select one response from the following options.

- Referred it to appointed academic integrity decision-maker, in line with institutional policy
- Failed the student in the assignment and/or subject
- Applied a penalty to the assignment mark

- Asked student to resubmit the assignment
- Referred the student to learning advice
- Counselling the student
- Ignored it
- Other

Q12e. If your typical response has *not followed* institutional policy, please let us know why. Select all the reasons that apply.

- Not applicable (I have followed institutional policy)
- Didn't know how to pursue the matter
- Too time consuming
- Impossible to prove
- I felt uncomfortable confronting the student
- I was worried it would impact my student evaluation of teaching results
- Staff are not supported by senior managers to pursue these matters
- I don't trust my institution's policies or processes
- I didn't want to be seen as a trouble-maker
- I was concerned it would affect my employment
- Other

Q12f. If you have referred 'third-party' cheating cases for investigation, what percentage of these cases were substantiated?

- Not applicable (I have not referred any cases for investigation)

- I don't know
- None
- About 5%
- About 10%
- About 30%
- About 50%
- About 70%
- About 90%
- 100%

Q12g. In cases where 'third-party' cheating cases were substantiated, what was the typical penalty/outcome? If a combination of penalties is usually implemented, please select all that apply.

- Not applicable (cases were not substantiated)
- Don't know/was not informed
- A warning/counselling
- A referral for learning advice
- Academic probation/monitoring
- An official record entered into an academic integrity case database
- Resubmit the assignment
- Reduced mark for the assignment
- Zero for the assignment
- Zero for the subject

- Pay a fine
- Suspension
- Exclusion/expulsion
- Referred to the police
- Other

*. All survey responses are anonymous.*

Q13. Have invigilators ever identified a 'third party' taking an exam on behalf of a student in a subject you teach?

- Yes
- No

Q13a. **How many times** have invigilators ever identified a 'third party' taking an exam on behalf of a student in a subject you teach?

- 1 - 2 times
- 3 - 5 times
- 6 - 9 times
- More than 10 times

Q13b. What type/s of exam were they? Select all that apply.

- Multiple choice questions

- Short answer questions
- Essay under exam conditions
- Oral exam or viva
- Practical exam
- Take-home exam
- Other
- I don't remember

Q13c. What was the typical penalty/outcome? If a combination of penalties is usually implemented, select all that apply.

- Don't know/was not informed
- A warning/counselling
- A referral for learning advice
- Academic probation/monitoring
- An official record entered into an academic integrity case database
- Resit the exam
- Zero for the exam
- Zero for the subject
- Pay a fine
- Suspension
- Exclusion/expulsion
- Referred to the police

*. All survey responses are anonymous.*

Q14. Have invigilators ever identified a 'third party' assisting a student in an exam in a subject you teach? This assistance may be either in person, or using devices such as mobile phones, smart watches, ear pieces, etc.

- Yes
- No

Q14a. **How many times** have invigilators ever identified a 'third party' assisting a student in an exam in a subject you teach? This assistance may be either in person, or using devices such as mobile phones, smart watches, ear pieces, etc.

- 1 - 2 times
- 3 - 5 times
- 6 - 9 times
- More than 10 times

Q14b. What type/s of exam were they? Select all that apply.

- Multiple choice questions
- Short answer questions
- Essay under exam conditions
- Oral exam or viva
- Practical exam



- Take-home exam
- Other
- I don't remember

Q14c. What was the usual penalty/outcome? If a combination of penalties is usually implemented, select all that apply.

- Don't know/was not informed
- A warning/counselling
- A referral for learning advice
- Academic probation/monitoring
- An official record entered into an academic integrity case database
- Resit the exam
- Zero for the exam
- Zero for the subject
- Pay a fine
- Suspension
- Exclusion/expulsion
- Referred to the police

## **SECTION 2: ATTITUDES TOWARDS THIRD-PARTY CHEATING**

### *SECTION 2.*

#### ATTITUDES TOWARDS THIRD-PARTY CHEATING

**Reminder:** This survey explores issues related to 'third-party cheating' in higher education assessment. This is where a student gets someone – a third party – to complete an assignment or exam for them. This third party might be a friend, family member, fellow student or staff member who assists the student as a favour. It might be a pre-written assignment which has been obtained from an assignment 'mill'. The third party may also be a paid service advertised locally or online (also called 'contract cheating').

***All survey responses are anonymous.***

Please indicate your views on the following student behaviours.

Q15. Buying, trading or selling notes, either online or in person, is wrong.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral/not sure
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Q16. Obtaining an assignment completed by someone else and submitting it as your own work is wrong.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral/not sure

- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Q17. Giving someone an assignment to submit as their own work is wrong.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral/not sure
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Q18. Having someone else take an exam for you, either as a favour or for money, is wrong.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral/not sure
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Q19. Taking an exam for someone, either as a favour or for money, is wrong.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral/not sure
- Disagree

Strongly disagree

Q20. Having someone assist you in an exam is wrong.

Strongly agree

Agree

Neutral/not sure

Disagree

Strongly disagree

Q21. Assisting someone in an exam is wrong.

Strongly agree

Agree

Neutral/not sure

Disagree

Strongly disagree

Q22. Plagiarising in assignments is wrong.

Strongly agree

Agree

Neutral/not sure

Disagree

Strongly disagree

Q23. How concerned are you that students are engaging in 'third-party' cheating in higher education?

Not at all concerned

Slightly concerned

Moderately concerned

Very concerned

Extremely concerned

Q24. What percentage of higher education students do you estimate have engaged at least once in 'third-party' cheating (in either assignments or exams)?

### **SECTION 3: ORGANISATIONAL FACTORS AND THIRD-PARTY CHEATING**

#### *SECTION 3. ORGANISATIONAL FACTORS AND THIRD-PARTY CHEATING*

**Reminder:** This survey explores issues related to 'third-party cheating' in higher education assessment. This is where a student gets someone – a third party – to complete an assignment or exam for them. This third party might be a friend, family member, fellow student or staff member who assists the student as a favour. It might be a pre-written

assignment which has been obtained from an assignment 'mill'. The third party may also be a paid service advertised locally or online (also called 'contract cheating').

***All survey responses are anonymous.***

Please indicate your agreement with the following statements.

Q25. The academic integrity policies and processes at my institution help to minimise third-party cheating.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral/not sure
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Q26. The academic integrity practices in my Faculty/School/Department help to minimise third-party cheating.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral/not sure
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Q27. My institution provides me with professional development and support to minimise third-party cheating.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral/not sure
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Q28. Assessment moderation processes at my institution help to minimise third-party cheating.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral/not sure
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Q29. Class sizes at my institution enable me to minimise third-party cheating.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral/not sure
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Q30. The amount of staff-student contact time allocated by my institution helps me to minimise third-party cheating.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral/not sure
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Q31. The time allocated for marking assignments at my institution helps me to minimise third-party cheating.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral/not sure
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Q32. The workload for teaching at my institution supports me in minimising third-party cheating.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral/not sure



- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Q33. The assessment policy framework at my institution assists me to minimise third-party cheating.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral/not sure
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Q34. Student Evaluations of Teaching at my institution encourage me to minimise third-party cheating.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral/not sure
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Q35. Performance management at my institution motivates me to minimise third-party cheating.

- Strongly agree

- Agree
- Neutral/not sure
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Q36. My institution recognises and rewards practices that minimise third-party cheating.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral/not sure
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

#### **SECTION 4: TEACHING AND LEARNING PRACTICES**

##### *SECTION 4. TEACHING AND LEARNING PRACTICES*

***All survey responses are anonymous.***

Please indicate your agreement with the following statements.

Q37. I provide opportunities for students to approach me for assistance when needed.

- Strongly agree

- Agree
- Neutral/not sure
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Q38. I make a conscious effort to ensure that students understand what is required in assignments.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral/not sure
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Q39. I explain my institution's academic integrity policy to students, and the consequences for breaching it.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral/not sure
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Q40. I spend class time teaching students how to reference (including how to quote, paraphrase and summarise with acknowledgement).

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral/not sure
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Q41. I spend class time talking about 'contract cheating' and its consequences.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral/not sure
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Q42. I spend class time teaching students how to engage in scholarship in my discipline (i.e., research, read, critically analyse and discuss discipline material).

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral/not sure
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Q43. I consistently monitor and penalise academic integrity breaches in line with my institution's policy.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral/not sure
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Q44. When marking, I make a conscious effort to identify potential academic integrity breaches.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral/not sure
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Q45. I make a conscious effort to be consistent with colleagues in grading assignments.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral/not sure
- Disagree

Strongly disagree

Q46. I provide sufficient feedback to ensure students learn from the work they do.

Strongly agree

Agree

Neutral/not sure

Disagree

Strongly disagree

Q47. There are lots of opportunities to cheat in the subjects I teach.

Strongly agree

Agree

Neutral/not sure

Disagree

Strongly disagree

## **SECTION 5: ASSESSMENT PRACTICES**

### *SECTION 5. ASSESSMENT PRACTICES*

***All survey responses are anonymous.***

How often do you implement the following curriculum and assessment features in your teaching role?

Q48. Assessment that requires students to develop research, analysis and critical thinking skills.

- Never
- Rarely
- Occasionally
- A moderate amount
- A great deal

Q49. 'Real-world' assessment that is relevant to students' future professions.

- Never
- Rarely
- Occasionally
- A moderate amount
- A great deal

Q50. Assessment with no 'right' answers, but a range of approaches that each have pros and cons.

- Never
- Rarely

- Occasionally
- A moderate amount
- A great deal

Q51. Small assessment tasks that provide feedback relevant to later, major assignments.

- Never
- Rarely
- Occasionally
- A moderate amount
- A great deal

Q52. Major assessments that build directly on feedback from previous ones.

- Never
- Rarely
- Occasionally
- A moderate amount
- A great deal

Q53. Assessment that brings together a range of knowledge and skills central to the program of study.

- Never
- Rarely



- Occasionally
- A moderate amount
- A great deal

Q54. Assessment that has been personalised and is unique to the student (e.g. each student has a unique question or set of data).

- Never
- Rarely
- Occasionally
- A moderate amount
- A great deal

Q55. Assessment completed mainly in class time.

- Never
- Rarely
- Occasionally
- A moderate amount
- A great deal

Q56. Assessment that is followed by an oral presentation where the student has to explain the assessment (e.g. a viva)

- Never

- Rarely
- Occasionally
- A moderate amount
- A great deal

Q57. Assessment which is worth a significant portion of the student's final grade (more than 40%).

- Never
- Rarely
- Occasionally
- A moderate amount
- A great deal

Q58. Assessment that the student only has a limited amount of time to complete (e.g. 3-7 days).

- Never
- Rarely
- Occasionally
- A moderate amount
- A great deal

Q59. Assessment that requires the student to reflect on workplace learning or a placement.

- Never
- Rarely
- Occasionally
- A moderate amount
- A great deal

Q60. A series of small, graded tasks that need to be completed regularly (e.g. weekly quizzes).

- Never
- Rarely
- Occasionally
- A moderate amount
- A great deal

## **SECTION 6: INVOLVEMENT WITH THIRD-PARTY CHEATING**

### *SECTION 6. INVOLVEMENT WITH THIRD-PARTY CHEATING*

**Reminder:** This survey explores issues related to ‘third-party cheating’ in higher education assessment. This is where a student gets someone – a third party – to complete an assignment or exam for them. This third party might be a friend, family member, fellow student or staff member who assists the student as a favour. It might be a pre-written

assignment which has been obtained from an assignment 'mill'. The third party may also be a paid service advertised locally or online (also called 'contract cheating').

***All survey responses are anonymous.***

Q61. Since you have been an educator, have you ever provided materials to a student which allowed them to gain an unfair advantage over others in their subject (e.g. a completed assignment, exam materials or answers)?

- Yes
- No

Q61a. Approximately **how many times** since you have been an educator have you ever provided materials to a student which allowed them to gain an unfair advantage over others in their subject (e.g. a completed assignment, exam materials or answers)?

- 1 - 2 times
- 3 - 5 times
- 6 - 9 times
- More than 10 times

Q61b. To whom did you provide the materials? If you have provided materials to more than one person, select all that apply.

- A student in the subject I was teaching
- One of my former students

- Friend/family member
- Partner or girlfriend/boyfriend
- Website where you swap/share assignments
- Website selling pre-written assignments on a range of topics
- Client of my tutoring, editing or proof-reading service
- Client of a local custom assignment writing service, advertised on campus
- Client of an online custom assignment writing service

Q61c. Were you ever paid money for materials?

- Yes
- No

Q61d. If you *have* ever provided materials to a student which allowed them to gain an unfair advantage, what were your reasons why? Please select all responses that apply.

- I did it for the money
- It made me feel good to get around the rules
- Everyone is doing it
- I knew I wouldn't get caught
- I knew the penalty would be minimal
- I wanted to help a student
- My work is my property and I can do what I want with it
- I didn't think it was wrong

- I wanted to punish my institution (for whatever reason)
- I do not have any opportunities for promotion or reward
- I do not have any opportunities to continuing employment
- Other

**Q61e. How many times** have your actions been discovered?

- Never
- 1-2 times
- 3-5 times
- 6-9 times
- 10+ times

**Q61f. What is the most serious penalty** you have experienced?

- Not applicable (my actions were not discovered)
- A warning/counselling
- Contract not renewed
- Dismissal
- Pay a fine
- Other

**Q62.** If you have *never provided* materials to a student which allowed them to gain an unfair advantage over others in their subject, please tell us your reasons. Select all the reasons

that apply from the list provided below.

- Personal integrity and ethics
- I knew I'd feel guilty
- I wanted students to learn and develop
- It's not fair to other students
- I didn't want to let down my institution
- I didn't want to risk being caught and punished
- I didn't want to lose my job
- Other

Q63. Thinking back to when you were a student, did you ever engage in any behaviour that would now be described as 'third-party' cheating?

- Yes
- No

Q63a. Approximately **how many times** did you engage in any behaviour that would now be described as 'third-party' cheating?

- 1 - 2 times
- 3 - 5 times
- 6 - 9 times
- More than 10 times


## SECTION 7: OPEN RESPONSE

### SECTION 7. OPEN RESPONSE

***All survey responses are anonymous.***

Q64. Is there anything else you want to tell us about third-party cheating? All responses will be treated as anonymous so please avoid using other people's names.

*(You can enlarge the text box below by clicking and dragging the bottom, right-hand corner of the box.)*



***SURVEY COMPLETED.***

Thank you for participating in this survey!

If you would like to enter into the lucky draw to win a \$500 Apple Store voucher, please click [HERE](#) to exit the survey and enter your email address. We will email you to let you know if you have won.



Powered by Qualtrics