

**Volume 17, Number 2**

**ISSN 1948-3163**

**Allied Academies  
International Conference**

**Las Vegas, Nevada  
October 10-13, 2012**

**Academy of Educational  
Leadership**

**PROCEEDINGS**

**Copyright 2012 by the DreamCatchers Group, LLC, Arden, NC, USA**

All authors execute a publication permission agreement taking sole responsibility for the information in the manuscript. The DreamCatchers Group, LLC is not responsible for the content of any individual manuscripts. Any omissions or errors are the sole responsibility of the individual authors.

The Academy of Educational Leadership Proceedings is owned and published by the DreamCatchers Group, LLC, PO Box 1708, Arden, NC 28704, U.S.A., (828) 507-9770. Those interested in the *Proceedings*, or communicating with the *Proceedings*, should contact the Executive Director of the Allied Academies at [info@alliedacademies.org](mailto:info@alliedacademies.org).

Copyright 2012 by the DreamCatchers Group, LLC, Arden, NC

---

# Table of Contents

**PRELIMINARY FINDINGS FROM A SURVEY OF STUDENT ACCEPTANCE AND USE OF E-TEXTBOOKS IN HIGHER EDUCATION..... 1**  
**Randy Brown, University of Mary Hardin-Baylor**

**WEB 2.0 IMPLEMENTATION: AN ANALYSIS OF AACSB ACCREDITED SCHOOLS OF BUSINESS FROM AN INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVE ..... 7**  
**Carl J. Case, St. Bonaventure University**  
**Darwin L. King, St. Bonaventure University**

**LEARNING THROUGH NARRATIVES: THE IMPACT OF DIGITAL STORYTELLING ON INTERGENERATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS ..... 9**  
**Kim Flottesch, Concordia University- St. Paul**

**ONLINE CHEATING – A CASE OF THE EMPEROR’S CLOTHING, ELEPHANT IN THE ROOM, AND THE 800 LB GORILLA" ..... 11**  
**James Harbin, Texas A&M University-Texarkana**  
**Patricia Humphrey, Texas A&M University-Texarkana**

**THE APPLICATION OF WEB-BASED LEARNING IN A MANAGERIAL ACCOUNTING COURSE ..... 13**  
**Gail Hoover King, Purdue University Calumet**  
**Songtao Mo, Purdue University Calumet**

**WHAT DRIVES PERFORMANCE OF ACCOUNTING MAJORS: DO ONLINE HOMEWORK MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS MAKE A DIFFERENCE?..... 15**  
**Janice L. Klimek, University of Central Missouri**

**CAREER CONCERNS OF CHINESE BUSINESS STUDENTS IN THE UNITED STATES: A QUALITATIVE STUDY ..... 17**  
**Xin Liu, University of San Diego, San Diego**

**INTEGRATING THE MARKETING RESEARCH AND MARKETING STRATEGY COURSES..... 19**  
**Michael A. McCollough, University of Idaho**  
**Steven R. Shook, University of Idaho**

**TAKING A CHANCE: INTRODUCING UNCERTAINTY INTO  
LEARNING GAMES ..... 21**  
    **Sherry Robinson, Penn State University/Buskerud University College**

**WHO HOLDS THE FUTURE ..... 27**  
    **Gregory W. Ulferts, University of Detroit Mercy**  
    **Terry L. Howard, University of Detroit Mercy**

**FACULTY EXPECTATIONS OF ADMINISTRATION: PREDICTORS OF INTENTION  
TO REPORT STUDENT PLAGIARISM ..... 29**  
    **Ashley J. Bennington, Texas A&M University-Kingsville**  
    **Harmeet Singh, Texas A&M University-Kingsville**

# **PRELIMINARY FINDINGS FROM A SURVEY OF STUDENT ACCEPTANCE AND USE OF E-TEXTBOOKS IN HIGHER EDUCATION**

**Randy Brown, University of Mary Hardin-Baylor**

## **ABSTRACT**

*Electronic books (e-books) have become a fixture in this modern world. The past few years has seen the e-book industry explode with hundreds (literally) of electronic reading devices such as e-readers or e-reader apps. The move to electronic textbooks (e-textbooks) has been slower, but the pace is increasing. Many students, professors, and universities are starting to push the move to e-textbooks. However, there are many issues involved in making this move, not the least is whether students actually want or would use e-textbooks. This study presents and discusses some initial results to a recent survey on student acceptance of e-textbooks as alternatives to “real” paper textbooks.*

## **Keywords**

Electronic books, e-books, electronic textbooks, e-textbooks, e-readers, Amazon Kindle, Barnes and Noble Nook, android tablet, iPad, iPhone, iPod, smartphone, technology acceptance model, task-technology fit.

## **INTRODUCTION**

The growth in popularity of electronic books (e-books) in the past few years has been phenomenal. There are numerous companies producing e-books and devices to read them. In fact, most companies have multiple devices to cater to a variety of consumers. For instance, Amazon has the original Kindle (now referred to as “Kindle Keyboard”), the larger Kindle DX, a touch version simply called “Kindle”, and most recently, the Kindle Fire and Kindle Paperwhite. Even the Kindle Fire has multiple choices – the original Kindle Fire, Kindle Fire HD, and now the Kindle Fire HD 8.9” with a bigger screen. This variety is echoed by the entire e-reader industry. Some devices are strictly for reading e-books, others are devices with other purposes, but also have the capability to support e-reader apps (iPad, Smart Phones, PCs, etc.)

The plethora of e-reader capable devices and the popularity of e-books has led, not unexpectedly, to the development of electronic textbooks (e-textbooks) for use in higher education. While is it not yet universal, many textbooks are now available in e-textbook format.

Some of the benefits are obvious – less weight to carry, fewer books to carry, and lower costs to name a few. There are also drawbacks, however, including, but not limited to: inability to “sell back” the book or let someone else borrow it, not all texts are available in electronic format, some devices may be hard to read in some light, and devices can run out of battery, leaving the user unable to read the book. Then there are the cultural, psychological, physical, and emotional resistances to change – some people just like to hold and feel (and smell) a paper book or textbook. So the question arises as to whether students want e-textbooks and would they use them if available. This study is an attempt to delve into this question.

### LITERATURE REVIEW

While e-textbooks have only recently become widely available, the ideas surrounding the concept have been around for several years, and there are already numerous studies and articles dealing with e-textbooks and higher education. A few are discussed here.

The idea of an e-book has been around for a lot longer than many people realize, and it dates back to the rise of the computer era. An article “Technology and the Library”, published by Joe Wyatt in 1979 is perhaps the first inkling that e-books might actually become a reality (Wyatt, 1979). Of course, Science Fiction authors have postulated computing machines and e-books for much longer. After Wyatt’s article, however, e-books were essentially ignored for two decades, at least in academic research. It was not until the turn of the millennium that e-book research really began to escalate.

A large number of articles focus on the move to e-books in libraries (Herring, 2003; Ramirez & Gyeszly, 2001; Reed, Flinchbaugh, & Moskal, 2004) and associated benefits and challenges, including the threat to physical libraries (Gibbons, 2001; Lonsdale & Armstrong, 2001). There are several experimental studies comparing students usage of e-textbooks vs. paper textbooks (Siebenbruner, 2011; Simon, 2002). Student preferences are mixed. In many of the studies, more students preferred paper textbooks to e-textbooks (Gregory, 2008; Hannigan, 2007; Woody, Daniel, & Baker, 2010). Other studies indicate that, under the right circumstances, e-textbooks might be preferable (Abdullah & Gibb, 2008; Croft & Davis, 2010; Nariani, 2009).

There are advantages and disadvantages with e-textbooks. Some of the disadvantages of e-textbooks include eyestrain (Hoseth & McLure, 2012), lack of available e-textbooks (Slater, 2010), inconsistency of formats (Arch, 2012), and more. Benefits include, but not limited to: lower cost (Rogerson-Revell, Nie, & Armellini, 2012), flexibility (Nie, Armellini, Witthaus, & Barklamb, 2011), and portability (Rodzvilla, 2009). One report suggests that e-readers and e-books are not really designed with higher education in mind. Textbook requirements and functionality is somewhat different from pleasure reading, so while students may like e-books for pleasure reading, until e-textbooks are designed better, they are not preferred in the classroom (McCarthy, 2011).

The discrepancies between studies indicating a preference for paper textbooks or e-textbooks need to be investigated further. Perhaps the theories behind the behaviors would explain more. O’Leary suggests the publishers see the digital formats as being secondary to the print versions and cites the Unified Field Theory (O’Leary, 2011). Lai et al (Lai & Ulhas, 2012) suggested a variety of theories, including the Technology Acceptance Model as described and extended by Davis et al (Davis, 1989; Venkatesh & Davis, 2000), Innovation Diffusion (Bhola, 1966), and Motivation (Herzberg, 1959).

## **RESEARCH METHOD**

After examining the existing research, it appears that there are some ambiguities in the results. Perhaps the correct model hasn’t been found or developed. E-readers and e-books are technology, so the TAM, or the “updated” TAM, called the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (Venkatesh, Morris, Davis, & Davis, 2003), appears to be an excellent choice, but not by itself. The research by McCarthy which indicates the existing technology may not be the right fit (McCarthy, 2011) leads the researcher to a second model – the Task-Technology Fit (TTF). TTF suggests that to be effective, a technology must not only be utilized, but it must also fit the task to which it is being applied (Goodhue & Thompson, 1995). We also need to explain what would motivate students make the move (or not) to e-textbooks as opposed to paper texts; therefore, the inclusion of Motivation Theory (Herzberg, 1959) to the mix. Innovation Diffusion (Bhola, 1966) could also play a part and was investigated as well.

Combining aspects of each of these theories and utilizing question categories from “Comparison of e-book readers” (Wikipedia), a questionnaire was developed to obtain information from students. Once created, the questionnaire was evaluated by a group of technology professors to establish face validity. After IRB approval, a web survey was developed and launched on the web. Approximately 3,000 students were invited to participate in the study. 198 usable responses were received, or about 6.5% response rate.

## **DATA ANALYSIS**

Some preliminary descriptive statistics analyses were performed on the data, resulting in some interesting findings. Of the 198 students, 137 (69%) had used an e-book. Of those 137, only 20 indicated they would always use an e-book when available, but an additional 41 said they would prefer an e-book, but would consider paper. So, only 61 out of 137 (45%) were leaning toward e-books. As expected, fewer students had used an e-textbook – only 87 (44%), which was still higher than expected. Of those 87, however, instead of the almost half, as indicated by e-books, only two (2.3%) were leaning toward e-textbooks at all and only one of those would “always” use an e-textbook. It becomes glaringly obvious that while e-books may be okay for leisure reading, when it comes to textbooks, e-textbooks have a huge barrier to

overcome. Curiously, of the students who had never used an e-textbook, there was one who indicated (s)he would always use an e-textbook, while a second showed a preference for e-textbooks – the same numbers as for those who HAD used an e-textbook.

## CONCLUSIONS

Initial results indicate that students are not satisfied with e-textbooks in their current format. However, this study is preliminary and limited to students from one university. The data collected is also for fact-finding and model building. A second study is planned to investigate more details about what students like or do not like through the use of equipment. Students will test-drive a variety of e-readers and report their experiences. Combining the second study with the first should provide many more insights into what will make e-textbooks more acceptable to students.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This paper written as part of a study funded by a University of Mary Hardin-Baylor Faculty Development Grant.

## REFERENCES:

- Abdullah, N., & Gibb, F. (2008). Students' attitudes towards e-books in a Scottish higher education institute: part 2 Analysis of e-book usage. [Article]. *Library Review*, 57(9), 676-689. doi: 10.1108/00242530810911798
- Arch, X. (2012). Under the Hood — E-textbooks and the Library. [Article]. *Against the Grain*, 24(1), 64-64.
- Bhola, H. S. (1966). The Configurational Theory Of Innovation Diffusion. [Article]. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 30(4), 668-668.
- Croft, R., & Davis, C. (2010). E-Books Revisited: Surveying Student E-Book Usage in a Distributed Learning Academic Library 6 Years Later. [Article]. *Journal of Library Administration*, 50(5/6), 543-569. doi: 10.1080/01930826.2010.488600
- Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, and User Acceptance of Information Technology. [Article]. *MIS Quarterly*, 13(3), 319-340.
- Gibbons, S. (2001). Growing Competition for Libraries. *Library Hi Tech*, 19(4), 363-367.
- Goodhue, D. L., & Thompson, R. L. (1995). Task-Technology Fit and Individual Performance. [Article]. *MIS Quarterly*, 19(2), 213-236.
- Gregory, C. L. (2008). "But I Want a Real Book": An Investigation of Undergraduates' Usage and Attitudes toward Electronic Books. [Article]. *Reference & User Services Quarterly*, 47(3), 266-273.
- Hannigan, G. G. (2007). Users' Awareness of Electronic Books is Limited. [Article]. *Evidence Based Library & Information Practice*, 2(2), 104-106.
- Herring, M. Y. (2003). Libraries in the cyberage: part 3: electronic publishing and the future of scholarship (Vol. 15, pp. 46-47).
- Herzberg, F. (1959). The motivation to work [by] Frederick Herzberg, Bernard Mausner [and] Barbara Bloch Snyderman (Vol. 2d ed): New York, Wiley [c1959].
- Hoseth, A., & McLure, M. (2012). Perspectives on E-books from Instructors and Students in the Social Sciences. [Article]. *Reference & User Services Quarterly*, 51(3), 278-288.

- Lai, J.-Y., & Ulhas, K. R. (2012). Understanding acceptance of dedicated e-textbook applications for learning Involving Taiwanese university students. [Article]. *Electronic Library*, 30(3), 321-338. doi: 10.1108/02640471211241618
- Lonsdale, R., & Armstrong, C. (2001). Electronic Books: Challenges for Academic Libraries. *Library Hi Tech*, 19(4), 332-339.
- McCarthy, D. (2011). Mobile Perspectives: On E-Books. E-Reading--The Transition in Higher Education. *EDUCAUSE Review*, 46(2), 20-22.
- Nariani, R. (2009). E-Books in the Sciences: If We Buy It Will They Use It? *Issues in Science and Technology Librarianship*(59).
- Nie, M., Armellini, A., Witthaus, G., & Barklamb, K. (2011). How Do E-Book Readers Enhance Learning Opportunities for Distance Work-Based Learners? *Research in Learning Technology*, 19(1), 19-38.
- O'Leary, B. (2011). Context First: A Unified Field Theory of Publishing. [Article]. *Publishing Research Quarterly*, 27(3), 211-219. doi: 10.1007/s12109-011-9221-8
- Ramirez, D., & Gyeszly, S. D. (2001). netLibrary: a new direction in collection development (Vol. 20, pp. 154-164).
- Reed, C. A., Flinchbaugh, M., & Moskal, R. (2004). Expanding the ILL Role -- Interlibrary Loan Contributing to Collection Development. [Article]. *Against the Grain*, 16(4), 44-49.
- Rodzvilla, J. (2009). The portable e-book: issues with e-book reading devices in the library. [Article]. *Serials*, 22(3 S1), S6-S10.
- Rogerson-Revell, P., Nie, M., & Armellini, A. (2012). An Evaluation of the Use of Voice Boards, E-Book Readers and Virtual Worlds in a Postgraduate Distance Learning Applied Linguistics and TESOL Programme. *Open Learning*, 27(2), 103-119.
- Siebenbruner, J. (2011). Electronic versus Traditional Textbooks: A Comparison of College Textbook Formats. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 22(3), 75-92.
- Simon, E. J. (2002). An experiment using electronic books in the classroom. *Journal of Computers in Mathematics and Science Teaching*, 21(1), 53-66.
- Slater, R. (2010). Why Aren't E-Books Gaining More Ground in Academic Libraries? E-Book Use and Perceptions: A Review of Published Literature and Research. *Journal of Web Librarianship*, 4(4), 305-331.
- Venkatesh, V., & Davis, F. D. (2000). A Theoretical Extension of the Technology Acceptance Model: Four Longitudinal Field Studies. [Article]. *Management Science*, 46(2), 186.
- Venkatesh, V., Morris, M. G., Davis, G. B., & Davis, F. D. (2003). USER ACCEPTANCE OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY: TOWARD A UNIFIED VIEW. [Article]. *MIS Quarterly*, 27(3), 425-478.
- Wikipedia *Comparison of e-book readers*. (9/10/2012). Retrieved 9/12/2012, from [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Comparison\\_of\\_e-book\\_readers](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Comparison_of_e-book_readers)
- Woody, W. D., Daniel, D. B., & Baker, C. A. (2010). E-books or textbooks: Students prefer textbooks. *Computers & Education*, 55(3), 945-948. doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2010.04.005
- Wyatt, J. B. (1979). Technology and the Library. *College and Research Libraries*, 40(2), 120-124.



---

# **WEB 2.0 IMPLEMENTATION: AN ANALYSIS OF AACSB ACCREDITED SCHOOLS OF BUSINESS FROM AN INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVE**

**Carl J. Case, St. Bonaventure University**  
**Darwin L. King, St. Bonaventure University**

## **ABSTRACT**

*Previous studies have demonstrated that electronic social networking is becoming an important aspect of the business and social world. One important question is whether institutions of higher learning have decided to implement these technologies and potentially benefit from their use. As a result, this study was conducted to examine Web 2.0 implementation at AACSB accredited schools of business, in particular, from an international geographic perspective. Results suggest that geographic area is likely a factor with respect to the decision to implement Web 2.0 technologies at AACSB accredited schools of business. When comparing continental regions, there were differences with respect to both the types of technologies and quantity of technologies implemented. In the west, for example, as many as 50% of the schools in a given area implemented a technology such as Facebook, but in the east, the largest implementation of any of the seven technologies was 13.5%. Researchers also found that institutional control may be a factor. Findings imply that because most institutions have not implemented Web 2.0 technologies, there may still be market opportunities for schools of business. As schools examine whether to utilize these Internet technologies, this research will assist in their decision making process.*



# LEARNING THROUGH NARRATIVES: THE IMPACT OF DIGITAL STORYTELLING ON INTERGENERATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

**Kim Flottesmesch, Concordia University- St. Paul**

## ABSTRACT

*Narrative theory and narrative performance theory is often used as a theoretical framework for exploring and understanding how intergenerational storytelling builds relationships within a family unit. Multimedia digital storytelling (DST) is increasingly used as a means to capture and reproduce community and family stories while engaging students through various learning styles and modalities. However, the story is frequently only a small part of the total learning from this process. The totality of learning, or the “narrative of knowing” (McAdams, 2006), is created through a participatory exchange between narrator and listener. The narrative of knowing encompasses technical and storytelling skill transfer between participants during the process and building relationship between participants. By discussing DST projects from an undergraduate Family Communication course, this article highlights the process of relationship building and the pedagogical concerns of training students to carry out research using the narrative approach in conjunction with DST in an intergenerational context. The author discusses students’ projects and how intergenerational relationships were strengthened through the use of DST.*



---

# **ONLINE CHEATING – A CASE OF THE EMPEROR’S CLOTHING, ELEPHANT IN THE ROOM, AND THE 800 LB GORILLA”**

**James Harbin, Texas A&M University-Texarkana**  
**Patricia Humphrey, Texas A&M University-Texarkana**

## **ABSTRACT**

*Take your pick of the above metaphors. It is the authors' belief that the amount of potential for cheating in online college and university courses is largely being ignored by the industry, and that turning a blind eye to this problem can lead to serious negative consequences for all involved, including society as a whole. This paper examines the growth in online classes, along with the potential for cheating and the reasons why six distinct groups with differing self-interests are turning a blind eye to this problem; students, faculty, higher education administrators, legislatures, parents and student support groups, and for-profit institutions. The possible negative repercussions to the higher educational system and society in general are many. Assessment is central to education because the main purpose of an educational institution is to validate student knowledge. Not being able to do that adequately or correctly is an indictment of all involved. A good place to start to deal with the problem is by acknowledging that it exists, however humiliating that might be. In the meantime, it appears the cheaters are winning the battle because of the 800 pound gorilla in the room.*



# THE APPLICATION OF WEB-BASED LEARNING IN A MANAGERIAL ACCOUNTING COURSE

**Gail Hoover King, Purdue University Calumet**  
**Songtao Mo, Purdue University Calumet**

## ABSTRACT

*This paper examines the effect of students' activities on a web-based learning system (Connect) in the introductory managerial accounting course. We find that a student's performance on Connect assignments is positively associated with the overall course grade. The empirical evidence indicates that web-based learning is an effective instrument to enhance students' learning efficiency. Additionally, the system can serve as a mechanism for instructors to monitor students' activities on course preparation and practice outside of the classroom.*

*The contributions of the study are two-fold. First, the paper advances the research on business education by providing insights on web-based learning using objective data. The study also sheds light on the incorporation of instructional technology to improve students' learning experience.*



## **WHAT DRIVES PERFORMANCE OF ACCOUNTING MAJORS: DO ONLINE HOMEWORK MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS MAKE A DIFFERENCE?**

**Janice L. Klimek, University of Central Missouri**

### **ABSTRACT**

*The use of online homework management systems (OHMS) has become increasingly popular over the last decade. With the demand for online courses in all fields of study, OHMS have become invaluable due to continuous access, automatic grading and instant feedback. While OHMS are certainly convenient for both instructors and students, previous studies report mixed results with regard to how well students perform when such systems are employed. Several studies have been conducted to test whether OHMS are perceived by students to be better than the traditional hand-written method of completing homework. Others have examined performance in varying disciplines including math, science, economics, stats and finance. Fewer studies have tested whether OHMS significantly improve performance in the accounting classroom and those studies have typically been conducted in introductory courses where a variety of business and non-business majors are represented. In this paper, accounting majors in their first required accounting course for majors were studied to determine whether accounting majors who used the OHMS performed better than the control group who prepared hand-written homework. While students who used an OHMS were significantly less likely to change majors, results of this study support previous findings that students' overall academic competence as measured by prior GPA and ACT scores, rather than the technique used to deliver homework, are better predictors of student performance.*



# **CAREER CONCERNS OF CHINESE BUSINESS STUDENTS IN THE UNITED STATES: A QUALITATIVE STUDY**

**Xin Liu, University of San Diego, San Diego**

## **ABSTRACT**

*This paper aims to explore factors that impact the career concerns of Chinese business students in American higher education. To gain an in-depth understanding of this issue, a series of interviews were conducted to explore the career concerns and needs of the participants who plan to return to China or remain in the U.S. after their graduation. The results indicate considerable consensus that social relationship has a significant impact on the job search of the participants who plan to return home. On the other hand, the participants who plan to stay in the U.S. are more concerned with cultural barriers. The results further indicate that career certainty and personal growth are also major concerns of the participants. An understanding of such factors may better enable Chinese employers and multinational companies to improve their recruiting and training programs to Chinese overseas students, as well as help career counselors to provide effective career services to Chinese overseas students.*



# INTEGRATING THE MARKETING RESEARCH AND MARKETING STRATEGY COURSES

**Michael A. McCollough, University of Idaho**  
**Steven R. Shook, University of Idaho**

## ABSTRACT

*The marketing research and marketing strategy courses are related, yet these two courses are often taught as individual, separate, stand alone courses. Therefore, students may view them as unique, with each being its own silo of content. For instance, the content students learn in Marketing Research they may have a difficult time applying in Marketing Strategy. Indeed, students may come away from the research class without an understanding how information informs marketing decisions. By integrating the Marketing Research and Marketing Strategy courses students understand the direct connection between research and marketing decisions. Further, by placing the marketing research information in context, student come to understand that marketing research is much more than simply statistics. We report both qualitative and quantitative data which shows that the integrated enhanced learning outcomes and that students viewed the integration favorably.*



# **TAKING A CHANCE: INTRODUCING UNCERTAINTY INTO LEARNING GAMES**

**Sherry Robinson, Penn State University/Buskerud University College**

## **ABSTRACT**

*“Gamification” is the application of concepts and techniques from games to other activities. While gamification is often used in business marketing activities, classroom activities can also benefit from this process. Today’s learners often view traditional classroom activities as boring or routine. Incorporating game-like elements into class activities can generate excitement, anticipation and engagement with both course content and other learners. This is especially important in an era when students have greater expectations of being engaged or even entertained. Recent studies in neuroscience show that adding an element of chance and risk to classroom learning games can have a positive influence on learning. This study presents a brief theoretical background on the use of learning games and the results of research involving learning games involving risk-taking and uncertainty.*

## **INTRODUCTION**

Games have become an established method for teachers to engage their students (Bergin, 1999; Ritzko & Robinson, 2006; Robinson, 2007). The type of mild stress associated with playing games could also aid learning (Howard-Jones, 2009). Such fun and engaging learning activities are likely to be very effective in connecting with Millennials. The following section presents some of the literature on learning games and the effects of risk on learning and learning games. The results of a study examining students’ reactions to learning games incorporating uncertainty and chance are then presented.

## **RISK-TAKING IN LEARNING GAMES**

Instructors often try to reduce chance as much as possible to make a game seem fair, but the danger is that the "game" becomes more like a public quiz or test. Introducing uncertainty into games can also make them more pleasurable, making them feel more like games (Howard-Jones, Bogacz, Yoo, Leonards & Demetriou, 2010, 2011; Robinson, 2007). Robinson (2007) determined that university students prefer learning games that are not based strictly on skill, but involve some element of chance. Dealing with the younger set (age 11-12), Howard-Jones and associates (2009) found that students preferred to ask questions from “Mr. Uncertain” (meaning a correct answer would be rewarded with either 2 or 0 points based on the toss of an animated

coin) rather than from “Mr. Certain” (meaning a correct answer would receive 1 point). Mr. Uncertain was chosen approximately 60% of the time, and 30 of 50 participants chose Mr. Uncertain more than half the time.

Research on risk-taking (e.g. Atkinson, 1957; Fiorillo, Tobler & Schultz, 2003; Howard-Jones, 2010, 2011; Howard-Jones et al., 2010, 2011; Howard-Jones & Demetriou, 2009) has shown that uncertainty in a learning game can enhance players’ experience in several ways, including changes in brain chemistry and activity. Fiorillo and associates (2003) performed experiments using reinforcement in which subjects received a reward after a stimulus was presented, so that the subjects associated the reward with that stimulus. When presented with the stimulus (but before the reward was received), participants’ brains released dopamine. When the reward was actually received, little additional dopamine was generated, assumedly because the reward was expected and predictable. A separate stimulus was followed by a reward only 50% of the time. This stimulus generated an equal amount of dopamine compared to the other stimulus. However, a second shot of dopamine was released when the reward appeared (or not), creating more overall dopamine than when the reward was predictably received or completely unexpected. The highest level of sustained activation of dopamine neurons was shown at a 50% level of uncertainty, followed by 25%/75%. These results are consistent with Atkinson (1957), who found that 50% chance increases motivation. These results suggest that uncertainty in receiving awards can lead to motivation and may help explain why people enjoy the uncertainty, risk and reward involved in gambling (Berridge & Robinson, 1998; Howard-Jones et al. 2011; Shizgal & Arvanitogiannis, 2003). The release of dopamine may also lead to improved learning, especially when immersive gaming is used to teach information (Adcock, 2006; Callan & Schweighofer, 2008; Fiorillo et al., 2003; Lisman & Grace, 2005, Howard-Jones, 2010; Howard-Jones & Demetriou, 2009).

Based on the research about the effects of risk-taking and chance on learning and learning games, a series of games were designed and used in university classrooms. The following section describes the games and reports the results of student surveys regarding their behaviors regarding risk and their opinions about chance in learning games.

## **METHODOLOGY AND RESULTS**

This study explores university students’ reactions to learning games that involve uncertainty. Inspired by the Mr. Certain/Mr. Uncertain game designed by Howard-Jones and Demetriou (2009), the instructor developed a Double or Nothing (DoN) option that was integrated into a variety of classroom learning games, all of which involved team play. This format presented players with the choice of “staying,” which would result in winning one point for a correct answer, or “going DoN,” which would result in either two points or no points based on the flip of an actual coin.

The DoN format was used in several games in three university courses. At the end of each course, students voluntarily completed surveys regarding their preferences and experiences with the learning games. A total of 61 participants completed survey (32 women, 28 men). Participants were asked an open-ended question regarding the percentage (0-100%) of time that they “went DoN” during the games that were played in class. As shown in Table 1, a total of 15 different answers were given by the 61 participants, but 4 answers accounted for 66.7% of total responses. The most common answer was 50% (23.3% of respondents), followed by 100% and 0% (16.7% each) and 25% (10%). The results of a t-test (3.840,  $p < .001$ ) show that the mean for women was 32.3% while the mean for men was significantly higher at 63.0%. It is clear from the side-by-side comparison of the answers that men were more likely to go DoN as 32.1% of men answered 90-100% while only 9.7% of women went DoN that often. In fact, the remaining women all went DoN 50% of the time or less. Only 42.9% of men went DoN 50% of the time or less. For men, 100% was the single most popular answer, with 25.0% reporting they always went DoN. In contrast, 25.8% of women never went DoN.

**Table 1: Percentage of Players “Going DoN”**

Percentage of the time player went DoN	Percent of players – Total	Percent of players - Women	Percent of players - Men
100%	16.7%	6.5%	25.0%
90	5.0	3.2	7.1
85	1.7	0	3.6
80	3.3	0	7.1
75	1.7	0	3.6
70	1.7	0	3.6
60	3.3	0	7.1
50	23.3	29.0	17.9
40	3.3	3.2	3.6
30	3.3	6.5	0
25	10.0	12.9	7.1
20	3.3	3.2	3.6
15	5.0	6.5	3.6
10	1.7	3.2	0
0	16.7	25.8	7.1

Students were also asked to rate on a scale of 1 (not at all) to 10 (very much) the degree to which they preferred games with the DoN option, as some of the games that were played did not involve the DoN option. Almost 60% of total students rated their preference as 6 or above, with 41.7% rating their preference as either 7 or 8 (see Table 2). Men were again more likely to give higher ratings. Their mean rating was 6.75 compared to women’s 5.06 ( $t=2.505$ ,  $p < .015$ ). This difference between men’s and women’s attitudes is more clearly seen in the distribution of the ratings. A full 75% of men, but only 43.8% of women, rated their preference as 6 or higher. At the top of the scale, 14.3% of men but only 3.1% of women rated their preference as 10 out of

10. In contrast, half as many men (7.1%) and four times as many women (12.5%) rated their preference as 1 out of 10. A closer look at the data showed that the same 7.1% of men who never went DoN also rated their game format preference as 1. Among women, 25.8% never went DoN, yet only 12.5% rated their game format preference as 1. In fact, the preference ratings among women who never went DoN went as high as 8, and averaged 4.5. Taken together, these findings suggest that men are generally more likely than women to go DoN rather than staying conservative, and are also more likely to prefer learning games that provide this element of risk. However, women who never go DoN do not necessarily dislike the DoN game format, and some of them are actually in the high DoN preference group. It is possible that these women used “staying” as a strategy as they would always receive points for correct answers whereas other teams that answered correctly would earn 0 points if the coin flip went against them.

**Table 2: Percentage of Student Players Who Preferred the DoN Format**

DoN Preference Rating	Percent of players – Total	Percent of players – Women	Percent of players – Men
10	8.3%	3.1%	14.3%
9	3.3	6.3	0
8	21.7	15.6	28.6
7	20.0	9.4	32.1
6	5.0	9.4	0
5	13.3	15.6	10.7
4	3.3	6.3	0
3	8.3	12.5	3.6
2	6.7	9.4	3.6
1	10.0	12.5	7.1

Taken together, these comments support the instructor’s informal assessment that students were enjoying playing together in teams, especially in the DoN format. Similar to the results reported by Howard-Jones and Demetriou (2009), receiving nothing for a correct answer when going DoN due to a negative outcome in the coin flip was viewed as a setback that would simply be overcome the next time. Receiving double points was similar to a major sports victory in that some students put their arms in the air and shouted in triumph. By allowing players to choose whether to stay or go DoN for each question, no group was forced to go DoN and those with conservative natures could play the entire game without this element of uncertainty, as shown by the 16.7% of players who never went DoN. At the same time, the addition of the DoN option clearly created a positive experience for many students.

## CONCLUSIONS

The results of this study show that most students prefer a level of chance greater than 0% when playing learning games. That is, they are willing to take some amount of risk rather than

relying solely on skill for assured results. While it was beyond the scope of this study to determine whether actual learning was enhanced or that brain chemistry was changed during game play, many students reported that they believed they learned during games and found the DoN option to be fun. Several associated fun with learning and become motivated to learn.

Future research will further investigate students' self-assessments regarding learning from games. Given that all games were played in groups, individual players are likely to have gone DoN even when they personally would have chosen to stay and vice versa. It may also have been a flaw in the design of the study that participants may have reported what their group chose even though it went against what they personally would have chosen. On the other hand, the group discussion surrounding the decision of whether to go DoN may have led to greater social interaction, and may have enticed conservative students to take more risks or risk-seeking students to be more conservative. This is an area for future research that will examine the influence of groups, especially mixed-gender groups.

Students today are a new generation with different ideas and expectations. While they find it difficult to pay attention when playing the role of passive receiver in communication, they willingly engage in active learning, especially when it involves a social environment (Bergin, 1999; Robinson, 2007). Students may not find a particular topic to be of great interest, but they may be willing to learn about it in order to do well at a game which they **do** find engaging, possibly developing an interest in the topic itself (Bergin, 1999). Thus, well-designed learning games can help provide appropriate activities that fulfill the goals of the instructor as well as the needs and desires of students. Given the results of this study, this system may especially be effective when designing activities for males.

## REFERENCES

- Adcock, R. A. (2006). Reward-motivated learning: Mesolimbic activation precedes memory formation. *Neuron*, 50, 507-517.
- Atkinson, J. W. (1957). Motivational determinants of risk taking behavior. *Psychological Review*, 64, 359-372.
- Bergin, D. A. (1999). Influences on classroom interest. *Educational Psychology*, 34(2), 87-98.
- Berridge, K. C. & Robinson, T. E. (1998). What is the role of dopamine in reward: Hedonic impact, reward learning, or incentive salience? *Brain Research Reviews*, 28(3), 309-369.
- Callan, D. E. & Schweighofer, N. (2008). Positive and negative modulation of word learning by reward anticipation. *Human Being Mapping*, 29, 237-249.
- Fiorillo, C. D., Tobler, P. N. & Schultz (2003). Discrete coding of reward probability and uncertainty by dopamine neurons. *Science*, 209, 1898-1902.
- Howard-Jones, P.A. (2011). From brain scan to lesson plan. *The Psychologist*, 24(2), 110-113.
- Howard-Jones, P. A. (2010). *The teacher's handbook of twig: Minds, brains and teaching with immersive gaming*. Retrieved 27 December 2012 from [www.lulu.com](http://www.lulu.com).
- Howard-Jones, P. A. (2009). *Neuroscience, learning and technology (14-19)*. Retrieved 3 August 2012 from <http://www.bristol.ac.uk/education/people/academicStaff/edpahj/publications/becta.pdf>
- Howard-Jones, P. A. Bogacz, R., Yoo, J. H., Leonards, U. & Demetriou, S. (2011). Toward a science of learning games. *Mind, Brain and Education*, 5(1), 33-41.

- Howard-Jones, P. A. Bogacz, R., Yoo, J. H., Leonards, U. & Demetriou, S. (2010). The neural mechanisms of learning from competitors. *Neuroimage*, *53*(1), 790-799.
- Howard-Jones, P. A. & Demetriou, S. (2009). Uncertainty and engagement with learning games. *Instructional Science*, *37*, 519-536.
- Lisman, J.E. & Grace, A. A. (2005). The hippocampal-VTA loop: Controlling the entry of information in to long-term memory. *Neuron*, *46* 703-713.
- Ritzko, J., & Robinson, S. (2006). Using games to increase active learning. *Journal of College Teaching and Learning*, *3*(6), 45-50.
- Robinson, S. (2007). Learning games from the ground Up. *Proceedings of the Academy of Educational Leadership Fall Conference*, *12*(1), 43-46.
- Shizgal, P. & Arvanitogiannis, A. (2003). Gambling on dopamine. *Science*, *299*, 1856-1858.

## WHO HOLDS THE FUTURE

**Gregory W. Ulferts, University of Detroit Mercy**

**Terry L. Howard, University of Detroit Mercy**

### ABSTRACT

*There are five areas on which colleges should focus:*

- *Direction*
- *Competitive Advantage*
- *Infrastructure*
- *Resources*
- *Community*

*Let's commit to innovative undergraduate degrees and cutting-edge, innovative graduate degrees, both of which prepare a new generation of adaptable and broad-minded business students by integrating the research and teaching of the students and faculty with the needs and work of businesses, public service organizations and other entities.*



---

# **FACULTY EXPECTATIONS OF ADMINISTRATION: PREDICTORS OF INTENTION TO REPORT STUDENT PLAGIARISM**

**Ashley J. Bennington, Texas A&M University-Kingsville**  
**Harmeet Singh, Texas A&M University-Kingsville**

## **ABSTRACT**

*The issue of student plagiarism in colleges and universities has been receiving increased attention in recent years. Many studies show that faculty have a variety of responses when they suspect plagiarism; some report it and others choose to address it themselves. Because the identification of student plagiarism and the choice to report or not report rests with faculty, this study examines faculty perceptions of administration's role and how those perceptions influence their intent to report plagiarism. The Theory of Planned Behavior serves as the framework to examine this issue. A direct correlation was found between faculty behavioral beliefs, normative beliefs, and control beliefs and their intention to report plagiarism to administration. The analysis finds that faculty would be more likely to address suspected acts of student plagiarism if there was an established procedure for faculty to follow and that they would be more likely to file reports if a committee of faculty, students, and administrators adjudicated suspected acts of student plagiarism.*

