Only 1 in 5 students reported that staff had talked to them about contract cheating...and we are not talking to them about it

Contract cheating is influenced by 3 factors

- Student dissatisfaction with learning & teaching
- Perceptions that there are lots of opportunities to cheat
- Speaking a language other than English

7 outsourcing behaviours investigated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>参与者</th>
<th>参与者</th>
<th>参与者</th>
<th>参与者</th>
<th>参与者</th>
<th>参与者</th>
<th>参与者</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 Australian Universities</td>
<td>1,147 Teaching Staff</td>
<td>14,086 Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contract cheating is influenced by 3 factors

- Student dissatisfaction with learning & teaching
- Perceptions that there are lots of opportunities to cheat
- Speaking a language other than English

Students are not concerned about contract cheating...

- Level of concern

...and this may lead to cheating

- Cheating students are 2x more likely to also share work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>非作弊组</th>
<th>作弊组</th>
<th>员工</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants

- 8 Australian Universities
- 1,147 Teaching Staff
- 14,086 Students

Students ‘share’ their work a lot...

- 15% bought, traded or sold notes

...and we are not talking to them about it

Only 1 in 5 students reported that staff had talked to them about contract cheating
Can authentic assessment design prevent contract cheating?

Assessments with no/some/all authenticity factors are routinely procured and submitted by students

5 authenticity factors

1. Frequency: the task is common or fundamental to discipline/profession
2. Fidelity: the task reflects how things are done in discipline/profession
3. Complexity: the task reflects the ‘messiness’ of real world problems
4. Impact: the task has an impact that is shared with/delivered in the real world
5. Feed forward: the task directly, meaningfully informs future practice

Students tell us that some assessments are less likely to be outsourced... but they are rarely used by staff

Assessment Types Utilised by Staff and Likelihood of Student Cheating

Suspected contract cheating often goes unreported for 3 reasons

- Perceptions it is ‘impossible to prove’
- It is too time consuming
- Staff do not feel encouraged to report

Contract cheating often results in lenient penalties

Staff report that penalties most commonly include:

- 30% Warning/counselling
- 27% Zero for the assignment
- 21% Reduced mark for the assignment

More severe penalties were rarely reported:

- 3% Suspension
- 2% Expulsion
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