Handbook of Research on Instructional Systems and Technology

Volume II

Terry T. Kidd
University of Texas Health Science Center School of Public Health, USA

Holim Song
Texas Southern University, USA

Information Science REFERENCE

INFORMATION SCIENCE REFERENCE

Hershey · New York

Acquisitions Editor: Kristin Klinger
Development Editor: Kristin Roth
Senior Managing Editor: Jennifer Neidig
Managing Editor: Sara Reed
Copy Editor: Holly Powell and Larissa Vinci
Typesetter: Jeff Ash
Cover Design: Lisa Tosheff
Printed at: Yurchak Printing Inc.

Published in the United States of America by
Information Science Reference (an imprint of IGI Global)
701 E. Chocolate Avenue, Suite 200
Hershey PA 17033
Tel: 717-533-8845
Fax: 717-533-8661
E-mail: cust@igi-global.com
Web site: http://www.igi-global.com/reference

and in the United Kingdom by
Information Science Reference (an imprint of IGI Global)
3 Henrietta Street
Covent Garden
London WC2E 8LU
Tel: 44 20 7240 0856
Fax: 44 20 7379 0609
Web site: http://www.eurospanonline.com

Handbook of research on instructional systems and technology / Terry Kidd & Holim Song, editors.

p. cm.

Summary: "This book provides information on different styles of instructional design methodologies, tips, and strategies on how to use technology to facilitate active learning and techniques to help faculty and researchers develop online instructional and teaching materials. It enables libraries to provide a foundational reference for researchers, educators, administrators, and others in the context of instructional systems and technology"--Provided by publisher.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-59904-865-9 (hardcover) -- ISBN 978-1-59904-866-6 (ebook)

1. Instructional systems--Design. 2. Educational technology. 3. Educational innovations. I. Kidd, Terry. II. Song, Holim.

LB1028.38.H357 2008

371.33--dc22

2007024155

British Cataloguing in Publication Data
A Cataloguing in Publication record for this book is available from the British Library.

Chapter LXII
Cyberethics Across the Curriculum

Jorge Gaytan
University of West Georgia, USA

Sunil Hazari
University of West Georgia, USA

Alexa North
University of West Georgia, USA

ABSTRACT

Business teacher educators are being challenged to establish ethical frameworks to teach students to solve problems related to business ethics and to demonstrate the connection between leadership and ethical behavior. In addition, business teacher education programs, housed in business schools accredited by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), are being affected by the demands placed by the Ethics Education Task Force of AACSB International to renew and revamp their commitment to business ethics education by concentrating on the connection between leadership and values. Following an ethical framework developed by The Center for Ethics at Harvard University, this chapter reviews models for sound ethical decision making; discusses academic honesty policy issues; provides strategies for detecting online plagiarism; gives strategies for teaching cyberethics; proposes future trends; and presents a resource list of Web sites to assist faculty in detecting plagiarism.

INTRODUCTION

Scandals at Tyco, Enron, WorldCom, Martha Stewart, Arthur Anderson, and others have influenced educational institutions to become increasingly involved in ethics education (Wilhelm, 2004). Business teacher educators are being challenged to establish ethical frameworks to teach students to solve problems related to business ethics and to demonstrate the connection between leadership and ethical behavior (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education [NCATE], 2003).

In addition, business teacher education programs, housed in business schools accredited by the AACSB, are being affected by the demands placed by the Ethics Education Task Force of AACSB International (2004) to renew and revamp their commitment to business ethics education by "focusing on the link between leadership and values" (p. 8). AACSB-accredited colleges of business "must offer courses that introduce ethical frameworks to help challenge students to resolve business and managerial problems; courses that lay out the larger societal context in which business operates" (Phillips, 2004, p. 1).

Consistent with this recommendation, the University of West Georgia's Richards College of Business (2005) has established the following statement of ethical expectations:

In educating and preparing students for positions of responsibility and ethical leadership in society, the Richards College of Business community members (administrators, faculty, staff and students) are committed to honesty and integrity in interactions and undertakings; respect for the rights, differences, and dignity of others; accountability for personal behavior.

The recently revised mission statement of the Richards College of Business also emphasizes ethics education. Preparing students for an ethically challenged world requires the effective integration of ethics education into the learning environment of the classroom. As technology-based education is rapidly increasing, it has become crucial to address issues related to cyberethics across the curriculum because it is rather simple for students to engage in unethical behaviors such as plagiarism and cheating on online tests (Gueldenzoph & Snyder, 2004).

As a prefix, cyber is defined as "loosely, a prefix referring to anything related to computers and networking" (Merriam-Webster, 2005). Ethics is generally defined as the standards or principles of conduct governing an individual or group (Merriam-Webster, 2005). Thus, cyberethics is simply the principles of conduct governing an individual or group when using the Internet (Baird, Ramsower, & Rosenbaum, 2000).

Most students today are Internet savvy as they have been exposed to e-mail, Web surfing, instant messaging, music downloading, file sharing on peer-to-peer networks, and other types of technology. This expertise allows them to view copying and pasting of text as a simple function of technology rather than the more serious act of plagiarism. In addition to publicly available Web sites used for research purposes, many universities provide access to full-text articles from journals, which if copied and pasted give the appearance of high quality professional writing on the part of students. It is often tempting for a student to copy and paste information available on these Web sites (Gueldenzoph & Snyder, 2004; Lathrop & Foss, 2000).

Furthermore, "paper mills" exist that make research and term papers on any topic available to students for a fee. Conradson and Hernandez-Ramos (2004) noted that accessibility of computers, the Internet, and other electronic resources such as CD-ROM encyclopedias have made cheating quicker and easier for students.

As a result of potential widespread cheating, it falls on instructors to create awareness about cyberethics. It appears that colleges, under pressure from accrediting agencies, are being proactive in making students aware of academic honesty policies (Phillips, 2004).

A FRAMEWORK FOR SOUND ETHICAL DECISION MAKING

The use of instructional technology raises several ethical issues that are both "intellectually interesting and enormously important" (Moor, 2005). Students must be given an opportunity to gain a theoretical grasp on ethical issues that will allow them to know how "to utilize ethical models, frameworks, and procedures of analysis that are developed for the organizational setting" (Wilhelm, 2004, p. 137).

Generally, four major ethical issues have been identified using the acronym PAPA (Mason, 1986; Vaagan & Koehler, 2005):

1. **Privacy:** As the use of technology increases, so does the threat to privacy.
2. **Accuracy**: Information educates. Misinformation effaces. A wealth of information resides on the Internet. However, sometimes it is difficult to discern the truth from the trash, the nugget of valuable information from the hearsay, supposition, inference, and opinion.
3. **Property**: Who has the rights to intellectual property on the Internet?
4. **Access**: Pervasive societal issues warrant more attention than surreptitious issues.

The Harvard University Center for Ethics (2003) established an ethical framework that (1) assists teachers and researchers with ethical issues that emerge as a result of "doing business," (2) encourages teaching and research about ethical issues, (3) assists teachers in the effective integration of ethical issues into the learning environment by providing training from experts in the field of ethics and pedagogy (e.g., ethical frameworks and models), and (4) promotes a perspective on ethics informed by both theory and practice. The Center's guiding principle is founded on the premise "that moral and political theory can help identify and clarify ethical issues in public life."

Following this ethical framework developed by Harvard University Center for Ethics (2003), this chapter reviews models for sound ethical decision making; discusses academic honesty policy issues; provides strategies for detecting online plagiarism; gives strategies for teaching cyberethics; proposes future trends; and presents a resource list of Web sites to assist faculty in detecting plagiarism.

MODEL FOR SOUND ETHICAL DECISION MAKING

Several decision-making models are available and can be used to analyze ethical situations and scenarios to assist students in reaching sound ethical decisions. Today's technology-based learning environment can increase students' motivation and make a positive impact on learning outcomes through new types of educational applications. These educational applications often involve real-world, problem-solving situations and ethical decision-making exercises, allowing students to develop sound ethical judgment. Ethical decision making for technology-based learning is no different than any other curriculum area. Ethical dilemmas occur in relation to privacy, accuracy, property, and access (Vaagan & Koehler, 2005) and, as technology-based learning is integrated throughout the curriculum, the need for ethics education is clear.

Ethics education is more than studying a code of professional conduct; it is a process whereby individuals become more consciously involved in making ethical decisions. According to Haas (2005), the goals of ethics education include creating an awareness of ethical dilemmas and providing methods of resolution. Ethical principles are the rules of conduct that derive from ethical values (Josephson Institute of Ethics, 2005) and can provide guidance in situations that do not lend themselves to an easy formula. These principles provide generic indicators, rather than absolute rules or values, to guide decision making. In addition, they provide the framework for analyzing situations or dilemmas to reach an ethical decision related to everyday situations.

Although many decision-making models exist, most have a common structure (Wilhelm, 2004):

1. Problem recognition—identification of the basic situation and the stakeholders and discernment between issues versus dilemmas
2. Identification of alternative courses of action
3. Evaluation of alternative courses of action and effects on all stakeholders
4. Estimation of probabilities and values of alternative solutions
5. Calculation of expected values
6. Justification of course of action chosen

Sound decision-making models involve active participation through asking and answering questions. The Harvard University Center for Ethics (2003) and the Professions presented the Lynn Sharp Paine's Manager's Compass decision-making model. This model contains four modes of reasoning associated with practical reasoning and ethical thought (Paine, 2003).

1. **Purpose:** Will the action serve a worthwhile purpose?
2. **Principle:** Is this action consistent with relevant principles?
3. **People:** Does this action respect the legitimate claims of the people likely to be affected?
4. **Power:** Do we have the power to take this action?

In summary, most decision-making models have a common structure as described by Wilhelm (2004). This structure includes problem recognition; identification of alternate courses of action; evaluation of alternate courses of action; estimation of probabilities and values of alternate solutions; calculation of expected values; and justification of courses of action taken.

ACADEMIC HONESTY POLICY ISSUES

One of the objectives of the ethical framework established by Harvard University Center for Ethics (2003) is to assist teachers and researchers with ethical issues that emerge as a result of "doing business." In reaching that objective, faculty receive assistance regarding the establishment of an effective academic honesty policy. According to Roworth (2002), school administration, faculty, and staff must model ethical behaviors and adherence to academic honesty. Students should be made aware of policies and required to sign an agreement of understanding of such policies.

Academic dishonesty has been broadly defined as cheating involving students providing or receiving unauthorized assistance in academic work or getting credit for work that is not their own (Chapman, Davis, Toy, & Wright, 2004). Institutions under pressure from accrediting agencies have developed academic honesty policies and are be-

ing proactive in making students aware of such policies (Phillips, 2004). While most universities include information about academic honesty in orientation sessions for incoming students, it must be reinforced throughout the program. Keeping such information fresh in the minds of students could dissuade violation of policy and help clarify ambiguous areas within the policy that can be discussed in class as part of ethics education discussions (Whitley & Keith-Speigel, 2001).

While each university, college, and/or department may have different verbiage in describing academic honesty, the basic tenet of such policies is to help students behave ethically when submitting assignments for academic credit. Consequences and sanctions must be clearly articulated in the policy to ensure that any violation of student honor code is properly addressed. Lathrop and Foss (2000) reported that clearly stated honor codes contribute to reducing cheating among students. The following is an example of a policy that can be included in course syllabi to discourage plagiarism, stating the consequences in case of violation:

- University courses are designed to provide students with the greatest opportunity to learn and to apply learning to the needs of organizations. Part of this learning process includes the review and integration of the work of others with the students' thoughts and ideas. In this learning process, there is no room for plagiarism, which takes away from meaningful learning and is unfair to the original author.

  Plagiarism is an ethical violation that is not tolerated by the University. Many useful online electronic resources (e.g., library databases) can be used to access research articles, and students are encouraged to focus on learning rather than the inappropriate use of another person's work without proper citation.

  Students are responsible for understanding plagiarism. In general, plagiarism is defined as the use of intellectual material produced by another person without acknowledging its source. The APA style manual has further information on plagiarism. In addition, students must read the University's catalog for the official statement on academic integrity and plagiarism.

  The following are some examples of what is considered plagiarism:

  - Copying of passages from works of others into an assignment, paper, discussion board posting, without acknowledgment
  - Cutting/pasting information available on the Web or online databases
  - Using the views, opinions, or insights of another author without acknowledgment
  - Paraphrasing another person's characteristic or original phraseology, metaphor, or other literary device without acknowledgment

Note: Plagiarism in any assignment will result in a letter grade of an "F" for the entire course.

Institutions must also have a procedure to keep track of such violations and to keep university administrators informed of any repeated violations by individual students. At the University of West Georgia (2006), the following procedure is recommended to faculty:

After meeting with the student, the instructor should send a brief report of the case, including the breach of academic integrity and supporting documentation to the office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA) requesting that this case become a part of the student's permanent record at West Georgia. This report should be

forwarded even if the instructor does not want the University to sanction the student. It is important to create a record of students' infringement of academic integrity to create a mechanism for identifying patterns of dishonesty. This will enable the University to take appropriate actions to suspend or expel the students with repeated incidents. (p. 99)

Regarding the general use of technology within institutions, an academic honesty policy is made more specific by using an *acceptable use policy* (AUP), which governs usage of computers and networks. School administrators must involve all faculty and staff in the development of an acceptable use policy for computer resources, including computer labs and the Internet. Similar to academic honesty policy discussed previously, AUP must be clearly articulated, effectively disseminated to all educational stakeholders (McCabe & Trevino, 2002), reinforced (Rader, 2002), and it must state the consequences for specific violations (Crystal, Geide, & Salpeter, 2000).

STRATEGIES FOR DETECTING ONLINE PLAGIARISM

The Harvard University Center for Ethics (2003) established an ethical framework for the purpose of, among others, assisting teachers and researchers with ethical issues that emerge as a result of "doing business." In reaching that objective, faculty receive assistance regarding the development of effective strategies for detecting online plagiarism. Online assessment represents a greater challenge (Fodor, 2003) because no existing technology can ensure academic honesty (Scanlon, 2003). In general, faculty should require the submission of all reference materials used by students to write their research papers. Finding effective techniques to assess student learning and maintaining academic integrity is a challenge in both conventional and online instruction because of issues related to effective assessment, cheating, identity verification, and plagiarism (Byrd & Lott, 2003; Heberling, 2002; Scanlon, 2003).

The accessibility of computers has made cheating quicker and easier for students. As a result of potential widespread cheating, instruc-

Table 1. Resource list for educators interested in learning more about online plagiarism

URL	Description
http://www.turnitin.com	Provides tools to detect plagiarism, offers peer-review features (subscription based)
http://www.mydropbox.com	Integrates plagiarism prevention technology with a versatile digital learning environment (subscription based)
http://www.canexus.com/	EVE Plagiarism Detection System (subscription based)
http://www.schoolsucks.com	Provides term papers for sale to students
http://www.essayrelief.com	Supposedly provides custom written non-plagiarized essays
http://www.ezwrite.com/	Purchase research papers online

Note: The aforementioned sites are being provided for information purposes only and are not endorsed by the authors of this paper

tors must teach students about cyberethics. In addition, publicly available Web sites used to research information are available and provide access to full-text articles from journals, which if copied and pasted give the appearance of high–quality, professional writing on the part of students. Students are often tempted to engage in this type of behavior. Furthermore, "paper mills" exist that make research and term papers on any topic available to students for a fee (Conradson & Hernandez-Ramos, 2004).

Regarding academic dishonesty in online courses, instructors are encouraged to use plagiarism screening programs that compare student written projects with databases such as the ones maintained by EduTie, Turnitin, and EVE (Chao, Wilhelm, & Neureuther, 2005). A resource list is presented in Table 1. When using discussion forums in online courses, instructors should hold plenty of threaded discussion sessions to become familiar with the students' writing styles (Singh & Pan, 2004) and to require papers to address issues covered in those threaded discussions. This way, if a student submits work that is unrelated to threaded discussions, online instructors could determine that the student had little participation.

Conversely, if work submitted by a student is not similar to that student's previous work, a reverse Internet search is recommended by using some of the student's wording and phrases (Heberling, 2002). In addition, instructors should use new and original assignments, including project-based assessment (Olt, 2002), and the short-answer feature of the testing module found in most software programs such as WebCT (MacKinnon, 2002). The verification of identity is another important issue to consider when teaching an online course (Byrd & Lott, 2003).

Personalizing the environment can dissuade academic honesty in online courses. Instructors can obtain pictures and signatures from all students enrolled in the online courses during the first initial meeting. Instructors can also hold the examinations on campus to proctor, compare signatures, and answer student questions (Alexander, Truell, & Bartlett, 2002), ensuring a higher degree of academic honesty (Fodor, 2003). In the event that campus testing is not feasible, software applications are available to develop online tests with a wide variety of functions (Fodor), allowing instructors to limit the time of the test, use several start times to accommodate time zones, give students access to one question at a time, and prevent students from returning to questions after answers had been submitted (MacKinnon, 2002).

In addition, the National College Testing Association (NCTA, 2003) has established the Consortium of College Testing Centers (CCTC) to allow distance learning students to take examinations at a reasonable rate in a controlled, proctored environment at local educational institutions, rather than having to travel to the place the course is being originated. As more courses are being made available online, instructors need to be aware of some of the strategies that can be used to help students adhere to academic honesty and acceptable use policies of the institution. Ross (2005) stated that the sophistication of dishonest students must be matched by an instructor's sophistication in detecting the dishonesty.

STRATEGIES FOR TEACHING CYBERETHICS

Another objective of the ethical framework established by Harvard University Center for Ethics (2003) is to assist faculty in the effective integration of ethical issues into the learning environment of their classrooms by providing training from experts in the field of ethics and pedagogy. While a number of institutions of higher education have chosen to teach ethics as a

stand-alone course (Wilhelm, 2005), many others have decided to integrate them into the existing curriculum. Questions regarding which approach is most effective continue to emerge, as countless educational stakeholders continue to debate this issue (Phillips, 2004).

Regardless of the approach used to teach ethics, students must receive such training including cyberethics (Johnson, 2004; Rader, 2002) because they hold the perception that anything on the Internet is free and appropriate to use (Siegfried, 2004). This lack of understanding of cyberethics by the students has led to the establishment of ethic centers at several institutions of higher education (Towell, Thompson, & McFadden, 2004). Faculty and administrators must articulate personal values and must model sound ethical behaviors.

In addition, faculty members must be trained in the proper integration of ethical issues into the curriculum, including cyberethics. As the literature has shown, instructors oppose such integration because they feel uneasy about teaching concepts outside of their area of expertise (Wilhelm, 2005). The following section provides strategies for teaching cyberethics in the classroom using the integrated approach, which involves the infusion of cyberethics into the existing curriculum (Wilhelm).

Design Sound Classroom Activities

The development of non-intrusive activities for teaching cyberethics in the classroom is essential (Wilhelm & Czyzewski, 2005). Unless instructors carefully design instructional activities related to cyberethics and effectively integrate them into the learning environment of their classrooms, teaching about cyberethics becomes ineffective (McDonald & Donleavy, 1995; Snyder, 2004). Several advantages exist when cyberethics are effectively addressed at various stages of a given course, including the development of a better sense of awareness of ethical issues by students and the establishment of an effective framework for analyzing cyberethics, as students engage in ethical discussions using real-life activities (Sims, 2002).

Require Classroom Discussions Related to Ethical Concepts

As previously discussed, students must be exposed to models for sound ethical decision making to understand ethical concepts and theories. In the area of morality, the affective domain is the key aspect that affects behavior (Kohlberg, 1969; Piaget, 1965; Rest, Narvaez, Bebeau, & Thoma, 1999). The effective integration of this affective domain into the classroom's learning environment requires the adoption of a social component (Rossouw, 2002). This non-intrusive social component can take many forms including meaningful classroom discussions, interactions with guest speakers, video review and discussion, role-playing exercises, case studies, and debates. These assignments must be required and count towards the final grade to motivate students to complete them in a timely manner (Wilhelm & Czyzewski, 2005). As a result, students are able to apply the acquired knowledge and develop ethical decision-making skills (Gueldenzoph & Snyder, 2004; Wilhelm, 2004).

Classroom assignments can take many forms. For instance, a common Internet crime is the online piracy and illegal downloading of music (Shumack & Forde, 2005). Students can be challenged to calculate the amount of money that is lost by a recording artist and the penalty imposed on the perpetrator for violating copyright laws (Gueldenzoph & Snyder, 2004; Siegfried, 2004).

Use Case Studies

Several institutions of higher education use case studies to effectively teach ethics in the classroom (Spain & Carnes, 2005). Case studies foster mean-

ingful and reflective thinking because an ethical decision-making framework is used to solve ethical problems and dilemmas. An example of an ethical decision-making framework being used by institutions of higher education is the one created by Livingstone (2003). This framework is used to engage students in the effective examination of ethical cases and it allows instructors to assess the changes, if any, in the levels of student moral reasoning (Wilhelm & Czyzewski, 2005).

CONCLUSION

Preparing students for today's technology-based learning environment requires a process to integrate cyberethics across the curriculum, especially for issues of academic honesty and online plagiarism. Sound decision-making models provide a framework for promoting student participation in making ethical decisions, from creating an awareness of ethical dilemmas through providing methods of resolution. Taken together, the models provide a process for educators to help students develop inventories of ethical skills and to assist students in better understanding how ethical decisions are made. Further, training teachers in the effective integration of cyberethics throughout the learning environment is highly recommended.

FUTURE TRENDS

While a number of institutions of higher education have chosen to teach ethics as a stand-alone course, many others have decided to integrate ethical issues into the existing curriculum. Questions regarding which approach is most effective will continue to emerge, as countless educational stakeholders will continue to debate this issue.

As ethical scandals continue to emerge, faculty and administrators will grapple with finding the most effective methods for cultivating ethical behaviors in their students. In addition, faculty will require training in the proper integration of ethical issues into the curriculum. As discussed earlier, the literature has shown that instructors oppose such integration because they feel uneasy about teaching concepts outside of their area of expertise.

Much needs to be done regarding how ethical issues can be effectively addressed within academic programs. Research is needed to find more effective methods and strategies for the proper integration of ethical issues into the curriculum. Ethics education must be integrated across the curriculum to increase the possibility that students will exhibit the behaviors found in such learning environments upon entering the workforce.

REFERENCES

Alexander, M. W., Truell, A. D., & Bartlett, J. E., II (2002). Students' perceptions of online testing. *The Delta Pi Epsilon Journal, 44*(1), 59-68.

Baird, R. M., Ramsower, R., & Rosenbaum, S. E. (2000*). Cyberethics: Social and moral issues in the computer age*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.

Byrd, B., & Lott, K. (2003). Evaluation in online courses. *Business Education Forum, 58*(1), 48-50.

Chao, C., Wilhelm, W. J., & Neureuther, B. (2005). A quasi-experimental study of electronic detection and pedagogical approaches for reducing plagiarism with college business students. *Proceedings of The Delta Pi Epsilon National Conference,* Cincinnati, OH (pp. 113-116).

Chapman, K. J., Davis, R., Toy, D., & Wright, L. (2004). Academic integrity in the business school environment: I'll get by with a little help from

my friends. *Journal of Marketing Education, 26*(3), 236-249.

Conradson, S., & Hernandez-Ramos, P. (2004). Computers, the Internet, and cheating among secondary school students: Some implications for educators. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation, 9*(9). Retrieved September 26, 2005, from http://PAREonline.net/getvn.asp?v=9&n=9

Crystal, J., Geide, C., & Salpeter, J. (2000). The concerned educator's guide to safety and cyberethics. *Technology and Learning, 21*(4), 24-31.

Ethics Education Task Force of AACSB International. (2004, February 3). *Ethics education in business schools*. Retrieved September 30, 2005, from http://www.aacsb.edu/eerc/EETF-Draft-Report-02-03-04.pdf

Fodor, J. T. (2003). Online college courses: Great for some people-not so great for others. *Promotion & Education, 10*(2), 72.

Gueldenzoph, L. E., & Snyder, M. J. (2004, November). Techniques for teaching Internet ethics. *Proceedings of The Delta Pi Epsilon National Conference, Washington, DC* (pp. 181-185).

Haas, A. (2005, June). Now is the time for ethics in education. *The CPA Journal*. Retrieved December 15, 2005, from http://www.nysscpa.org/cpajournal/2005/605/essentials/p66.htm

Harvard University Center for Ethics. (2003). *A Mission of Ethics*. Retrieved October 13, 2005, from Harvard University's Web site: http://www.ethics.harvard.edu/welcome.php

Heberling, M. (2002). Maintaining academic integrity in online education. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 5*(1). Retrieved June 7, 2006, from http://www.westga.edu/%7Edistance/ojdla/spring51/spring51

Johnson, D. (2004, January). Proactively teaching technology ethics. *Library Media Connection, 22*(4), 24-25.

Josephson Institute of Ethics. (2005). *Making sense of ethics*. Retrieved December 20, 2005, from http://www.josephsoninstitute.org/MED/MED-1makingsense.htm

Kohlberg, L. (1969). Stage and sequence: The cognitive developmental approach to socialization. In D. Goslin (Ed.), *Handbook of socialization theory and research* (pp. 347-480). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Lathrop, A., & Foss, K. E. (2000). *Student cheating and plagiarism in the Internet era: A wake-up call for educators and parents*. Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited; Eurospan.

Livingstone, J. (2003). *A framework for ethical decision making*. Wellesley, MA: Babson College Case Development Center, Babson College.

MacKinnon, G. R. (2002). Practical advice for first time *online* instructors: A qualitative study. *Journal of Instructional Delivery Systems, 16*(1), 21-25.

Mason, R. O. (1986). Four ethical issues of the information age. *Management Information Systems Quarterly, 10*(1). Retrieved December 21, 2005, from http://www.misq.org/archivist/vol/no10/issue1/vol10no1mason.html

McCabe, D., & Trevino, L. (2002). Honesty and honor codes. *Academe, 88*(1), 37-41.

McDonald, G., & Donleavy, G. (1995). Objections to the teaching of business ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics, 14,* 839-853.

Merriam-Webster. (2005). *Merriam-Webster online dictionary*. Retrieved December 20, 2005, from http://www.m-w.com/dictionary/ethics

Moor, J. H. (2005). *What is computer ethics?* Retrieved October 5, 2005, from the Southern Connecticut State University's Web site: http://www.southernct.edu/organizations/rccs/resources/teaching/teaching_mono/moor/moor_definition.html

National College Testing Association (NCTA). (2003). *Consortium of college testing center guidelines*. Retrieved April 1, 2005, from http://testing.byu.edu/NCTA/Consortium/guidelines.asp

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). (2003). *Assessing education candidate performance: A look at changing practices*. Washington, DC: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Olt, M. R. (2002, Fall). Ethics and distance education: Strategies for minimizing academic dishonesty in online assessment. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 5*(3). Retrieved June 7, 2006, from http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/fall53/olt53.html

Paine, L. S. (2003). *Value shift: Why companies must emerge social and financial imperatives to achieve superior performance*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Phillips, S. (2004). "Major push" toward business ethics in MBA programs of study. *Market Call* (CNNfn). Retrieved October 1, 2005, from EBSCO Host/Regional Business News database.

Piaget, J. (1965). *The moral development of the child*. New York: Free Press.

Rader, M. H. (2002). Strategies for teaching Internet ethics. *The Delta Pi Epsilon Journal, 44*(2), 73-79.

Rest, J., Narvaez, D., Bebeau, M., & Thoma, S. (1999). *Postconventional moral thinking: A neo-Kohlbergian approach*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Richards College of Business. (2005). *Mission statement*. Retrieved September 30, 2005, from http://www.westga.edu/~busn/mission.htm

Ross, K. (2005, October). Academic dishonesty and the Internet. *Communications of the ACM, 48*(10), 29-31.

Rossouw, G. (2002). Three approaches to teaching business ethics. *Teaching Business Ethics, 6,* 411-433.

Roworth, W. (2002). Professional ethics, day by day. *Academe, 88*(1), 24-27.

Scanlon, P. M. (2003). Student online plagiarism: How do we respond? *College Teaching, 51*(4), 161-165.

Shumack, K., & Forde, C. (2005, November). Music piracy: Attitudes, ethics, and statistics among teenagers and college students. *Proceedings of The Delta Pi Epsilon National Conference,* Cincinnati, OH (pp. 91-96).

Siegfried, R. M. (2004). Student attitudes on software piracy and related issues of computer ethics. *Ethics and Information Technology, 6*(4), 215-222.

Sims, R. (2002). Business ethics teaching for effective learning. *Teaching Business Ethics, 6,* 393-410.

Singh, P., & Pan, W. (2004). Online education: Lessons for administrators and instructors. *College Student Journal, 38*(2), 302.

Snyder, M. G. (2004, September). Tips for teaching kids to respect copyrights. *Curriculum Review, 44*(1), 1-2.

Spain, J. W., & Carnes, L. W. (2005, December). Strategies for teaching business ethics across the curriculum. *Business Education Forum, 60*(2), 31-33.

Towell, E., Thompson, J. B., & McFadden, K. L. (2004). Introducing and developing professional standards in the information systems curriculum. *Ethics and Information Technology, 6*(4), 291-299.

University of West Georgia. (2006). *Undergraduate Catalog 2006-2007.* Carrollton, GA: Author.

Vaagan, R., & Koehler, W. (2005). Intellectual property rights vs. public access rights: Ethical aspects of the DeCSS decryption program. *Information Research, 10*(3). Retrieved October 1, 2005, from http://informationr.net/ir/10-3/paper230.html

Whitley, B., & Keith-Speigel, P. (2001). Academic integrity as an institutional issue. *Ethics and Behavior, 11*(3), 325-342.

Wilhelm, W. J. (2004). Teaching ethics in the business environment: A review of the top fifty U.S. business schools' approaches to ethics education. *Proceedings of The Delta Pi Epsilon National Conference*, Washington, DC (pp. 129-140).

Wilhelm, W. J. (2005). A review of the top fifty U.S. business school's approaches to ethics education. *Journal of Business and Economic Perspectives, 31*(1), 1-14.

Wilhelm, W. J., & Czyzewski, A. B. (2005). Teaching business ethics in an undergraduate basic accounting course. *Proceedings of The Delta Pi Epsilon National Conference,* Cincinnati, OH (pp. 125-129).

KEY TERMS

Cyberethics: Cyberethics are related to online teaching and learning.

Decision-Making Models: Decision-making models are prototypes or frameworks for ethical decision-making processes.

Ethics Education: Ethics education is the teaching of ethics in the classroom.

Ethical Frameworks: Ethical frameworks are schemes used to teach ethics in the classroom.

Ethical Models: Ethical models are prototypes or frameworks for ethical decision-making processes.

Plagiarism: Plagiarism is the unauthorized use or close imitation of the language and thoughts of another author and the representation of them as one's own original work.

Technology-Based Education: Technology-based education is the integration of instructional technology into the learning environment of schools.