

Lars-Erik Nilsson  
Anders Eklöf  
Torgny Ottosson  
Tema Lärande och lärandemiljöer  
Kristianstad University, Sweden

[Lars-Erik.Nilsson@komp.hkr.se](mailto:Lars-Erik.Nilsson@komp.hkr.se)

Paper presented at the 32st congress of the Nordic Educational Research Association (NERA)  
in Reykjavik, Iceland, 11<sup>th</sup> to 13<sup>th</sup> of March

## **Cheating as a Preparation for Reality**

### **ABSTRACT**

**TITLE Cheating as a Preparation for Reality**

Authors Nilsson, Lars-Erik, Eklöf, Anders, Ottosson, Torgny

The purpose of this paper is to discuss research interests implied by the discourse on student cheating. In today's discourse student cheating has become closely connected with the use of technology, perhaps the most cited example being plagiarism suggesting students downloading essays directly from databases on the Internet and handing them in as their own. Proposed ways to deal with cheating have also become closely connected to technology. Ways to analyse texts and compare to students' style of writing have been proposed as have ways to scan databases for presumed originals. We suggest that this way of looking at cheating misses the point by a mile. Changing work practices, new technology and changes in school culture all constitute dilemmas that educators have to deal with. Billig (1996, pp. 238-245) suggests that social dilemmas are the inevitable consequence of there being principles and values. We must look closely at the values behind cheating and the situated nature of school activity. There will always be controversies about different ways to look at these values and principles and what counts as cheating in our society? Is everything that counts as cheating in school today to be considered wrong? In what way can cheating be said to be mediated by society and by school practices?

Written less than three years after the Enron affair, during the aftermath of the debate on Bush and Blair's alleged tampering of information about Iraqi weapons for mass destruction or, from a Swedish perspective, the discussions on corrupt business practices in one of Sweden's largest insurance companies Skandia Liv, it may seem a little off to raise the questions of cheating in education. From our perspective however this is not so far fetched. In the same time span several students were suspended from their studies at Swedish universities because of cheating (Högskoleverket, 2003) and Swedish National Tests in Mathematics for secondary school were placed as .jpegs on the Internet and even traded on the net (Lagergren & Wester, 2003) an incident reported in Swedish newspapers (Utbrett fusk ...).

### **Research on Cheating and Plagiarism in Education**

Earlier research on cheating has primarily been concerned with two issues. One has been to investigate the extent to which students' cheat and student attitudes towards cheating (Aiken, 1991; Davis, Grover, Becker, & McGregor, 1992; Auer & Krupar, 2001). Davis et al. suggest that there have been recurrent claims for more than sixty years that cheating has become epidemic. The authors follow these reports back to 1941 where Drake claims that there is a cheating rate of 23 % among American college students (p. 16). The other issue has been students reported reasons for cheating and finding ways to explain why students cheat (Barnett & Dalton, 1981; Davis et al., 1992). Davis et al. talk of situational determinants for cheating, such as pressure or class size, and dispositional determinants, such as low intelligence, need of social approval or low social control, while high personal ethics provide resistance (p. 17).

Looking back there seems to be an almost total agreement that cheating is a problem and that it is phenomena that is increasing measured both through reported cases and student confessions about cheating in scientific reports (Davis et al., 1992; Auer & Krupar, 2001; Sandler, 2000; Austin & Brown, 2000). This claim will be taken as a starting point for this article, despite the fact that it can be argued that digital technology makes it possible to uncover more examples, that honour code systems may cause more reports and that the discourse on cheating and plagiarism itself may have caused teachers to become more suspicious. There is a dilemma and there is a need to look at how this dilemma is constituted.

What then is cheating? Searches in databases and on the Internet, whether in English or Swedish, reveals that cheating and plagiarism poses a social dilemma that gives rise to controversies not least in the area of education. The article database Elin returns 231 articles about cheating AND education. 651 articles however are returned for plagiarism, indicating that focus in discussion is on a special form of cheating. Another link is established to copyright infringement, a search word that combined with education yields another 231 articles. There is a strong connection between cheating and the Internet, a combination that yields 45 articles, but only 15 of these articles concern education. While all 15 talk about students, only 6 mention teachers. Of the many articles discussing plagiarism only 69 of these discuss the Internet and a mere 24 concern education.

While cheating, plagiarism and the Internet seem to be frequently covered subjects in Elin, it is hardly covered at all in Rixlex, a database that contains protocols, motions and proposals from the Swedish parliament, suggesting that it is not considered a politically important dilemma. A search for "fusk OCH skola" (cheating AND school) returns only 194 hits between 1992 and 2004. A majority of these hits concern cheating in general and when there

is a connection to education it concerns the importance that socialisation through the school system works to prevent cheating. Two references to “fusk” can be found and these concern cheating in education. In a parliamentary debate (Parliament Protocol 1998/99:80) Beatrice Ask, former Minister of Education and representative for “Moderata samlingspartiet”, suggests that Swedish National tests can not be relied on because they are handled in such a way that students can find the answers on the Internet.

A similar search in “Artikelsök”, a database that covers around 500 journals and 20 daily newspapers returns 192 articles about “fusk”. It would seem that interest in cheating and plagiarism in the educational system is only considered problematic to some. This is confirmed from a United States perspective by Standler (2000), according to whom plagiarism is rarely covered in legal journals or law text books. This is also the message from the disciplinary function at Högskolverket, who, when asked on the telephone about students barred from higher studies, bewildered asks “why, are they dangerous to others” (notes from telephone conversation 2003-03-04). This conversation revealed that cheating not under any circumstances could be considered a grave enough offence to merit other measures than short time suspension.

From a wider horizon however, cheating seems to attract attention as public figures are caught cheating in their private relationships, in business or for that matter in sports using designer drugs. Cheating is even presented as a part of postmodern life, where people take on identities on the Internet (Turkle, 1997, pp. 228-231) and set up pages about cheats. From a socio-cultural perspective cheating and plagiarism can be seen as situated activities. What is constituted as cheating in academe or school may not be constituted that way in other forms of institutional discourse. Ghost Writing (Martin, 1994, pp. 3-4), for instance, can be conceived of as an institutionalised form of plagiarism commonplace in popular press. In Education there has been other ways of constituting plagiarism. The metaphor of the original contribution in the educational world as well as the exam as a normalizing function implies special ramifications of cheating and plagiarism in education not applicable in other activities. The situated nature of cheating and plagiarism and the ramifications of possible differences in values on cheating in the educational system and society at large are little discussed, but should merit research.

In this paper we cover four themes that we find appear about cheating and plagiarism in education. The first theme concerns technology, the second pedagogy, the third ethics and values, and the fourth the situated nature of cheating and plagiarism. We suggest that there are substantive differences between different ways of making sense of cheating and plagiarism in these themes. The purpose of this paper is to discuss research interests implied by the discourse on student cheating.

### **Technology as a Means to Cheat and to Prevent Cheating**

There is a repeated connection made between the affordances of the Internet and cheating and plagiarism. Berners-Lee’s (1989) suggestion “Information management: A proposal”, and later Berners-Lee and Cailliau’s (1990) “The World Wide Web” were intended to solve an information management problem that had become pressing at CERN about how to manage and find information that was needed. The authors’ proposal was to create a hyperlinked system that connected resources of information, thus making it easier for scientists to find and retrieve information needed in their scientific enterprises. It would seem foolish to deny that

these affordances made the technology suitable for use in ways not originally intended, such as storing and downloading term-papers, swapping soundtracks or movies, and similar forms of information management. A common suggestion made is that it has become more tempting for students to cheat because of the Internet and also more difficult to prevent cheating. There is however another way of looking at the Internet and it has been suggested that it is not technology that is the problem. Instead technology helps us find those who cheat. This way the discourse on cheating, plagiarism and technology has two different aspects.

### **Technological Affordances for Cheating and Plagiarism**

There seems to be an agreement among such diverse groups as reporters, officials, teachers, students and researchers that information and communication technology in the form of computers and the Internet not only makes it possible to cheat by means of plagiarism, it also simplifies for students to do so (Austin & Brown, 1999; Auer & Krupar, 2001; Carnie, 2001). They can easily retrieve information using search bots, databases, and cd-rom based encyclopaedias, and if they are knowledgeable about the risks rearrange the text, otherwise submit it as patchwork or an exact copy. These affordances however go far beyond simple downloading and handing in of retrieved term-papers. Students can easily cut and paste information using word processors (Austin & Brown, 1999). These last couple of years we would also claim that it has become possible for any person with a little interest in audio or video editing to doctor their data in such a way that it would take experts in the field to uncover the fraud. Such methods call for revisiting the types of scientific fraud marking the works of a Lysenko where it is the foundations for analysis that is tampered with.

### **Term Paper Sites**

The potential for cheating thus goes far beyond the copycat problem. This problem however seem to be the epitome of what is considered a threat to student assessment. Plagiarism is not only boosted by technology. It is boosted because it combines with the e-commerce at the Internet. Trading of term papers is not a novelty dependant on the Internet. Such papers have been traded long before the Internet, if not on “the cover of the Rolling Stone” so at least in its advertising section of the mentioned journal (Vigue, 1997). The present development makes it possible for students to use any of many sites providing work done by others. Today these sites cover almost all levels in the educational system and they can be easily found using search words like “term papers”, “hausarbeiten”, or in Swedish “uppsatser” or “ex-arbeten”.

Term paper sites are controversial in many ways. One way to distinguish between them is whether they trade papers or supply them freely. The freely available Swedish site [Mimers Brunn](#) makes it possible for students to both upload and download term papers. The site has a disclaimer saying that it does not encourage students to copy work, but rather to use other students' papers as examples and sources to be treated in their own right. The site has sections for teachers, advice on how to write term papers and how to treat sources and it is fully searchable. It has won the national ThinkQuest award because of its way to present student work and deal with the ethical problems that follow from placing such work freely available on the Internet. It has been condoned by the Swedish National Agency of Education and the students who designed the sites often take part in educational conferences. The Swedish National Agency of Education however has been criticized for supporting the site by teachers. In an article (Truedsson, 2002) Mimers Brunn claims that their free term papers are so well-known that they cannot encourage cheating and suggests that giving students better assignments and requiring them to argue their thesis would make students inclined not to

cheat. One of the teachers who filed a complaint to the Swedish National Agency of Education answers that it would be incredibly naïve by Mimers Brunn not to recognise that students visit sites like their own just to take shortcuts. “The opportunity makes the thief” as the saying goes, and the teacher argues that Mimers Brunn creates an opportunity for cheating and does this with the Swedish National Agency of Education’s recommendation. He goes on to criticise the site because it does not reveal its sources or exercises source criticism and claims that students “copy the summaries they are supposed to do themselves”. What is made relevant are differences in how the students behind Mimers Brunn make sense of the assignment to write a term paper and how the teacher makes sense of the assignment. Mimers Brunn talks of arguing your own thesis but the teacher talks of summarizing.

### **A Discourse on Term Paper Mills**

In the United States universities’ decisions in individual cases where students have been accused of plagiarism have been upheld by the judicial system (Standler, 2000, Section 4). Many states also have statutes that make it unlawful to sell term papers and both successful and unsuccessful attempts have been made to shut down term paper services ever since they started to appear in the 1960’s. Boston University for instance lost a case against [A1 Term Paper](#). Standler, however, argues that such cases may be won but have to be pleaded more carefully. It is apparent by Standler’s choice of wording “that cases need to be pleaded more carefully” that he sides with the universities and considers this as a case for disciplining rather than as a case for reformulating what is to be considered cheating or what is to be considered good pedagogy.

Despite colourful names like DueNow and A1 Term Paper term paper mills do not argue that students should have the right to buy papers and hand them in as their own. Term paper business argue differently and say they do not condone plagiarism. They are publishers and as such entitled to freedom of press. They would as [DueNow](#), argue that (Why should you ...):

While there are numerous reasons why you should try to avoid using free online paper databases, your main concern should be that of plagiarism. The staff of many high-schools, universities and colleges have begun using online anti-plagiarism databases to ensure that all work that is handed in is 100% original and does not match any of the papers in their database. While DueNow.com Inc in no way condones plagiarism, the good news is that all of the papers that you will find on DueNow.com are under the legal copyright of our company, and, as such, are not available for the use of any other organization without our express written consent (including the anti-plagiarism databases). Free paper sites, on the other hand, usually accumulate their papers simply by browsing the internet and “lifting” them from other free sites. Not only is this act illegal in itself, but it also places those papers in the public domain (accessible by anyone) and does not protect the originality of that paper.

Law suites may be possible to plead in any court in countries or states where term paper sales are considered unlawful. DueNow points to some problems with litigation. Students who use their services may be hard to catch simply because the papers are property of DueNow and kept secret. Boston University therefore sent agents to buy papers just to prove term papers were possible to buy. While it was possible for the university to prove that A1 Term Paper actually sold term papers it was not possible to stop them. What makes this extremely difficult

is that term paper business can be set up where there are no laws that outlaw them and it will only take a credit card and somewhere to download to get to the wanted paper.

### **Technology as a Solution to Cheating and Plagiarism**

If Internet, as believed by many, is the problem it is also considered a solution to the same problem. Quite a few articles report technical methods, software or services that are supposed to prevent plagiarism. In his book “Med eller utan filter” (With or without filter) Rask (2000, pp. 26-27) argues the DIP method (in Swedish an abbreviation for “The insightful pedagogue”) will make it hard for students to plagiarise. What this insightful pedagogue is supposed to do is copy a phrase from the student paper and paste it into a search bot and, Rask claims, he or she in most cases will find the original. It is obvious that this method does not work on sites like DueNow but neither does it work if the files have been retrieved from an archived format and as fate would have it, unfortunately students seem to be more acquainted with .zip .gzip .shar and .tar than teachers. It is highly unlikely that any method that works from the assumption that plagiarisms can be searched for and matched will work.

If there are businesses that sell term papers there is likely to be businesses that find plagiarisms. Businesses like [Turnitin.com](http://Turnitin.com), IntegriGuard, Glatt Plagiarism Services and in Sweden [Urkund](http://Urkund) all promise to track down plagiarized student papers. Turnitin.com claims to be the world’s most widely used system to prevent what they refer to as cut and paste plagiarism. It has access to many sources including ProQuest’s database of journal articles. When student reports are fed into the system they are returned almost directly with colour coded identifications of plagiarized sections. [Urkund](http://Urkund) advertises itself as the system that prevents plagiarism. The services offered by [Urkund](http://Urkund) promise that its system’s sources have been powerfully controlled, that it is pre-emptive and can prevent plagiarism with a minimal administrative effort. The sources are collected from three international types of sources, Internet sites and databases, published material as journals, books and encyclopaedias, and student material. Urkund’s technical setup is built on a script that has all student papers that are sent by e-mail to institutions pass Urkund’s screening process where they are screened to prevent that they are plagiarisms and stored to prevent future plagiarism. Urkund was tested by the journal “Computer in Education” (Näslundh, 2002) and the journal claimed that all that a student needed to do to have their paper pass was to make some systematic changes to the text they had plagiarized. The anti plagiarism business filed a complaint against the journal to the Swedish Press ombudsman who threw the case out. Representatives from Urkund also wrote an article where they accused the author of the article of being dumb and naïve, a wording that comes close to the language used by the teacher above who complained about Mimers Brunn. They also accused the author of setting up her tests the wrong way. The belief in anti plagiarist services in universities seems at least to be so firm that many universities buy in. Still their effectiveness is debated. One concern is the invisible web (Sherman & Price, 2001, p. 57). By definition this web is set up in such a way that it cannot be searched by common search engines.

### **The Skilled Copycat**

While “the insightful pedagogue” may serve as a metaphor for a teacher who is not easily fooled by cheating carried out with the help of technology “the skilled copycat” can serve as a metaphor for students that can use technology to fool “the insightfule pedagogue. We have ourselves experimented with texts that were picked out of Encyclopaedias and term paper databases matching the age of simulated authors. We have then fed them into summary

services like SweSum or Microsoft Word's summary. Not only have the texts generated, especially with SweSum, been readable and representative of the subject covered, they have also been virtually untraceable. Furthered doctored by the student who adjusts the wording, uses search and replace to weed out some adult type words and some inserted questions, explanations and reflections they have appeared as original contributions from a student. When showing the process to teachers and headmasters these have sighed and asked what to do.

### **An endless array of measures and counter measures**

The final technical counter measure proposed are forms of analysis that compare the student's original writing to the handed in paper and writings in the domain covered. Software built on [latent semantic analysis](#) uses a mathematical/statistical technique to evaluate a written text. It can compare texts in various ways, like sentence comparison, one-to-many comparison, and matrix-comparison. [Foltz, Laham, and Landauer \(1999\)](#) describe a software called "The intelligent essay assessor" that is used for scoring the quality of essays using simulations of psycholinguistic phenomena shown. According to the authors LSA reflects similarities of human meaning effectively. And so it goes on much like in law where a new law is exceeded by a new loophole or in sports where a new drug on the list of banned drugs is immediately replaced – measures and counter measures.

### **Backtracking to Concept Level**

As finally the combatants line up with their technical arsenal it dawns on us that we have too readily accepted that we know who the combatants are, what it is that they are supposed to be guilty of, and that their crimes are universal and can be generalized over contexts. Furthermore we have to readily accepted that there is a phenomena called cheating that is not contingent on historically situated practice but rather is universal. As illustrated above technology can both be blamed for cheating and plagiarism and be seen as a means to solve the problem. Little is said in such a discourse about what this particular problem is and how it is constituted. So let us backtrack. This far ita has been a narrative about students that cheat as they download work from the Internet or copy and paste other peoples texts into essays that they hand in as their own. But wait a minute. What does that have to do with Enron or Skandia or presidents that present falsified reports? Right, this must be a story about an ethical problem and education and technology is just the scene and requisites used by the authors to illustrate their case.

### **The Discourse on Cheating and Plagiarism**

Let us look at cheating and plagiarism. By some these words are treated as synonyms. Hunt (2002) who however does not want this particular paper published on the Internet to be quoted, but whom we will quote anyway (with his personal consent) just to make a point, argues that we need to make the distinction between cheating and plagiarism. He suggests that the question of copy and original is taken ti lightly in todays discussion on "cheating".

Let us first, however, take the case of us quoting Hunts paper. We are in good company. It has already been quoted by a site at Uppsala University (Wiederheim, 2004), in Sweden used as an authority on plagiarism by the Swedish Schoolnet. Are we plagiarists? According to Hunt we are not (personal communication, 2003-04-04). We have done our best to present his views and given him credit for his contribution by citing his paper. It is just a question of courtesy not to quote him without permission. Since we asked for his permission we are

courteous, but Uppsala University, well let us not talk about that. To lots of writers cheating and plagiarism is the same. The “hardcore” writers who talk of an epidemic spread of cheating perceive of plagiarism as the epitome of cheating in our time. They argue that we have a raise in cheating because of the Internet. Students download their papers off the Internet or buy them at term paper mills.

### **Hunts Case on Cheating**

To Hunt (2002) pagers, cd-roms or other technical artefacts smuggled into the exam room as an extension of the students memory should not be confused with plagiarism. These actions are forms that he labels cheating. We would concede that from a socio-cultural perspective it can be argued that artefacts that act as memory extensions could be seen as legitimate aids and that exams should be about other things than recalling something that has been memorized. What Hunt argues, however, is that it would be hard to plagiarize at an examination since it would require students to know the answers beforehand. We would debate this and ask that is not plagiarism exactly what many exam room contexts are about? You go there and if you fail to give exactly the text book answer the test is asking for you fail. Furthermore if you give an exact quote nobody will expect you to attribute it to the author. Hunt makes the point that while not all cheating is plagiarism only a small portion of the plagiarism that occurs can be called cheating. Plagiarism is more often about ignorance than “deliberate, ‘let’s buy this term paper’ Dishonesty”.

### **Cheating, Plagiarism and Awareness**

In an exam paper written at the Teacher Training programme at Kristianstad University the authors asked teachers and students what they considered to be cheating (Hultén & Wiberg, 2003). Typically they thought that the Internet had made cheating more frequent, but the students reported that their cheating was mostly traditional forms with sending notes and looking over the shoulder of a fellow student. The teachers, however, seemed to think that Internet cheating was more frequent. It was apparent in the survey that teachers found it difficult to decide what was to be considered plagiarism and that they were divided into two groups when they talked about cheating and plagiarism, one that made sense of these concepts using rules and one that made sense of the concept using intent. As one of the teachers put it: “How can it be cheating if the student is not aware of it?” This is one of the points made by Carbone (1999), that is, that teachers too readily assume that students know what plagiarism is.

In his dissertation Nils-Erik Nilsson (2002) asks himself how to understand the students’ different ways of writing. His basic assumption is that human beings develop their knowledge by interaction with their physical and socio-cultural environment. He uses theories from Bakhtin and Goffman in his attempt to understand and categorize the different writing techniques he finds among the students. He first states that no one that speaks is the first to use the words. When we try to express something, we take part in a hidden dialogue with what others have said before us. When we assimilate the speech of others it is not merely a simple transformation, we also adapt by giving the words the meaning we want them to have (Nilsson, 2002, p. 66). The student who takes a text and alters some of the words is maybe taking the first steps on a long stairway, leading towards a new discourse and a personal adaptation to a subject discourse. The question of whose voice it is we hear when students write and speak is problematic to Nilsson. Seen from his perspective it is not so easy to speak about cheating and plagiarism. The process of developing a language of ones own (if even possible) on a subject area holds strategies where it is a necessity to use the thoughts and

thereby the words of those who were before us. Scientific education is a good example of this. Nilsson uses three different roles of a speaker aligned with Goffman's theories (Nilsson 2002, p. 68). The *animator* gives life to speech. When a student acts like animator he or she merely mediates the text of someone else, by copying from a source. The *author* decides the meaning that is expressed by the text. This takes careful selection and the re-creation of the original text on the part of the author. The third role that Nilsson describes is the *principal* who is the originator of the thoughts and ideas that come to expression. Connected to these roles Nilsson describes different techniques that the student can choose. He uses a categorization serving as a taxonomy. "The copyist" uses a type of footing where the student only acts like animator. "The sampler" uses the same type of footing and writes down word by word, but also acts as an author in the he or she makes independent selections. This, according to Nilsson, is the most common technique. In the following stages, "the re-creator", "the referent" and the "interview referent", the students increase the amount of independency towards the original text acting more and more like authors. The storyteller and the examiner hold the footing of the principal and use creative techniques. The distinction between reproductive and creative techniques is centred on whether the students are trying to say something in "their own voice" or are merely transmitting in the voice of someone else.

Nilsson argues that we have to see the act of copying as stages of the students' language development, thus influencing their writing. He also claims that one reason why students do not consider plagiarism a problem is that the goals differ between the students and the teachers. Whereas the teachers are oriented towards the content motivated by a desire that the students should learn, the students' main motivation is to show the teacher that they have read the book. In this way Nilsson provides us with tools to understand the concept of plagiarism. If the students are left alone with the process and not challenged with tasks that force them to take the role of principal, reproductive techniques will be the result. He says that "therefore, I think that the teachers have to be there for the pupils at the critical stages of the process and challenge the pupils in the zone of proximal development" (Nilsson, 2002, p. 214).

Nilsson's way of making sense of plagiarism is well in line with Hunt's (2002). Hunt distinguishes between cheating, plagiarism and, building on Bakhtin, normal derivative discourse. Taking up your cell phone and getting the answer to an exam question from someone else is just plain cheating and so is the form of plagiarism exemplified by buying term papers. Unacknowledged sources and inadvertent copying he calls plagiarism. In Nilsson's (2002) way of conceptualising writing these are steps on the way towards mastery. Most lectures Hunt places as a form of plagiarism that can be considered normal derivative discourse. Thus Hunt and Nilsson both points to the slippery slope towards mastery of writing original texts. Before a student is accused of cheating and plagiarism it seems to us to be important to ask at what level it is reasonable for that student to perform

### **Two Ways of Dealing With Cheating and Plagiarism**

In the Kristianstad case two ways of making sense of cheating and plagiarism seemed to emerge. One group of teachers saw cheating and plagiarism as roughly the same phenomenon and establishing whether a student had been cheating as a fairly uncomplicated task, catching them in the act or locating the sources. The other group of teachers argued that cheating required an understanding of the rules and that student copying often was not premeditated plagiarism and therefore could not be defined as cheating. These groups were further subdivided into teachers who saw the phenomena as something that should be dealt with by sanctions and teachers who suggested that it should be dealt with by instruction. These groups

are also distinguishable in the public discourse on cheating and plagiarism. Next to using technology to stop cheating changing instruction seems to be the most embraced suggestion. Howard (2001) argues that we should not police plagiarism but teach instead. She sees plagiarism as a result of teaching providing wrongly constructed assignments and robbing students of an audience for their writing. Though not going as far, Leland (2001) suggests that students should be given reading advice on plagiarism, that writing assignments should be constructed to capture the students' attention and require components that cannot easily be plagiarised. McDowell (2002) suggests that students' problems originate from their problem dealing with information on the Internet. Standler (2000) covers the legal angle. It is important to sanction students, and teachers for that matter, who cheat. They may be suspended or fined if brought to civil trial. Cizek (2003), mostly talking about cheating teachers, argues that cheaters have to be found and punished and argues the need of an honour system to support honest practices. Many, as Minkell (2002) or Austin and Brown (1999), hold both positions: it is important to teach and inform but also important to support the idea of swift and sure consequences.

### **The Return of the Enrons**

We brace ourselves for the return of the Enrons, US-British Iraqi-disinformation and Swedish Skandia-affairs. What about them? What have they got to do with cheating? We have made a case that maybe cheating should not always be called cheating. Maybe students are wiser than teachers at some points and their actions tell us that we cannot develop tools to extend our capabilities and then prevent students from using them. We have made a case that maybe plagiarism should not always be called plagiarism. Maybe claims that students are plagiarists need to rest on an assurance that they really know what plagiarizing means. Maybe it is more difficult to draw the line between what has been stolen and what has been assimilated and buried deep in the mind of the student, perhaps so deep it is perceived of as the student's own property. We have made a case that maybe plagiarism is a logical starting point for learners and it is up to educational institutions to make sure that methods used, assignments given and exams constructed lead away from plagiarism. We have even made a case that maybe cheating and plagiarism are not on the raise at all and that we simply have found better methods to catch students. But surely, despite all these reservations there are some students who are cheaters or plagiarists. That leaves us with the real problem. Students are to be prepared for a life where cheating and plagiarism exist in some cases not as cheating and plagiarism but as expected practices. The problem with different contextual demands is argued by many. Hunt (2002) argues that "the OED's first definition ... 'the wrongful appropriation or purloining, and publication as one's own, of the ideas, or the expression of the ideas (literary, artistic, musical, mechanical, etc.) of another'" would not hold in a world beyond the campus. Quoting Kincaid he claims that in that world few would call such practices cheating. "Newspaper writers and editors 'boilerplate in' paragraphs lifted from the AP or Reuters wire and produce stories which are pastiches of other stories". In line with Baudrillard's concept of simulacra it can be argued that not only are spectators living in a simulated world but also the reporting journalists. Rather than plagiarising they are mediating a world they have not seen. How do we prepare students for different forms of practices and ethics? How do we do it and at the same time manage to send the message that the practices of Enron and Skandia are to be considered unethical by most standards (well maybe not by the elitist networks that used them)?

## **Conclusion**

In this paper questions have been raised about the concepts of cheating and plagiarism. We conclude that more research seems to be needed into how the educational system makes sense of these concepts. Two areas of research have been found that date back more than sixty years, research on the occurrence of and attitudes to cheating and the research on the causes of cheating. We conclude that there is a need for research into the implications of new technology for cheating and plagiarism and for fighting both. Furthermore there seems to be a case for research on how to align education with new technology since there seem to be technological affordances that at the same time support plagiarism and good learning practices. Finally there seems to be a case to argue research on the implications of different contextual understandings of cheating and plagiarism.

## References

- Auer, N. J., & Krupar, E. M. (2001). Mouse click plagiarism: The role of technology in plagiarism and the librarian's role in combating it. *Library Trends*, 49, 415-433.
- Austin, J. M., & Brown, L. D. (1999). Internet plagiarism: Developing strategies to curb student academic dishonesty. *The Internet and Higher Education* 2(1): 21-33.
- Aiken, L. R. (1991) "Detecting, understanding, and controlling for cheating on tests." *Research in Higher Education*, 32(6), 725-736.
- Barnett, D. C., & Dalton, J. C. (1981). Why college students cheat. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 22(6), 545-551.
- Berners-Lee, T. (1989) *Information management: A proposal*. Retrieved 2004-03-05, <http://www.w3.org/History/1989/proposal.html>
- Berners-Lee, T., & Cailliau, R (1990) *The World Wide Web*. Retrieved 2004-03-05, <http://www.w3.org/Proposal.html>
- Billig, M. (1996). *Arguing and thinking : A rhetorical approach to social psychology* (New ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carbone, N. (2001). Thinking and talking about plagiarism. Retrieved 2003-09-04, <http://bedfordstmartins.com/technotes/techtiparchive/ttip102401.htm>
- Carnie, A. (2001). How to handle cybersloth in academe. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 47(17), pB14, 1p
- Caruana, A., Ramaseshan, B., & Ewing, M. T. (2000). The effect of anomie on academic dishonesty among university students. *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 14(1), 23-30.
- Cizek, G. J. (2003). When teachers cheat. *Streamlined Seminar*. Retrieved from Ebsco 2004-02-26.
- Davis, S. F., Grover, C. A., Becker, A. H., & McGregor, L. N. (1992). Academic dishonesty: Prevalence, determinants, techniques, and punishments. *Teaching of Psychology*, 19(1), 16-20.
- Foltz, P., Laham, D. & Landauer, T. (1999). The Intelligent Essay Assessor: Applications to educational technology interactive multimedia. *Electronic Journal of Computer Enhanced Learning*, 1(2). Retrieved 2004-03-09, <http://imej.wfu.edu/articles/1999/2/04/index.asp>
- Hannabuss, S. (2001). Contested texts: Issues of plagiarism. *Library Management* 22(6/7), 311-318.
- Howard, R. M. (2001). Dont police plagiarism: Just TEACH. *Cronicle of Higher Education*, 48(November 18), 46-49
- Hultén, K., & Widberg, P.-O. (2003). "Är det förresten fusk om det inte är medvetet?" *En studie av lärares och elevers syn på fusk, med en fördjupning kring Internetfusk* (Teacher training examination paper). Kristianstad: Kristianstad University.
- Hunt, R. (2002). *In praise of plagiarism*. Retrieved 2004-03-04, <http://www.stu.ca/%7Ehunt/plagiary.htm>
- Högskoleverket. (2003). *Sammanställning av beslut och domar i disciplinärenden som rör studerande vid universitet och högskolor 2002*. Stockholm: Högskoleverket.
- Lagergren, T., & Wester, A. (2003). *Resultatbedömning: Skolbesök år 9 med anledning av prov på nätet*. Stockholm: Swedish National Agency of Education.
- Lalander, P., & Johansson, T. (2002). *Ungdomsgrupper i teori och praktik* (2., revised and updated ed.). Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Leland, B. (2001). Plagiarism and the web. Retrived 2004-03-09, <http://www.wiu.edu/users/mfbhl/wiu/plagiarism.htm>
- Martin, B. (1994). Plagiarism: A misplaced emphasis. *Journal of Information Ethics*, 3(2), 36-47.
- McDowell, L. (2002). Electronic information resources in undergraduate education: An exploratory study of opportunities for student learning and independence. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 33(3), 255-266.

**Kommentar [h1]:** Här ska det förmodligen inte vara något issue-nummer.

Minkel, W. (2002). Web of deceit. *School Library Journal*, (April 2002), 50-53. Retrieved from Elin, 2004-03-09.

*Många metoder för att fuska sig till betyg*. Dagens Nyheter, 2003-01-13. Retrieved 2004-03-04, <http://www.dn.se/DNet/jsp/polopoly.jsp?d=147&a=96508>

Nilsson, N.-E. (2002). *Skriv med egna ord: En studie av lärprocesser när elever i grundskolans senare år skriver forskningsrapporter* (doktorsavhandling). Malmö: Malmö högskola, lärutbildningen.

Näslundh, C (2002) Söka och hitta kopierade arbeten. *Datorn i Utbildningen*, 3(13). Retrieved 2004-03-04, <http://www.diu.se/nr3-02/nr3-02.asp?artikel=s13>

Online tool helps universities, colleges fight plagiarism. *Community College Week*; 1/20/2003, 15(12), p18, 1/2p, 1c

Kommentar [h2]: ?

Rask, S.-R. (2000). *Med eller utan filter: personliga funderingar kring etiken, pedagogiken, källkritiken och vuxenrollen när Internet kommer till skolan* (KK-stiftelsens skriftserie 5). Stockholm: KK-stiftelsen.

Sherman, C., & Price, G. (2001). *The invisible web: Uncovering information sources search engines can't see*. Medford, NJ: Information Today.

Standler, R. (2000). Plagiarism in colleges in USA. Retrieved 2004-03-04, <http://www.rbs2.com/plag.htm>

Swedish Parliament. (1999). Speech 133 Beatrice Ask (m). Records of meetings in the chamber 1998/1999:80.

Truedsson, L. (2002). *Internetfusk: En utmaning för lärarna*. Retrieved 2004-02-24, <http://www.skolutveckling.se/skolnet/kolla/internetfusk.html>

Turkle, S. (1997). *Life on the screen: Identity in the age of the Internet* (New ed.). London: Phoenix.

*Många metoder för att fuska sig till betyg*. Dagens Nyheter, 2003-01-13. Retrieved 2004-02-23, <http://www.dn.se/DNet/jsp/polopoly.jsp?d=147&a=96508>

*Utbrett fusk på högskolorna*. Dagens Nyheter, 2003-06-17. Retrieved from Medierarkivet 2004-02-23, <http://www.mediarkivet.se>

Wiederheim-Paul, F. (2004). *Plagiathandbok*. Retrieved 2002-02-23, <http://fefwid.fek.uu.se/plagiathandbok.htm#top>

Vigue, D. (1997). *Educators fighting a web of deceit*. The Boston Globe. Retrieved 2004-02-14, [http://www.computernewsdaily.com/147\\_052797\\_130001\\_8138.html](http://www.computernewsdaily.com/147_052797_130001_8138.html)

*Why you should avoid free online paper databases*. Retrieved 2004-03-04, <http://duenow.com/plagiarism.php>