FACULTY PRESCRIPTIONS FOR ACADEMIC INTEGRITY: AN URBAN CAMPUS PERSPECTIVE

by

Patricia Susan Wehman

B.A. Mathematics and B.S. Computer Science, West Virginia University, 1985

M.S. Computer Science, West Virginia University, 1986

C.A.S. Information Science, School of Library and Information Science, 1991

M.Ed., Mathematics Education, University of Pittsburgh, 1997

M.P.H., Epidemiology, University of Pittsburgh, 2002

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of

School of Education in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education

in Administrative and Policy Studies

University of Pittsburgh

2009

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

This dissertation was presented

by

Patricia Susan Wehman

It was defended on

February 2, 2009

and approved by

William E. Bickel, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Department of Administrative and Policy Studies

Samuel D. Conte, Ph.D., Adjunct Assistant Professor, Department of Administrative and Policy Studies

Sean Hughes, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Department of Administrative and Policy Studies

Dissertation Advisor: John L. Yeager, Ed.D., Associate Professor, Department of Administrative and Policy Studies

Faculty Prescriptions for Academic Integrity: An Urban Campus Perspective

Patricia Susan Wehman, Ed.D.

University of Pittsburgh, 2009

With alarming frequencies students are viewing the acts of academic dishonesty as commonplace. Cheating is now considered an alternative form of academic behavior which is situationally dependent upon the risks involved. Any apparent institutional, faculty, and student indifference to academic dishonesty communicates to students that the values of integrity are not sufficiently important to justify a serious effort to instill them. One means of combating academic dishonesty is to involve faculty that sit at the heart of the higher educational system. Faculty can conduct their courses to uphold the institution's academic integrity policies.

This study investigated faculty training regarding academic dishonesty, the dissemination of academic integrity expectations to students, faculty perceptions of academic integrity in the classroom, faculty responses to incidents of academic dishonesty, and faculty familiarity with the University of Pittsburgh's School of Arts and Sciences Academic Integrity Code.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank God the Father and Jesus Christ for Their plan to create a family of which I am counted as one of the many across time. I gratefully appreciate Them affording me the opportunity to fulfill one of my lifelong dreams.

I would like to dedicate this dissertation to my parents, Marcia and Hugh Wehman. My mother took her daughters weekly to our hometown library, never missed annual parent-teacher nights, and continues to show great enthusiasm for learning. My father worked 10-hour days for 46 years giving his daughters monetary support for undergraduate school and the heritage of a strong work ethic. Thanks mom and dad.

In addition, I would like to give special thanks to Dr. John Yeager, my dissertation chair and advisor, who served as my professor for numerous higher education classes and who would unselfishly meet with me before my work hours to guide me to completion. I would also like to thank my other committee members for their expertise in research and their willingness to critique my writing. Thank you, Dr. William Bickel for being an outstanding educator and research mentor. Thank you, Dr. Samuel Conte, Registrar at the University of Pittsburgh, for being a worthy mentor who provided me with valuable advice whenever I was "stuck" during the dissertation process and who tolerated me "stacking" my office with research papers and

digital dissertations. Thank you, Dr. Sean Hughes for your humor and willingness to serve on my committee.

I would also like to express appreciation to Dean John Cooper and Associate Dean John Knapp for "allowing" me to ask their faculty to complete my survey. Finally, many thanks to the one hundred ninety two undergraduate faculty members who took the time to participate in my study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

1.0 CHAPTER ONE

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to investigate the issues involved with faculty preventing cheating in their classrooms at an urban institution. Cheating is an issue of concern to administrators, students, and faculty. Students often struggle to maintain a sense of personal integrity in a peer culture that accepts alternate means to obtaining a grade or degree rather than by work and sacrifice of students' time (Diekhoff, LaBeff, Clark, Williams, Francis, & Haines, 1996; Davis, Grover, Becker, & McGregor, 1992). Academic dishonesty has been around for centuries, but the Internet, e-mail, and the subsequent proliferation of information has made the problem of curbing academic dishonesty quite extensive. The cleverness of students is often the focus of attention when cheating is mentioned. However, the single biggest factor in escalating academic dishonesty is the failure of the faculty to "diligently teach, enforce, advocate, and model personal integrity" (Josephson, 2004). It is the teachers who have the greatest responsibility to foster an ethical culture that nurtures the virtues of fairness, honesty, and honor. Students then will follow.

Academic dishonesty is an extensive problem on most college campuses. Jendrek (1989) reported that various types of research studies across the United States show that 40% to 90% of students cheat. Cheating appears to be widely accepted by students provided they don't get

caught (Graham, Monday, O'Brien, & Steffen, 1994; Jensen, Arnett, Feldman, & Cauffman, 1992; Whitley, 1998; Zimmerman, 1998). Across the years despite the establishment of institutional honor codes to promote campus academic integrity, research suggests that student academic dishonesty; a complex behavior influenced by multiple situational, contextual, and individual qualities, has eroded higher education and is a nationwide problem of epidemic proportions (Davis et al., 1992; Davis & Ludvigson, 1995; Spiller & Crown, 1995; Whitley & Keith-Spiegel, 2002). Although many attempts have been made to define academic dishonesty, cheating takes on many forms such as copying from another student's examination answers, falsifying correctness of self-scored homework, copying written text without crediting the authors, collaborating on take-home examinations when work is to be independent, cutting pages out of texts and journals to limit access by other students, and forging an official university transcript.

Why do such a large percentage of students admit to these acts of academic dishonesty? Literature suggests that student attitudes are changing regarding the seriousness of these offenses (Educational Testing Service (ETS), 1999; McCabe & Trevino, 1997). A literature review over the past 40 years indicates that the prevalence of cheating in the college classroom has increased dramatically (Bies, 1998). Are faculty members addressing this problem? The responsibility of the faculty is a significant component in addressing academic dishonesty. The extent to which faculty are individually successful in eliminating cheating within their own classrooms may be a strong determining factor in the success of an institution's efforts to battle the problem. This paper will address the role that faculty play in maintaining academic integrity.

1.1.1 Definition of Terms

1. *Cheating*. Fraud, deceit, or dishonesty within an educational setting (Definitions of Academic Dishonesty, 1999).

2. *Academic Dishonesty*. A mode of conduct in opposition to principles of academic integrity.

3. *Academic Integrity*. A mode of conduct based on an individual and institutional commitment to the principles of honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility (Academic Integrity Guidelines, 2005).

4. *Collusion*. The act of producing material in concert, collectively, or in collaboration with others and giving the false impression that the work is the sole output of the student submitting it for assessment (Murdoch University Assessment Policy, 2004). Collaboration may include: a) splitting the work on one assignment among several students with each student submitting a combined effort, b) swapping materials from classes taken for those to be taken, and c) receiving professional assistance from on or off campus sources (Dick, Sheard, Bareiss, Carter, Joyce, Harding, & Laxer, 2003).

5. *Fabrication*. The intentional, unauthorized falsification or invention of any information such as research data or citations (Pavela, 1978).

6. *Higher Education.* Education conducted at the post-secondary level by community colleges, junior colleges, four-year colleges, and universities.

7. *Plagiarism*. The use of intellectual material (words, ideas, pictures) produced by another without crediting the source (Academic Integrity Guidelines, 2005).

1.1.2 Problem Statement

According to self-reported studies, 40-80% of students admit to cheating (Stover & Kelly, 2002) with an increasing number of students viewing these behaviors as acceptable. Although the majority of cheating research places the onus of academic dishonest behavior squarely upon students' shoulders, faculty may play a part in failing to curtail the problem, thus reinforcing the dishonest behaviors. In spite of faculty reluctance to respond appropriately to incidents of academic misconduct due to their ignorance of institutional policy or because the

administrative reporting process is too complicated to pursue, a review of cheating research over the past 30 years suggests that faculty have been able to identify and control many variables associated with the likelihood of academic dishonesty. Research literature is sparse in terms of the role of faculty in perpetuating academic dishonesty by faculty's failure to employ preventive measures. This study investigated how prepared faculty members perceive themselves to be in the management of academic behaviors in their classrooms and how faculty handled academic integrity violations within their classrooms.

1.1.3 Research Questions

Nine research questions that guided this study were:

Faculty Academic Integrity Training and Dissemination of Expectations to Students

1. What types of academic integrity training have faculty received at the University?
2. What information do faculty members provide to students about academic dishonesty?

Faculty Success and Failure with Maintaining Academic Integrity within the Classroom

3. How extensive is the problem of academic dishonesty in the classroom?
    A. In the past year, what types of academic integrity violations have faculty observed in their classrooms?
4. What techniques do faculty members employ to prevent cheating on exams in their classes?
5. What actions do faculty members take when they encounter academic dishonesty on examinations, homework, and papers in their classrooms?
    A. In the past year, what has prevented faculty from taking any disciplinary action whenever they observed cheating on examinations?
6. Does tenure stream or non-tenure stream faculty report having more problems with student cheating on examinations, papers, homework, and lab assignments?

7. Are there gender differences in the amount of faculty reporting student cheating on examinations, papers, homework, and lab assignments?

8. What should the University do to promote academic integrity in the classroom?

Faculty Knowledge of Academic Integrity Policy and University Programs

9. What is the level of faculty familiarity with the School of Arts and Sciences Academic Integrity Code and University programs?

    A. Do faculty members know the content of the School of Arts and Sciences Academic Integrity Code?

    B. Are faculty members familiar with the University's academic integrity programs?

1.1.4 Rationale/Significance of the Study

The aim of this study was not to blame faculty for student cheating, rather its aim was to provide faculty awareness of academic dishonesty. The study hoped to suggest strategies for institutions of higher learning to employ to begin to reduce this epidemic on their campuses. Since the literature is sparse on the role of faculty in the prevention of academic dishonesty, this study's outcome may inform the literature to heighten faculty awareness of academic integrity policies and procedures and may ultimately encourage faculty to report observed cases.

2.0 CHAPTER TWO

2.1 LITERATURE REVIEW

Students come to college faced with high expectations and dreaming of their future lives with credentials. At some point in the collegiate journey, students will be faced with the decision whether or not to violate academic integrity rules. Students know that if they are caught cheating, they would disappoint their family, damage their reputations with their professors, and possibly leave a blemish on their academic transcripts (Showghi, 2004). Whether or not the students are caught, unfavorable marks are left on the institution for failing to prevent the dishonest academic activity. The institution, academic department, faculty member, and student may have a share in the blame. This review of the literature will examine the prevalence of cheating and the cost of ignoring it, efforts of higher education institutions in preventing academic dishonesty, and the role of faculty in maintaining academic integrity within their own classrooms.

2.1.1 Prevalence of Cheating

Cheating is no longer just performed with a crib sheet in the corner of an exam classroom; it now encompasses the realm of plagiarizing from the Web for assignments and misrepresenting oneself in distance education courses. A large portion of the literature focuses

on cheating during an examination, cheating on homework, plagiarizing in writing assignments, and cheating using technology. How often do higher education students participate in these dishonest behaviors? Violations of academic integrity may go unnoticed by faculty and peers or are selectively, purposely ignored by faculty and peers. Asking students to confess using a survey remains the most common method to investigate the frequency of academic dishonesty (Cizek, 1999). Table 1 identifies the prevalence of self-reported academic dishonest behaviors among college students across the years from 1992 to 2008. Table 1 addresses the issue that although many studies obtain data about dishonest behaviors, few studies have gathered data on how often such behaviors are exercised. The final column in Table 1 displays whether the research study indicated the amount of dishonest behavior. For example, a study may ask students how many times they have bought a paper from the Internet. It can be suggested that the behaviors in Table 1 are the result of a lapse on the part of students when it comes to the issue of ethical behavior. Greene and Saxe (1992) surveyed 82 undergraduate students on 15 forms of dishonesty and the amounts of their behaviors. They found that 81% of undergraduates self-reported cheating, while 99% reported seeing their peers cheat.

In terms of students helping one another when it is not permissible, Hard, Conway, and Moran (2006) surveyed 421 university undergraduates and found that over 65% used cooperative "learning" techniques to complete work assignments that were to be completed as solo efforts. Davis et al. (1992) found that 76-88% of students would allow another student to access to their answers during an examination if the student in need was a friend. Zimmerman (1998), in a survey of 2,441 undergraduate and graduate students, found that half of the students admitted to collaborating on individual assignments, while Whitley and Keith-Spiegel (2002) found approximately 42% of 6,096 undergraduate students copied homework. Further, in a study by

Rettinger, Jordan, and Peschiera (2004), 70% of 103 undergraduate, liberal arts students admitted to cheating on homework. Robinson, Amburgey, Swank, and Faulkner (2004) reported that 76% of its 118 undergraduate students received questions from students that had already taken exams, while 89% collaborated on take-home exams.

Zimmerman (1998) found 49.1% of the students surveyed had copied sentences without footnoting. Over 48% of the undergraduates from the 31 institutions in the survey by Whitley and Keith-Spiegel (2002) admitted to plagiarism. Mustaine and Tewksbury (2005) reported that about 15% of its 1,218 students in its eight-state survey admitted to having fabricated references for a research paper.

McCabe and Trevino (1996) estimate that more than 85% of students just want a degree and try to get the degree with the minimum work possible, whether or not it involves cheating. Students rationalize that college is just a credentialing institution that allows students to pursue a chosen career. Cheating seems to have a grade attached to it. Each offense has its own level of moral intensity with some forms of cheating being deemed worse than others (Boselovic, 2006). According to Seirup-Pincus (1995), faculty members perceive academic dishonest behaviors on a continuum of seriousness. At one end of the continuum are the very serious offenses such as forging a University document, stealing a test, and sabotaging someone else's work. At the less serious end are behaviors such as failing to report a grading error and studying from someone else's notes.

Table 1. Student Self-Reported Academic Dishonesty in College, Years 1992-2008

Citation	Description	Forms of Dishonesty	Findings	Address Behavior Amounts
Davis, Grover, Becker, and McGregor (1992)	6,000 students from 35 colleges (eight large state, eight medium state, five large private, eight small private, six 2-year)	Cheating	Those admitting to cheating ranged from a low of 9% reported by a sample of women at a small private liberal arts college to a high of 64% reported by men at a small regional university.	No
Greene and Saxe (1992)	82 undergraduates	15 behaviors including bringing in a completed blue book to class	81% of undergraduates admitted to cheating, whereas 99% were able to cite cheating incidents of others.	Yes
Graham, Monday, O'Brien, and Steffen (1994)	480 students from two colleges in the Midwest, community college and Catholic college	17 behaviors including asking for an answer during an exam and giving test questions to later sections	89.9% admitted to cheating. For specific behaviors, those percentages topping the list include: allowing another student to copy homework (63.1%), using a paper for more than one class (53.6%), getting answers from a student in an earlier section (49.6%), giving questions to students in later sections (46.2%), using old tests without teacher knowledge (37.5%), and not contributing fairly in group work (36.4%).	No
Kerkvliet (1994)	420 Economic students at two large public universities	Examination cheating	42% of the randomized response survey students reported cheating on at least one examination in any course, whereas 25% of the conventional direct question survey students reported cheating on at least one examination in any course.	No
Davis and Ludvigson (1995)	2,153 juniors and seniors enrolled in upper division courses at public and private institutions in 11 states	Cheating	In this follow-up study drawn from S. F. Davis et al. (1992), between 42-64% of respondents from various institutions reported having cheated in college.	Yes
Spiller and Crown (1995)	2,583 students	Changing answers on a self-graded test	Studies published between 1927 and 1986 showed variation in reported cheating rates, ranging from eight percent to 81% with an average of 40%. Frequency was not related to the year of the study.	No
Mixon and Mixon (1996)	157 business students enrolled in economics and accounting at Southeastern Louisiana University	Cheated on a test or written work	37% admitted to having cheated.	Yes

Citation	Description	Forms of Dishonesty	Findings	Address Behavior Amounts
Diekhoff, LaBeff, Clark, Williams, Francis, and Haines (1996)	474 undergraduate introduction to sociology/psychology students at small state university in Southwestern U.S.	Cheating as defined by cheating on exams, cheating on quizzes, and cheating on assignments	61.2% reported engaging in some form of cheating.	No
Whitley (1998)	Literature review of 46 studies and 40 estimates. Studies of prevalence of cheating among college students published between 1970 and 1996 and national survey samples (McCabe and Trevino, 1993)	Unclassified cheating, cheating on exams and other assignments, cheating on homework and plagiarism	Reports of the prevalence of unclassified cheating ranged from 9-95%, with a mean of 70.4%; reports of the prevalence of cheating on exams ranged from 4-82% of students, with a mean of 41.3%; reports of the prevalence of cheating on homework ranged from 3-8% of students, with a mean of 40.9%; and reports of plagiarism ranged from 3-98% of students with a mean of 47.0%.	No
Zimmerman (1998)	2,441 graduate and undergraduate students from one urban commuter institution in the South (University of New Orleans)	13 behaviors including using cheat sheets and making an unauthorized copy of a computer program	The most common self-reported cheating behaviors were collaborating on individual assignments (49.9%) and copying sentences without footnoting (49.1%).	Yes
Lathrop and Foss (2000)	12,000 students at 40 small-to-medium sized colleges	Cheating	From 1990 to 1995 there was an increasing trend of collusion (30% to 38%).	No
Jordan (2001)	175 students from a small private, liberal arts college that had a formal honor code	17 behaviors including copying from another student's exam, plagiarism, and inventing laboratory data	54.9% reported participating in at least 1 cheating behavior during the target semester.	No
Jensen, Arnett, Feldman, and Cauffman (2002)	261 undergraduates at a state university in the Midwest	Six behaviors including copying homework and exams and using someone else's term paper	60% of college students indicated that they had copied off someone's homework during the past year, whereas a slightly larger percentage had allowed someone to copy their homework.	Yes
Stover and Kelly (2002)	Literature review from a case study. Research studies in which prevalence of plagiarism was reported.	Cheating by plagiarizing	Studies estimate that 40-60% of students cheat during their college careers.	No
Whitley and Keith-Spiegel (2002)	6,096 undergraduates from 31 institutions of higher education in the U.S. Data compiled from McCabe and Trevino (1993).	12 behaviors including using unfair means to learn test content beforehand	78.3% of the students admitted to committing any of the 12 behaviors. 52.2% admitted to cheating on exams. 41.6% admitted to copying homework, and 48.4% admitted to plagiarizing.	No

Citation	Description	Forms of Dishonesty	Findings	Address Behavior Amounts
Sheard, Markham, and Dick (2003)	597 undergraduate/ graduate/postgraduate students from School of Computer Science and Software Engineering at Monash University in Australia.	16 cheating behaviors including submitting same assignment in two+ courses and obtaining a medical excuse for a late assignment when not sick	79.2% of the undergraduate students (N=486) and 53.3% of the non-undergraduate students (N=111) reported participating in one or more cheating behaviors.	No
Rettinger, Jordan, and Peschiera (2004)	103 undergraduates from a liberal arts college in the Northeast.	17 honor code violations	83% admitted to having cheated in college. 53% reported cheating on exams, 42% on papers, and 70% on homework.	No
Robinson, Amburgey, Swank, and Faulkner (2004)	118 undergraduates from a public university in Eastern Kentucky.	Seven behaviors including collusion and using un-permitted notes	89% of students have collaborated on take-home exams. 34% admitted usage of cheat sheets, while 57-89% admitted to other cheating techniques. 76% admitted to receiving questions from someone who had already taken the exam.	Yes
Mustaine and Tewksbury (2005)	Survey of 1,218 students from 12 Southern post-secondary institutions (large and small universities and 4-year colleges) in 8 states.	Five behaviors including fabricated references for a research paper and having a ghost test taker	35.4% of the students reported cheating. The incidence rates follow: copied from someone during an exam ─ 13.8%; used unfair methods to learn test contents beforehand ─ 10.9%, fabricated references for a research paper ─ 15.1%, helped someone else to cheat (test/paper) ─ 17.8%, had someone take test or write paper for you ─ 5.1%.	No
Hard, Conway, and Moran (2006)	Survey of 421 undergraduates at a medium-sized university in the northeast.	16 behaviors including collusion and plagiarism	65.2% of students worked together on assignments when individual work was to be done, while 60.6% of the students lifted sentences, tables, etc. without crediting the authors.	Yes
Jackson (2007)	Survey of 295 students from three community colleges and three 4-year public universities.	11 acts including collaboration on assignments, copying during a test, turning in other's work	75% of community college students admitted involvement in one of the 11 acts, whereas 84.8% of the university students admitted to engaging in one of the 11 acts.	No
Miller, Shoptaught, and Parkerson (2008)	Survey of 324 students in a credit course (undergraduate and graduate)	12 behaviors including copying or paraphrasing without footnoting, getting answers from someone already having taken an exam, receiving help beyond expectations	80.7% of the students committed at least one of the 12 cheating behaviors with 46.6% copying or paraphrasing without footnoting, 47.2% receiving exam questions in advance, and 36.6% received assignment help beyond expectations.	No

2.1.2 The Cost of Ignoring Academic Dishonesty

Even though students give reasons for their academic dishonesty, there are social and practical consequences for ignoring student academic dishonesty. Consequences may include: the student and/or his or her peers are cheated, an increased risk that the student will cheat elsewhere in life, jeopardy of the institution's reputation, and lack of confidence in the credentialing system.

Academic dishonesty cheats the student in the following ways: the student learns little when the opportunity to learn is ignored, the gratification of creating something that he or she distinctly owns is lost, and if discovered by others, the career of the student could be ruined depending upon the context and seriousness of the offense (Whitley & Keith-Spiegel, 2001). Moral development and civic responsibility of students are some functions of higher education (Whitley & Keith-Spiegel, 2002). A motive that students freely use for academic dishonesty is that no one else will suffer (Jensen et al., 1992). Students are overlooking the fact that students who commit acts of academic dishonesty cheat themselves out of search for knowledge in classes to which their degrees are supposed to attest. Academically dishonest students also disadvantage peers when their class is norm-referenced graded. Students may even ruin their careers with permanent marking on their transcripts. For example, sanctions for academic integrity violations at the American University in Washington, DC may include a permanent notation on the student's transcript stating "Failure in Course [title] for a Violation of the Academic Integrity Code" (American University, 2002). Notations to the permanent academic record cannot be removed by the student and will be visible to anyone requesting a transcript including employers.

According to Whitley and Keith-Spiegel (2001), students who cheat in college frequently continue to cheat in graduate and professional schools and to engage in unethical business practices. Harding, Carpenter, Finelli, and Passow (2004) suggest a strong relationship between prior academic dishonesty (high school) and self-reported involvement in dishonest behavior (college and workplace) of engineering students. Their work suggests that despite changes in context from high school to college and to the workplace, many individuals will make the same ultimate decision when faced with a temptation to engage in deviant behavior. The top cheating temptations revolved around homework, lab reports, and tests or quizzes. Leading workplace temptations were usage of company supplies, falsification of records (time sheets, expense reports, and quality assurance documents), lying about work quality, ignoring safety problems, accepting improper gifts, and taking credit for another's work. Should it be part of the mandate of the educational system to prepare students to behave ethically in the business word? In the writings of Verschoor (2007), it seems as if business students are being socialized with deviant ideologies that may carry through to domains such as the classroom and later the workplace. Business executives are encouraged to use cutthroat techniques so that the winner takes all. A curriculum slanted at "short-term profitability at any cost" offset with stand-alone business ethic courses is an attempt to prevent business professionals from "following in the footsteps of Enron's senior management" (Vershoor, 2007, p. 15).

Further social consequences of academic dishonesty include damage done to the reputation of the institution when incidents of academic dishonesty are publicized. A damaging consequence of cheating is that the respect, trust, and the sense of community (from the classroom to the institution) are eroded (Cizek, 2003). Besides the reputation of the institution being tarnished as a result of academic integrity violations, students are falsely credentialed for

their professions with grades for courses that they did not rightly earn leaving the students unprepared for their professions when they graduate (Dick et al., 2003). According to Dick et al., graduating incompetent professionals who may produce faulty work could even endanger human life. A cheater "automatically reduces the credibility and the value of every other degree awarded by the alma mater" (ETS, 1999). A lack of confidence in the academy as a valid credentialing agency could possibly lead to loss of support for higher education (Whitley & Keith-Spiegel, 2001). What can the institution do to help?

2.1.3 Institutional Efforts

Since it is well documented that students are cheating, and society is paying a price, institutions of higher education are taking a serious look at their institutions to begin to battle this epidemic. Students and faculty responsibilities are spelled out in academic integrity policies and faculty are becoming more involved at the institutional level in its efforts to reduce cheating.

2.1.3.1 Academic Integrity Policies

Most higher education institutions have academic integrity policies in place to discourage cheating (McMurty, 2001). Whose domain of responsibility is it that students and faculty are educated about the content of institution's academic integrity policies and procedures? Some institutions insert into their on-line bulletins statements about academic integrity code. The on-line University of Pittsburgh's Arts and Sciences Undergraduate Student Handbook states that "Students and faculty are expected to familiarize themselves with the published rules and regulations governing academic integrity" (Academic Integrity Code, 2006). A logical question arises. Do faculty and students take the time to read the academic integrity policies and

procedures when they are not faced with a cheating crisis? At some institutions, academic integrity policies specify that it is the responsibility of the course instructor to specify academic integrity rules to his or her students. The Pennsylvania State University's academic integrity policy states "At the beginning of each course, it is the responsibility of the instructor to provide students with a statement clarifying the application of University and College academic integrity policies to that course" (Academic Integrity Policy, 2000). This would be a way for faculty and students to be reminded what the standards for integrity are at the university and school level. Biernacki (2004) found that some faculty members do not report cases of cheating due to unfamiliarity with their institution's policies and procedures.

McCabe' (1993) study of eight hundred faculty at 16 colleges and universities across the U.S. found that faculty at honor code institutions were "more likely to rate their schools higher than non[-honor] code schools on factors such as students' understanding of academic integrity policies, faculty support of these policies, and the overall effectiveness of the policy" (McCabe, Trevino, & Butterfield, 2001, p. 225). The McCabe (1993) study confirmed in its large diverse sample of faculty that faculty prefer to handle academic dishonesty one-on-one rather than get involved in the campus judicial process that is spelled out in academic integrity policies. Twenty percent and 30% of the faculty at non-honor code and honor code institutions respectively were either dissatisfied or very dissatisfied when they reported cheating. Complaints include the efforts of the faculty were too great, the penalties were not severe enough, and the judicial boards were too lenient.

In a study of 130 campuses, only 12% had judicial boards whereby students had enough votes to render a verdict of innocent or responsible without the support from at least one faculty member or administrator on the board (McCabe & Makowski, 2001). These 130 institutions

indicate that 47%, 27%, and 10% of the chairs of the judicial boards were faculty, administrators, and students, respectively. Of the remaining 16% of the campuses, the judicial board chair was elected or appointed and students could hold the position. Faculty and administration still hold the dominant role in the judicial process. Academic policy allowed faculty on 58% of the campuses to deal directly with suspected cases of academic dishonesty, while 18% of institutions indicated that their policy made no statement about faculty reporting suspicious incidents. Hearing boards were most often comprised of five members. McCabe and Makowski recommended that students be given three of the five votes if a majority is necessary to render a student guilty of cheating. McCabe and Makowski reasoned that they wanted to "give students real control of the process yet would also allow for faculty or administrator presence on the board, which is of value in promoting full, shared community responsibility for academic integrity" (p. 21). Even with this sharing of more control and responsibility with students, many academic integrity policies allow appeals to be made to the institution's highest administrative official for the final verdict and imposed sanction. In short, faculty and students need to be aware of their institution's academic integrity policy and be given opportunities to play a role on the judicial board.

2.1.3.2 Institutional Characteristics

According to Donald McCabe, the Founder of the Center for Academic Integrity at Rutgers University, these institutional characteristics are indicators of academic dishonesty: a campus norm of cheating, no honor code institution, faculty support of academic integrity policies is low, the penalties for academic integrity violations are not severe and there is little chance of detection, and there are higher incidences of violations at larger, less selective

institutions (ETS, 1999). Faculty plays a role in supporting their institution's anti-cheating efforts.

The institution needs to mandate that individual schools, departments, and faculty set precedence for academic integrity so that students clearly know what academic behaviors are prohibited. Students and faculty do not agree on what constitutes academic dishonest behaviors and they do not agree on the severity of the behavior (Roig & Ballew, 1994). This disagreement between faculty members and students "may be aggravated in situations in which the status of the behavior is ambiguous" (Whitley and Keith-Spiegel, 2002, p. 27). Schools and/or departments may choose to write their own academic integrity policy and require that this policy or reference to it be included on all faculty syllabi. As an example, the School of Arts and Sciences at the University of Pittsburgh in Pittsburgh, PA, is one such institution that requires undergraduate faculty to include a statement about academic integrity and the website link on all syllabi.

Since students and faculty define cheating behaviors differently and the levels of student cheating are consistently high across institutions of higher education (Dick et al., 2003), educators must look not only at their individual classroom situations but to the integrity goals of their institutions. Five successful ways in which faculty have been used by colleges and universities to reduce academic dishonesty at the institutional level are offered in Table 2.

Table 2. Ways Faculty Successfully Participate in Institutional Level Anti-Cheating Programs

Reinforcing an institutional culture of integrity
Honor code "participation"
Academic integrity training
Well-defined, consistent sanctions
Training in on-line detection programs

Reinforcing an Institutional Culture of Integrity

Institutions need to cultivate an environment of integrity and to educate students about dishonesty. One way to reduce academic dishonesty is to improve the educational culture so that students no longer decide to cheat. People with integrity will refrain from cheating. According to Hinman (1997),

> People with integrity have a sense of wholeness, of who they are, that eliminates the desire to pretend – through cheating, through plagiarizing, and the like – that they are someone else. For them, signing their name to something signifies that it is theirs. They would not want to pass something off as their own. (p. 2)

The challenge for colleges and universities is to instill in people integrity to which they live up to and challenge their peers to do the same. Integrity begins at home and is passed on to others. There are rules that apply to the road, rules that apply to the age of alcohol consumption, rules that apply to taxpayers, rules that ban steroid usage in athletics, and rules that apply to collegiate students. Students need to hear from the faculty that a degree is something that should be earned with honesty. However, changing the campus environment takes time. Policies and procedures need to be defined that pertain to academic dishonesty and there must be communication and enforcement across the campus community. Institutional policies and peer climate are related to cheating (Smith, 2000).

If institutions are genuinely interested in coping with the problems of academic dishonesty, they need to take a look at the clarity and adequacy of their institution's rules governing integrity, communicate this to incoming students, and enforce standards across disciplines and the school years (Parlour, 1995). At the institutional level, freshman orientation has often been the place where there is reference made to the institutional honor system and/or

policies governing academic dishonesty. Faculty members may become involved by reiterating the policies and violation procedures that are in place at the institution at the start of each term and before major assignments. Faculty members at some institutions are asked to reinforce the notion of zero tolerance for academic dishonesty in their syllabi.

Interestingly, a study by Levy and Rakovski (2006) suggests that an intolerant policy toward academic dishonesty will keep dishonest students from enrolling in courses, but at the price of also deterring some honest students from registering for the zero tolerance courses. Levy and Rakovski "hypothesized that a professor's high expectations regarding honest academic behavior would attract honest students and deter dishonest students" (p. 740). Of the 813 respondents to a question concerning a zero tolerance professor, 132 (10.6%) respondents indicated that honest students would avoid or avoid at all costs zero tolerance professors. Levy and Rakovski suggest that over 10% of the honest students will avoid a professor taking a zero tolerance stand, while the professor's stance will discourage about one-third of the most dishonest students from enrolling. These authors did not systematically explore the causes of honest students avoidance of a zero tolerance professor, but reported that open-ended comments indicated that the students may perceive the professor to be inflexible in other areas of the teacher-student relationship and that a "harmless" act might be interpreted as a dishonest act by the zero tolerance professor. Thus, honest students may be "scared off" by a professor's strong, inflexible attitudes.

Honor Code "Participation"

Faculty members also play a role in institutional integrity at institutions with honor codes. They often "play a compelling role in the fulfillment of an institutional pledge to support a culture of academic integrity" (Biernacki, 2004, p. 12). Institutions with an honor code system

appear to have a better success rate in combating academic dishonesty, and the likelihood of cheating increases when peers possess supportive and tolerant attitudes toward cheating. Academic institutions would like to foster a culture of honesty and ethical conduct and often attempt to do so through the establishment of honor codes and promises that students repeat at admission orientation. Faculty members often "relate the academic honor policies of the institution through their syllabi" (Levy & Rakovski, 2006, p. 735) and might also express discontent with dishonest students by encouraging students to report cases of academic integrity violations. The likelihood of cheating decreases when peers possess intolerant attitudes toward cheating.

McCabe, Trevino, and Butterfield (1999) conducted a qualitative investigation in regards to the academic integrity in honor code and non-honor code institutions. Honor code students were significantly less likely to rationalize or justify their own cheating as students from non-honor code institutions. However, the literature remains controversial whether honor codes as sole preventive methods do indeed discourage cheating. It seems best to suggest that the concept of peer disapproval augmented through an honor code system may discourage cheating. Just having an honor code means little if students do not know how to use it. The honor code must be introduced to new students and made a topic of ongoing campus dialog throughout the students' college experience. This is where faculty step in and reinforce the honor system in their classrooms. A clear institutional policy is established whereby trust is given to students on honor-code campuses. Faculty then reminds students that they are stewards of their own scholarship as well as stewards of their peers. According to McCabe and Trevino (2002), peer disapproval is a suggested method of reducing cheating. The campus culture associates a negative social stigma to students engaging in acts of academic dishonesty. Students must

actively engage in accepting responsibility for their own and their peer academic integrities. Students find it easy to convince themselves that it is permissible to cheat if others are cheating and the institution or individual faculty members are doing nothing about it (McCabe, 1992). Students cheat, but they "cheat less often at schools with an honor code and a peer culture that condemns dishonesty" (McCabe & Trevino, 2002, p. 37).

Academic Integrity Training

A third method of increasing academic integrity at the institutional level is to have the entire faculty trained as to what academic integrity is and how violations should be handled. An institution's honor code or academic integrity policies and procedures would be ineffective just standing alone so academics need to be informed and receive support from their institutions in dealing with academic integrity issues (Dick et al., 2003). A workshop during new faculty orientation is a way to indoctrinate the future educator's about the seriousness that the institution places upon honest scholarship. Hall (1996) noted that faculty has a special need to address questions about collaborative learning and academic cheating. Where should the line be drawn? Hall also shared the importance of including a syllabus integrity statement in new faculty handbooks.

Mandatory periodic refresher workshops on academic integrity would allow faculty from across the disciplines a way to share their successes and failures. These refresher workshops could include information on the profile of a cheater, the peer culture and reporting peers, and ethical and behavioral theories and models of academic dishonesty. Faculty that is educated regarding what behaviors to expect from students are more readily prepared to face situations that arise in their classroom.

Well-defined, Consistent Sanctions

A fourth method that faculty can be involved with their institutions to reduce the occurrences of academic dishonesty is to consistently hand out the well-defined consequences of academic dishonesty that are visible in their institution policies (Dick et al., 2003). The faculty should also report cases of dishonesty and the consequences to the institution so that these numbers can be published for students to see as a reminder that the faculty backs the institution's efforts to maintain fair scholarship.

Students want boundaries with enforced sanctions when they observe peers cheating. Faculty and peers are influential in setting the "institution's tone" toward tolerance or intolerance of academic dishonesty. It is as if students want boundaries and discipline for overstepping those boundaries. Findings seem to show that it may be beneficial to educate faculty on how college students view various responses to academic integrity violations (Carter & Punyanunt-Carter, 2006). Students appear to prefer a negotiation strategy that is handled after class, not before a judicial board, peer or other. This makes sense because it seems worse to be embarrassed in front of peers and/or the administration than handling the case after class in the privacy of the professor's office. Most institutions have clearly defined disciplinary proceedings for students who flagrantly engage in acts of dishonesty; however, faculty needs to address penalties for less serious instances of misconduct as well (Wilhoit, 1994).

Training in On-line Detection Programs

Institutions should support faculty in their endeavors to maintain integrity in their classrooms by providing training on and encouraging the usage of technology to aid in academic dishonesty detection (Dick et al., 2003). Turnitin.com, a leading anti-plagiarism program developed in Oakland, CA is a popular software program with campus-wide subscription costs

ranging from $1,000 to $10,000 per year, depending on college size. The program is easy to use and is known for its large repository of student papers. In 2002, approximately 150,000 students from 400 colleges in the U.S. were on its client list (Foster, 2002; Plagiarize, 2002). Turnitin archives papers that are submitted by registered users. In addition to papers, the Turnitin database consists of 800 million Internet pages (Groark, Oblinger, & Choa, 2001). Turnitin.com reports that some 30% of submitted papers are "less than original" since Turnitin.com software detects instances of word-for-word replication or obvious paraphrasing amongst papers stored in its database (Plagiarize, 2002). The software chops each paper into small pieces and compares the digital fingerprints to more than a billion similarly collected fingerprints. When a matching pattern is found, the software makes a note and highlights the instances of paraphrasing or replication.

Other commercial services to which instructors may submit papers include EVE2 (Easy Verification Engine), CopyCatch, and PaperBin (Johnson, Patton, Bimber, Almeroth, & Michaels, 2004). EVE2 is anti-plagiarism software that instructors may license for a one-time fee and download to their hard drives. Once the instructor submits a student's writing to the software, it examines the text and makes a large number of searches of the Internet to locate "suspect" sites. Once these sites are located, EVE2 visits them to determine if they contain work that matches the paper in question (Groark et al., 2001). CopyCatch is a tool that screens documents for matching phrases of text. Instructors submit files to compare to one another. The basic version is available at no cost to higher education institutions, but the enhanced version requires a fee and it searches the Web for similarities. PaperBin.com is a subscription service for faculty who desire to prevent plagiarism. Student papers are checked against its database for

similarities and the instructor is e-mailed the analysis. Subscription cost is $4.95 per registered instructor.

Fees-based software detection programs can be used by faculty so that institutions are prepared to retaliate against text copied from websites, ready-made papers, or other students. In addition to commercial services, faculty may also be trained to simply submit suspicious phrases from their student papers to Google.com or Google scholar (http://scholar.google.com). Institutions can adopt an effort to train faculty to use software and search engines to detect plagiarism. Next, consider what faculty can do within their classrooms to prevent cheating.

2.1.4 Faculty Role in the Classroom

Faculty plays a central role in upholding the institution's assurance of integrity standards within their classrooms. The faculty role in maintaining academic integrity will be examined by considering the similarities and differences between student and faculty attitudes towards academic dishonesty, how faculty confront suspected cases of academic integrity violations, and identifiable tactics that faculty have been using to successfully deter cheating.

2.1.4.1 Faculty versus Student Attitudes

Across research studies, compared with students, faculty view academic dishonest behaviors differently (Biernacki, 2004; Roig & Ballew, 1994; Sims, 1995). As faculty struggle with students who viewing cheating behaviors differently than themselves, faculty must also deal with the issue of cultural relativism. Students from certain African, Asian, and Middle Eastern cultures believe that words and ideas are the property of citizens as opposed to being owned by an individual (O'Leary, 1999). Hence, collaboration is not considered culturally wrong. So,

faculty are armed with the task of facing students whose opinions may differ from their own regarding what is and isn't cheating.

Higbee and Thomas (2002) administered academic integrity questionnaires to faculty and students at a large southeastern public research university. Behaviors could be classified as cheating, not cheating, or depends. Over forty-nine percent of the faculty thought that turning in the same paper during the same semester was unquestionably dishonest, whereas almost 40% of the students thought that the behavior was unquestionably dishonest. Several faculty members thought that the behavior was acceptable provided that the paper was tailored for each class. One faculty member thought it would be "hypocritical for teachers to criticize students for writing more than one paper based on the same library research, considering how many publications may be generated by one faculty research project" (p. 45). A student suggested using a paper more than once only if it received a high grade, while others thought turning in the same paper twice was "ok" if the paper fit both courses.

A greater percentage of the faculty in general thought that the listed behaviors were wrong. Ninety-six percent of the faculty thought that changing laboratory results to reflect what the results should have been was unquestionably inappropriate, while 84% of the students agree. Eleven percent of the faculty thought that maintaining a file of exams to be used by an organization was always wrong, whereas only two percent of the students agreed. Sororities and fraternities are notorious for this activity. Over forty-three percent of students responded that asking someone from an earlier class for test questions was always wrong, whereas 77% of the faculty agreed.

Whitley and Keith-Spiegel (2002) list five norms that students do not consider to be dishonest academic behaviors. One, students may study from old tests without the instructor's

permission. Two, taking short cuts such as reading condensed books, listing unread sources in a bibliography, and faking lab reports is permissible. Three, unauthorized collaboration with others is okay especially if student being helped is their friend. Four, some forms of plagiarism are tolerated (omitting sources and using direct quotations without citation). Five, conning teachers is permissible. Faking excuses for missing deadlines and marking more than one answer on a multiple choice test were considered to not be dishonest. In addition, students may not see acts of dishonesty as being wrong in courses in which they have negative attitudes.

Faculty on the other hand did not consider the following four behaviors to be dishonest (Whitley & Keith-Spiegel, 2002). One, behaviors may be accidental such as marking more than one response on a multiple-choice question or not citing all sources used in a paper's bibliography. Two, faculty overlooked behaviors that may result from ignorance such as not knowing how to cite a direct quote. Three, students asking other students to proof their paper for grammatical and spelling errors prior to the assignment being graded, and lastly, approximate behaviors such as reading a condensed version of a book was considered to not be dishonest.

Despite the areas of agreement, students generally view academic dishonesty more leniently than do faculty members (Sims, 1995). The severity of the academic offense also plays a role in the dealing with integrity. Institutional or cultural factors may also contribute to how severe faculty and students view offenses (Koljatic & Silva, 2002). The goal remains to bring faculty and student views into alignment. Often this is accomplished by an institutional list of un-permissible behaviors that can be read by both parties. However, Jendrek (1989) found that the creation of a detailed dishonesty code did not guarantee that faculty would follow it.

Biernacki (2004) conducted an academic integrity research study of faculty and undergraduates from a small private university in the southeast. She found a statistical

significant difference in mean scores (1.0 = “no influence” to 4.0 = “strong influence”) for teaching behaviors that may influence student cheating between the faculty and student groups. Faculty respondents believed that most grading behaviors listed, moderately or slightly influenced student cheating, whereas student respondents perceived slight to no influence of faculty grading behaviors on student cheating. Overall, faculty members perceived most of the teaching behaviors to have a greater influence on student cheating than did the students.

In a study of the estimated prevalence of 28 dishonest academic behaviors provided by 217 students and 38 faculty members, student perceptions differed from those held by faculty (Koljatic & Silva, 2002). Student’s perceived academic dishonest behaviors to be more widespread. With student self-reported behaviors as the “true” rate, students overestimated the rates of cheating behavior among fellow students by 11.4%, while only two percent of faculty overestimated cheating rates. Similarly, Simon, Carr, DeFlyer, McCullough, Morgan, Oleson, and Ressel (2001) found that 21% of the students in a survey indicated that downloading papers off the Internet to be a moderate to serious problem at their institution, whereas 10% of faculty at the institution indicated that they suspected that undergraduates had downloaded papers from the Internet and submitted them as their own work.

2.1.4.2 Academic Integrity Violations

Faculty, when they observe or suspect that academic integrity has been violated; need to make the determination if the behavior is indeed deemed to be dishonesty by their institution. Dick et al. (2003) defined a behavior as cheating if one of the two following questions could be answered in the positive.

- Does the behavior violate the rules that have been set for the assessment task?

- Does the behavior violate the accepted standard of student behavior at the institution?

If a student's behavior violates one or both standards, the faculty member needs to consider the seriousness of the offense. Dick et al. (2003) lists six factors that need to be considered when a professor assesses the seriousness of an academic offense.

1. Did the student intend to deceive and did the student intend to achieve an unfair advantage?
2. Was any other person directly harmed by the behavior now or in the future?
3. What value does the assessment task represent in the overall course?
4. Is the scope of the behavior limited to one or two students?
5. Does the cheating behavior represent a criminal behavior such as theft, blackmail, or fraud?
6. Has the student not satisfactorily mastered the learning? (p. 172-173)

The seriousness of an academic integrity violation increases with any of the following: deception, direct harm to another student, the greater the value of the assessment task, the larger the scope of the cheating behavior, if the behavior was criminal in nature, and if the student has not mastered the learning outcome.

2.1.4.3 Confronting Academic Dishonesty

Once faculty members render the behaviors as dishonest, these educators are faced with the task of confronting students whom they suspect or observe committing academic dishonesty. At the University of Central Florida, Biernacki (2004) surveyed faculty and found that of the reported incidents of academic dishonesty, action was taken two-thirds of the time. The remaining one-third of the time, 58% of the faculty ignored an incident of dishonesty within the past year on some occasions, mostly due to lack of evidence. When cheating was observed or

suspected, 38% percent of the faculty surveyed reported cheating students to the administration, Department Chair, or the disciplinary committee within the past year, 34.5% of the time.

Passive Actions

Why would a faculty member choose not to support his or her institution in stamping out academic dishonesty? One key issue in the management of academic dishonesty is faculty legal responsibilities. In today's litigious society, it may be possible for faculty to be "sued by a student and in some cases may not be defended by their institution as they have violated the institution's policy on cheating" (Dick et al., 2003, p. 182). Documented cases exist whereby professors who pursued cheating allegations became victimized by the process (Schneider, 1999). Faculty confronting students may create undesirable consequences. First, a student's career may be ruined. Second, the faculty member may become entangled in lengthy litigation (Davis et al., 1992). There are three conditions under which faculty are likely to be found liable for damages: a) if the faculty member makes a knowingly false and malicious accusation, b) if the faculty member discusses the case and uses the student's name with individuals who are not involved in the resolution of the matter, and c) if the faculty member violates the student's right to due process by ignoring the institution's procedures for resolving academic dishonest accusations (Whitley & Keith-Spiegel, 2002).

Besides the fear of lawsuits, faculty may be reluctant to go forward with formal charges due to mistrust of administrators and desire to maintain control of the situation (Schneider, 1999). In addition, some faculty members have experienced retaliation from students or animosity from other faculty when putting forth a formal charge (Simon et al., 2001). Donald L. McCabe surveyed 800 faculty at 16 institutions in which 70% of the students reported cheating at least once (Schneider, 1999). He found that 40% of the faculty reported never reporting

cheating, 54% reported seldom reporting cheating, while only 6% reported often reporting cheating. Faculty also take passive actions for incidents of dishonesty due to lack of administrative support, justice perusal being too time consuming, being too busy with other responsibilities, unfamiliarity with the university academic integrity policies and procedures, consideration of the behavior as trivial, concern that students would not like them, and fear that their teaching and classroom management skills will be brought into question (Biernacki, 2004). Faculty who did not confront students whom they suspected or observed being involved in an academic dishonesty case were left with feelings of discontent and their relationships with the involved parties suffered (Saddlemire, 2005).

Proactive Actions

McCabe in Schneider (1999) found that when faculty does confront students, it tends to confront them one-on-one, quickly, and quietly. Actions taken by faculty may be outlined in the institution's academic integrity guidelines. Table 3 lists eight proactive actions that faculty may pursue against students who they suspect or observe cheating. Biernacki (2004) found that the most frequent action taken against students was a verbal reprimand. Fifty-one percent of the faculty members reported using this strategy over the past year, while close to 40% reported giving students zero grades on tests or assignments. Many faculty members took more than one disciplinary action against students involved in cheating. Eighty percent of the faculty members either verbally warned dishonest students and/or gave zero grades on tests or assignments in lieu of reporting the students. It seems that faculty members as well as students prefer to handle problems informally rather than by formal university policy (Jendrek, 1992). In addition, Jendrek (1989) examined faculty reactions to students' cheating on exams at a university that has a policy for defining, processing, and punishing instances of academic dishonesty. Results

indicated that faculty members tended to ignore academic integrity policy and preferred to deal with each situation on a one-on-one basis because the faculty did not understand implications of following or ignoring integrity policy. In a study of 234 faculty at the University of Nevada, Reno, nearly 59% of the respondents preferred to handle suspected cases of academic dishonesty informally because there is often insufficient evidence to formalize a charge. Thirty-eight percent of the faculty indicated that they would be uneasy with the process of formalizing a violation of academic integrity against a student; whereas 42% stated that they would be comfortable formalizing a charge. According to Graham et al. (1994), faculty generally can agree on a definition of cheating yet cannot agree on how to deal with cheating. According to Saddlemire (2005), faculty tends to agree that violations of academic integrity have to be handled independent of one another due to the different variables involved. Faculty probably will become involved in several cheating incidents, sometimes against their wishes, during their careers. This involvement will force them to deal with how to maintain integrity in their own classrooms. They are now compelled to "balance their own personal values and beliefs with those of the professional culture surrounding them" (Saddlemire, 2005, p. 117). Finally, if faculty members have evidence to confront, they should be motivated by specific goals when facilitating a resolution and possibly wait until their emotions of "anger, betrayal, and fear" have subsided (Saddlemire, 2005, p. 122).

Table 3. Proactive Actions taken by Faculty against Cheaters

Verbally reprimanded the student(s)
Written reprimand to student(s) and advisor(s)
Student(s) had to redo an assignment or retake an examination
Reduced letter grade for the test or assignment
Awarded a zero for the test or assignment
Failed student for the course
Formalized case to the Dean or Department Chair
Formalized case to the Student Judicial Board

Is direct confrontation the best means to draw closure to an academic integrity violation? In the qualitative survey study by Staddlemire (2005), some faculty chose alternatives to direct confrontation. Some faculty members allow students to admit their own guilt, while others grade very stringently when they see papers with identical answers. Some faculty ask the guilty parties to come forward so that they may be given a chance to redo the test or assignment at a reduced grade or fail the test or assignment.

2.1.4.4 Deterring Cheating

While a student was seated at a desk waiting for the professor to hand out the final exam and accompanying blue book, the professor paused before the class and said, "You may look upward for inspiration, downward for concentration, but not to the side for information" (Cizek, 1999, p. 163). How can faculty be used to prevent cheating? In the 2004 May/June issue of *Change*, D. L. McCabe and G. Pavela offered 10 principles for faculty members to apply on their campuses to promote collegiate integrity and discourage cheating. These 10 principles were proposed when McCabe found that less than two-thirds of faculty placed academic integrity code

references on their course outlines. These principles create a "modified" honor code that seems to have produced lower rates of cheating and plagiarism at institutions adopting them. This "modified" code encourages students to take an active role in setting higher ethical standards for peers while retaining the usual proctoring of tests.

Principle 1, faculty should "discuss their commitment to seeking the truth, integrity, and honesty with their students" (Just Ask Perspective, 2004, p. 8). Teachers have an obligation to their institutions and their professions to reward scholarship to students who master knowledge and to show dishonor to students who are academically dishonest (Strike & Soltis, 2004). Ethical values and principles are an issue. When a student enrolls or a faculty member is hired by the institution of higher learning, he or she becomes a member of the community and assumes "obligations to [the] institution whose rules one presumably agrees to follow" (Strike & Soltis, 2004, p. 2).

Principle 2, faculty should foster lifelong commitments to learning. A job of a teacher is to "demonstrate that learning can be a captivating and joyful experience" (McCabe & Pavela, 2004, p. 12). Educators need to pay attention to cheating motives because "cheating is the symptom of disinterest or dissatisfaction that students have with education" (p. 12). Educators cannot do much to alter the fact that "if Bozo the Clown were in front of the class, the results would be [practically] the same. The bright [students] would do well, [and] the dummies would fare poorly" (Strike & Soltis, 2004, p. 132). A battle lies within the hearts and minds of the "70-80% of students for whom dishonesty is not the first option but who, under [some] circumstances, may turn to [academic dishonesty] as a last resort" (Hinman, 2002, p. 36). Cheating for them is not a way of life. The battle is not with the 10-15% who would cheat under no circumstances, nor is the battle with the fewer than 10% that actively plan in advance to

cheat. The war is raged with the largest proportion of students who find that they face a deadline, are bored with the material, or can't stand the teacher. Cheating under these circumstances seems more justifiable. Yes, a deadline is important, but more important is the scholarship that students achieve as they master the material at hand with a fondness for the subject. According to Redden (2008), an educator's job is to make the material relevant and interesting to students by building on his or her own enthusiasm in the subject matter. An instructor's desire is that this enthusiasm becomes infectious.

A third principle to promote collegiate integrity is to affirm the role of a teacher as a guide and mentor (Just Ask Perspective, 2004). Students need to be shown how to study, learn, write, and do research. Many students do not perceive plagiarism to be all that wrong (Ashworth, Bannister, & Thorne, 1997). Also, students have their own moral code as to what type of peer help is justifiable and what they consider okay academic behaviors to engage in as long as it does not disadvantage other students. In a survey by the Center for Academic Integrity at Duke University in which almost 50,000 students participated, over 75% of the respondents did not think copying off the Internet was a serious issue (Barlow, 2006). In the same survey, 40% admitted using at least a few unacknowledged borrowings in their papers (Warger, 2005). Brown and Howell (2001) conducted a study to examine the efficacy of policy statements on plagiarism and showed that the wording of statements on plagiarism was critical. It was not enough alone to make a statement about plagiarism. The statement must be worded right. The study showed that students need to know where the boundaries are drawn in regards to appropriate academic behaviors. A cursory definition and friendly warnings were found to be ineffective compared with specifics on the definition of plagiarism and how to avoid it in writings. Faculty need to give students examples of passages that are plagiarized and

paraphrased. Students should receive this training upon entrance to the institution, and in subsequent courses that require any type of writing. Faculty will reduce the amount of plagiarism by "taking away the perceived need for a student to cheat" (Just Ask Perspective, 2004, p. 8). Besides plagiarism, collusion should be addressed. It is not unusual for students in first courses to not know the difference between helping each other and doing each other's work (Dick et al., 2003). Faculty should train students on "how and when to help each other without shortcutting the educational experience" (Dick, 2003, p. 179).

Principle 4 is to help students understand the Internet and its potential for problems (Just Ask Perspective, 2004). The Internet offers endless possibilities for learning and also the potential problems of theft, fraud, and deception "if students don't learn disciplined ways to use online sources effectively and honestly" (McCabe & Pavela, 2004, p. 13). There are at least three kinds of term paper sources on the Web (Lathrop & Foss, 2000). These include traditional paper mills, papers "published" by students and instructors, and free papers for the downloading. Students need to hear from faculty that they can be "informed" by such papers, but turning them in as their own workmanship is undeniably forbidden.

Principle 5 is that students need to be encouraged to be responsible for academic integrity. It is time to stop the notion that everyone is doing it. Whether the institution uses an honor code or a modified honor code, students should be given a "significant role in establishing and upholding student standards" (Just Ask Perspective, 2004, p. 8). The goal is to have students working "in communities where competition is fair, integrity is respected, and cheating is punished" (McCabe & Pavela, 2004, p. 13).

Principle 6 is faculty clarifying expectations for students. What are the educational goals of the class paper, class assignments, and class examinations? Forming "a partnership between

the student and the [faculty member] in the learning process helps the student better understand the reasons and goals behind the assigned work" (Dick et al., 2003, p. 179). Faculty should address the standards, remind students of the standards, and uphold the standards themselves (Just Ask Perspective, 2004). Course syllabi are places where students receive guidance about courses and clarification of "course expectations in advance regarding honesty in academic work, including the nature and scope of student collaboration" (McCabe & Pavela, 2004, p. 14). In addition, faculty need to instill in their students that there is no expectation for students to be experts on any number of things that they are asked to write about, rather that students should be foretold that they need to "support their conclusions with evidence and arguments by others who really are experts" (Barlow, 2006, p. 43).

Principle 7 is faculty development of fair and creative forms of assessment. Students despise busywork. It requires more time for faculty to develop personal, creative assignments. It's more difficult to justify cheating on an assignment personally tailored for the student (McCabe & Pavela, 2004). Students are deprived of their opportunity to test their theories during an exam if they cheat (Davis & Ludvigson, 1995). Faculty should tell students that if they desire to aim for understanding, then they should take a fair opportunity to be tested. Cheating can be reduced with quality assessment items (Dick et al., 2003). Faculty needs to invent creative ways to combat academic dishonesty during exams. Shon (2006) using in-depth narratives from 119 higher education students enrolled in a criminology class, examined creative tactics used by students during in-class exams and found that students manipulate variables such as psychological and behavioral profiles of their professors, technology, peers, and their own bodies to negotiate schemes undetectable to their professors.

Dick et al. (2003) suggests ways that faculty may reduce cheating with quality assessment items. First, for projects, create unique assignments for each student or groups of students. There will be less collaboration across projects. Second, faculty should change assignments each term so that students are not tempted to obtain copies of previous student answers. Third, faculty should reduce unnecessary constraints on students' work that has no educational value. If working together is permissible, and there is no need to demonstrate self-sufficiency, then the focus should be the learning objective, not independent work. Fourth, faculty should assess students on work that they have individually done such as papers, lab assignments, and computer programs. A fifth way faculty may reduce cheating is to give some open book, open note exams which will allow students to demonstrate higher levels of learning such as synthesis and analysis rather than recall.

However, faculty should be cautioned that although creativity cuts down on some cheating, traditional approaches are still necessary. For example, staggering student seating, preparing multiple test versions, and close monitoring deter cheating (Dick et al., 2003). Kerkvliet and Sigmond (1999) found that in a survey of 393 students from 12 classes at two universities that there was an estimated 12% reduction in cheating with the simple use of an additional test proctor or the usage of verbal announcements about honesty. An additional test version reduced the probability that students cheated by 25%, and "the control measure having the largest deterrent effect was having a tenure-track faculty member as opposed to a Graduate Teaching Assistant (GTA) as the instructor" (Kerkvliet & Sigmond, 1999, p. 341). When students were taught by faculty rather than GTAs, they were 32% less likely to cheat. Also, changing the normal seating location of students accompanied by the administration of multiple versions of a test with items in different sequences frustrates students who are trying to borrow

answers. In addition, neighboring students now might not know the achievement records of the students next to them (Strom & Strom, 2007).

Principle 8 of the list of Ten Principles of Academic Integrity is for faculty to reduce opportunities for students to engage in academic dishonesty. As was just shown, proper classroom management techniques and good exam security may reduce cheating. (McCabe & Pavela, 2004) suggest encouraging floundering students to visit the university resource centers such as writing centers, math centers, or language resource centers.

Principle 9 asks faculty to respond to academic dishonesty when it takes place. No repercussion cheapens the degree. If a student has cheated, he or she has cheated, even if it is the first offense (Just Ask Perspective, 2004). However, punishments need not be "unduly punitive" for first offenses. It is easier for faculty to not be bothered and look the other way. Interestingly, in a study of 267 social science students from a large Southwestern public university, no significant differences were found between faculty turning a blind eye and sending the cheater(s) before a review board. Possibly students perceive that the faculty members do not want to deal with the incidents so they place them into someone else's hands (Carter & Punyanunt-Carter, 2006). College students prefer a negotiation option as the way to resolve cases as opposed to faculty members doing nothing by ignoring the incidents.

Principle 10 calls for faculty to help define and support academic integrity standards on a campus wide basis. McCabe and Pavela (2004) suggest that there is more to integrity than identifying repeat offenders and applying consistent due process procedures. McCabe and Pavela want faculty to affirm shared values that make colleges and universities true communities by enforcing integrity standards and accepting only genuine coursework from their students.

2.1.5 Summary

Regardless of the societal harm that cheating can cause, the percentage of self-reported incidents of cheating in higher education remains high. There is a need to spend time and energy controlling cheating that could be better utilized on enhancing positive learning (Dick et al., 2003). Institutional training on the factors that motivate academic dishonesty may serve as a springboard for faculty to best anticipate circumstances that may entice academic dishonesty. Also, proper education of students may curb some of the dishonest behaviors.

Faculty can set the stage for integrity in their classrooms. Faculty pedagogical conduct can positively influence students to maintain academic integrity. Faculty also may raise the bar to deter students from cheating by writing multiple forms of examinations, increasing proctorship, and campaigning for smaller class sizes.

Why do faculty members often ignore incidents or suspected incidents of academic dishonesty? A faculty member suspects that a student has cheated, but is may be too difficult to pursue because of insufficient evidence and/or too time consuming to pursue because the situation could escalate if the student denies the charge. Faculty need to know the boundaries under which they can operate. A faculty member may have to deal with retaliation with legal action if he or she ignored or is ignorant of his or her institution's academic integrity policies and reporting procedures. This study investigated how much training faculty have had in handling cheating in the classroom, how faculty responded to cheating in their classrooms, and how well the faculty knew their school's academic integrity policy.

3.0 CHAPTER THREE

3.1 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The setting of this study was the University of Pittsburgh, a state-related public research university that serves 9,790 full-time equivalent and 538 part-time Arts and Science students and employs 702 full-time and 310 part-time faculty (Fact Book, 2008). The potential population of this study consisted of all undergraduate Arts and Sciences instructors with the exception of GTAs at the University of Pittsburgh located in Pittsburgh, PA. This study consisted of a two-phase research design.

3.1.1 Phase One

The first phase of this study was issue generation. This phase of the study, which fulfilled the investigator's Supervised Research class, was initiated Spring Term of 2007 and was completed Summer Term of 2007. During the first phase of this research, 19 of the 25 invited undergraduate Arts and Sciences instructors participated in a face-to-face academic integrity interview with the investigator. The literature was consulted to define academic dishonest behavior, and the literature was used to create academic integrity questions. The purpose of the first phase of the study was to investigate issues in maintaining academic integrity within faculty classrooms. IRB approval was obtained prior to data collection. Refer to Appendix C.

From the analysis of the interviews, a questionnaire was developed and subsequently modified to permit the gathering of data on a larger scale during the phase of dissertation study. One of the key items to be removed from the survey was data that pertained to faculty perceptions of how severe particular types of cheating were. It was determined that each dishonest infraction would be situationally dependent upon the student(s) involved and the surrounding circumstances at hand. In addition, five faculty members had reviewed the questionnaire prior to IRB submission in Phase Two of the study. IRB approval was obtained, refer to Appendix C.

3.1.2 Dissertation Study Population and Sample

Faculty members that were listed as faculty on the Arts and Sciences online faculty directory were surveyed from 31 Arts and Sciences departments in which faculty taught undergraduate courses. The Data Warehouse reporting tool of the PeopleSoft Student Service System identified the undergraduate faculty from these departments. Participation was solicited through an invitation e-mail with a link to the survey. Appendix A contains the e-mail invitation. Two weeks after the initial e-mail invitation, a second e-mail (Appendix B) containing another link to the survey was sent by the investigator reminding the instructors to fill out the survey.

3.1.3 Data Collection Instrument

A faculty (instructor) survey in Appendix D was developed to investigate faculty training regarding academic dishonesty, the dissemination of academic integrity expectations to students,

faculty perceptions of academic integrity in the classroom, faculty responses to incidents of academic dishonesty, and faculty familiarity with the School of Arts and Sciences Academic Integrity Code. Individual survey items have been cross-referenced to research questions as depicted in Table 4.

Table 4. Cross-reference of Research Questions to Individual Survey Items

Research Question	Corresponding Survey Items*
1. What types of academic integrity training have faculty received at the University?	1
2. What information do faculty members provide to students about academic integrity?	2-3
3. How extensive is the problem of academic dishonesty in the classroom?	4-5
4. What techniques do faculty members employ to prevent cheating on exams in their classes?	6
5. What actions do faculty members take when they encounter academic dishonesty on examinations, homework, and papers in their classrooms?	8-9
6. Does tenure stream or non-tenure stream faculty report having more problems with student cheating on examinations, papers, homework, and lab assignments?	15, 5
7. Are there gender differences in the amount of faculty reporting student cheating on examinations, papers, homework, and lab assignments?	13, 5
8. What should the University do to promote academic integrity in the classroom?	7
9. What is the level of faculty familiarity with the School of Arts and Sciences Academic Integrity Code and the University's academic integrity programs?	10-11

* Survey items 12-15 collected faculty demographic data.

Literature has shown that asking respondents to answer questions of a sensitive nature such as passive approaches taken by faculty to overlook academic dishonest behaviors are best done by softening the wording (Dillman, 2000). The passive approach questions were asked in a non-accusing manner. Also, although reliability and validity are discussed as if they are inherent in a survey instrument, literature also shows that respondents are more likely to answer survey questions honestly if they feel their responses are confidential and anonymous (TAP Multi-Community, 1998/1999).

3.1.4 Data Analysis

The SAS (Statistical Analysis Software) programming language was used to input and analyze the investigator's survey data. Frequencies were determined of

- the types of training that faculty have had in academic integrity
- the way in which faculty introduced academic integrity to their classes
- whether faculty discussed penalties for cheating with their classes
- the types of cheating that faculty had in the classroom
- testing techniques that faculty used to deter cheating
- ways in which the University should promote academic integrity in the classroom
- the disciplinary actions that faculty have taken when cheating occurs
- reasons why faculty did not respond to cheating incidents
- how familiar faculty were with the School of Arts and Sciences Academic Integrity Code.

Means were calculated of how severe of a problem that faculty perceived exam, homework, paper, and lab assignments cheating to be in their classrooms. Cross tabulations

were taken of both faculty tenure track and gender by reported amounts of student cheating on exams, homework, and papers. Opened-ended responses to survey questions such as 7 and 19 allowed the researcher to "understand and capture the points of view of other people without predetermining those points of view through prior selection of questionnaire categories" (Patton, 1990, p. 24). The challenge of interpreting the results was to reduce the volume of responses. Inductive analysis was used to group together common answers from different individuals. In inductive analysis, categories and themes "emerge out of the data rather than [categories and themes] being imposed on them prior to data collection and analysis" (Patton, 1990, p. 390). The results of this analysis were systematically tied back to the literature.

4.0 CHAPTER FOUR

4.1 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the statistical analysis of the responses to the SurveyMonkey.com survey that includes close-ended questions and an analysis of open-ended responses gathered in the survey to give faculty the opportunity to give responses that could not otherwise be collected by a series of check boxes. The purpose of this research was to investigate a) faculty training regarding academic dishonesty and dissemination of academic integrity expectations to students, b) faculty successes and failures with maintaining student academic integrity within their classrooms, and c) faculty knowledge of the policies related to academic integrity within the School of Arts and Sciences and the University academic integrity programs. This chapter presents the findings of the study in two major sections: the characteristics of the participants and discussion of the findings of the study. The findings of the study were guided by the research questions as presented in Chapter 1. Where possible, associations with the literature were provided.

4.1.1 Characteristics of the Sample

Four hundred forty faculty teaching undergraduate Arts and Science courses during the Spring Term of 2008 were sent the initial survey. Some faculty had since left the university or

had changes to their university e-mail addresses. Of the 440 faculty, 398 were reached with a current University of Pittsburgh e-mail address. Forty-two (9.5%) e-mails were returned as un-deliverable. Survey response was 48.5% (193 of 398). One response (not included in the total) had to be removed from the analysis due to incomplete data, while one response (response #193) was received after the analysis and write-up had occurred. An additional four faculty could not be reached by the follow-up e-mail reminder. However, because of anonymity of responses, it could not be determined whether these four faculty members chose to participate in the study following the initial e-mail.

Response rates for e-mail surveys tend to be low. Boehm (2006) received a response rate of 38.4% (288/750) from an e-mail academic integrity survey sent to chief academic officers or provosts, while Henderson (2007) receive an e-mail response of 41/242 (16.9%) from an electronic academic integrity survey sent to full-time and part-time faculty members at a public, four-year Baccalaureate School of Arts and Sciences. Could the return rate have been better had a paper survey with a pre-addressed return envelope been used? Flannigan (1999) received a paper mail back rate of 57.3% (406/708) from a paper academic integrity survey sent to full-time and part-time faculty from the University of North Colorado and Aims Community College. Return rates varied widely between studies. Coren (2006) sent a return addressed academic integrity questionnaire to 379 faculty at a U.S. university and received a response rate of 29.8% (113/379), whereas Bower (1998) received a return rate of 71.0% (405/570) from a paper academic dishonesty survey sent to faculty at two Midwestern universities. Administrative support may play a role. Surveys which were endorsed by a high ranking administrative figure seemed to receive higher response rates. As for this study, the researcher had the fortunate

opportunity to encourage School of Arts and Sciences staff who worked with course offerings to encourage the faculty in their departments to complete the anonymous e-mail survey.

Table 5 presents a descriptive tabulation of the characteristics of the sample. Of the 192 participants, only two (1%) chose to have their gender remain anonymous, while 54.7% were male faculty and 44.3% were female faculty. A large proportion of the respondents were full-time faculty (81.2%), while 65.1% had tenure stream positions. A large percentage (44.3%) of the faculty classified themselves as belonging to the humanities discipline, whereas 30.2% and 23.4% were of the natural and social sciences disciplines, respectively. The average teaching course load per year was approximately three (3.44) courses. The largest percentage of courses taught by the faculty respondents were lectures (85.9%), seminars (44.5%), independent studies (35.6%), directed studies (35.1%), and recitations (22.0%).

Table 5. Gender and Teaching Profiles of Undergraduate Arts and Sciences Faculty

Variable	N	Percentage of Categories
Gender		% of Gender
Male	105	54.7
Female	85	44.3
Unknown	2	1.0
Employment		% of Employment
Full-time	156	81.2
Part-time	36	18.8
Stream and Professorship		
Tenure Stream		% Tenured Professorship
Associate Professor	43	22.4
Assistant Professor	41	21.3
Full Professor	32	16.7
Lecturer	8	4.2
Instructor	1	0.5

Non-tenure Stream		% Non-tenure Professorship			
Lecturer	45	23.4			
Instructor	18	9.4			
Assistant Professor	3	1.6			
Associate Instructor	1	0.5			
Full Professor	0	0.0			
Variable	N	Percentage of Categories			
Disciplinary Classification		% of Disciplinary Classification			
Humanities	85	44.3			
Natural Sciences	58	30.2			
Social Sciences	45	23.4			
Unknown	4	2.1			
Types of Courses Taught	N=191	% Teaching Type of Course			
Lecture	164	85.9			
Seminar	85	44.5			
Independent studies	68	35.6			
Directed studies	67	35.1			
Recitation	42	22.0			
Laboratory	27	14.1			
Internship	20	10.5			
Workshop	12	6.3			
Practicum	11	5.8			
Other*	6	3.1			
Mass media	2	1.0			
Clinical	1	0.5			
Colloquium	1	0.5			
Average # of Courses Taught/Year		N	Mean	STD	Range
		192	3.44	1.64	1-12
Average # of Years of Teaching		N	Mean	STD	Range
		189	16.58	11.91	1-48

* Small classes, ensembles, writing-intensive, writing & reading courses.

4.1.2 Discussion of Findings

Nine research questions already listed were developed to fulfill the purpose of this study. The presentation of the findings divided into three subsections follows as each research question is answered.

4.1.2.1 Faculty Academic Integrity Training and Dissemination of Expectations to Students

Research Question #1: What types of academic integrity training have faculty received at the University?

Table 6 contains the type of training pertaining to student cheating that faculty members have received. This study indicated that approximately 29% of the teaching Arts and Sciences faculty did not receive any training concerning student academic misconduct. One faculty member stated that older faculty simply did not have the options that younger faculty now enjoy. The other 71% of the faculty sometimes indicated that they had received more than one type of training. Word of mouth (~44%) represents the largest percentage. Some departments take this matter seriously with the department chairs leading the efforts (~18%). Possibly some departments rely on new faculty orientation to cover the essentials. Less than 10% stated that their departments taught workshops to inform faculty about student academic misconduct. Thirty-eight faculty members, who were shy of one-fifth of the respondents, indicated that they had received other types of training concerning academic dishonesty. Table 7 represents a compilation of such training.

Table 6. Percentage of Types of Academic Integrity Training Received by Teaching Faculty

Type of Training	Number	Percentage of Faculty
Word of Mouth	84	43.8
None	56	29.2
Other	38	19.8
Department Chair Briefing	34	17.7
Training During New Faculty Orientation	22	11.5
Department Taught Workshops	17	8.9
Faculty Development Course	16	8.3

Table 7 details the other types of academic training that the faculty members have received. The faculty indicated that group education (seminars/workshops/focus groups and GTA training) as well as self-education (ListServ and on-line courses) gave them opportunities to learn about maintaining academic integrity in their classrooms. Some faculty received training from peers and/or the administration. A respondent indicated that there was a department "brown bag" workshop on academic integrity conducted by the Center for Instructional Development and Distance Education (CIDDE) staff, while another faculty member was part of a seminar on academic integrity as part of the upgrading of Blackboard, the University of Pittsburgh's online course content management system. As a response to other types of training, two faculty members indicated that they received their training when they were GTAs at the university, while two others taught GTAs. One respondent was required to attend a student ethics and integrity workshop at her previous university, while another faculty member participated in a focus group on cheating at her son's middle school. One faculty member had taught this material to students in conjunction with a Freshman Studies course that he taught. Three faculty members took online courses and five self-educated themselves by researching academic integrity policies and articles in professional journals. Three faculty belonged to an

electronic mailing listing in which they received articles on higher education, some of which involved prevention of student cheating.

According to Bower (1998), over 55% of the faculty responding to a cheating survey reported that lack of awareness of academic dishonesty was a reason why they did not respond to academic dishonesty, so education pertaining to student cheating may increase faculty's awareness to be on the lookout for incidents of cheating within the classroom. When faculty receives little training, they respond or do not respond to incidents of academic dishonesty through their often narrow lenses. When faculty members congregate, addressing student cheating would be a way to encourage faculty to try to curb student cheating. According to Brilliant and Gribben (1993), open dialog regarding complexities of issues surrounding academic dishonesty and exchange of perceptions, responses, and ideas in a faculty workshop "appears to be an effective initial step in the process of recognizing important aspects of this problem" (p. 438).

Table 7. Number of "Other Types" of Academic Integrity Training Received by Faculty

Type of Training	Number
Seminar, workshop, focus group	6
Self-educated	5
GTA training (Class Instructor or Student)	4
Taught by peers	4
Administrative Dean/Chair instructing others	3
ListServ	3
Membership on an Academic Integrity Review Board	3
On-line courses	3
Faculty meeting discussion	2
From other administrators	2
Content part of Freshman Studies Course	1
Faculty and Staff Handbook	1
Teaching experience	1

Research Question #2: What information do faculty members provide to students about academic dishonesty?

According to the University of Pittsburgh's Arts and Sciences Academic Integrity Code (2006), students are expected to act in accordance with the academic standards of their fields of study, and this academic integrity code sets the standards for protocol regarding issues relating to academic dishonesty. How good a job have the Arts and Science undergraduate faculty done in regards to informing students about cheating? The dean required that all Arts and Sciences syllabi remind students where they can go online for their guidance as to what academic behaviors the school would not accept. According to Table 8, nearly 93% of the faculty teaching undergraduates included a statement on their syllabi.

It made sense that a handful of faculty teaching independent study or directed study classes may not require a syllabus due to the nature of these courses in which they are intimately familiar with the content of student work. Approximately 17% of the faculty included the required academic integrity website address but chose not to discuss the matter with students. Further analysis of these 17% (n=33) revealed that 36.4% (n=12) of the faculty taught directed study and 42.4% (n=14) of the faculty taught independent study courses. Two other possible explanations for why faculty did not discuss the matter with students were contained in these comments from two of the 33 faculty who chose not to discuss cheating with some of their classes. "A reminder regarding academic integrity is part of the 'instruction sheet' distributed for each major assignment that students undertake outside the classroom. Students are instructed to read a statement that I post on the course webpage which addresses issues of academic integrity." Comment one stated that students were to read the statement on their own. A second

comment implied that the teacher was certain that he intimately knew the work of his students. "Nobody cheats in my classes because I know each and every one of them. They know that I care about what they produce and that I pay very close attention personally to their writing styles."

From this statement about academic integrity from the Arts and Sciences web site, it was the responsibility of faculty to convey to the student what resources may be used during the course and on examinations.

> The integrity of the academic process requires fair and impartial evaluation on the part of faculty and honest academic conduct on the part of students. To this end, students are expected to conduct themselves at a high level of responsibility in the fulfillment of the course of their study. It is the corresponding responsibility of faculty to make clear to students those standards by which students will be evaluated and the resources permissible for use by students during the course of their study and evaluation. (Academic Integrity Statement for Syllabi, 2006)

The statements to be included on syllabi follows. "Cheating/plagiarism will not be tolerated. Students suspected of violating the University of Pittsburgh Policy on Academic Integrity, from the February 1974 Senate Committee on Tenure and Academic Freedom reported to the Senate Council, will be required to participate in the outlined procedural process as initiated by the instructor. A minimum sanction of a zero score for the quiz or exam will be imposed." Some faculty stated that they list this statement but don't preach about it since they allow students, depending on the circumstances involved, chances to make amends for their actions by allowing the assignment to be redone. These faculty members thought that it was too harsh to impose a minimum sanction of a zero. In some institutions, when it has been deemed that serious

academic dishonesty had not occurred, the "faculty member may initiate an informal process in which he or she meets with the student and the student's advisor to negotiate a written plan of remediation" (Saunders, 1993, p. 227).

Harris (2003) found that 70% of students wanted deterrents and consequences to be used to address the issue of academic dishonesty. When should students be informed of their academic rights? According to Hardy (1982), "professors should precisely define 'academic dishonesty' at the onset of the term" (p. 72) so that violators namely freshmen and sophomores cannot claim ignorance of institutional policies. At a state university, Sistrunk (1997) found that an instructor's presentation of university expectations concerning academic conduct was the most effective means of influencing students' perceptions regarding cheating. Sistrunk's research also found that distributing a code of conduct without discussion had less impact on student perceptions of their academic dishonest behavior.

The other category in Table 8 yielded that faculty may also discuss academic integrity with their students before exams, final exams, excused make-up exams, or laboratory/research assignments and/or when faculty suspect or observe dishonesty. One faculty member directed students to a website that he created on avoiding plagiarism. Another faculty member informed students on the first day of class when they could complete their work as part of a cooperative effort and when the work was to be done independently. Several professors spent the time working with students at the beginning of the term considering what it meant to write in "his or her own words." Using some else's words was deemed as plagiarism.

It appeared that students need expectations. Placing a statement on the syllabus would seem appropriate especially if the instructor is embracing the institution's commitment to academic integrity which embraces honesty, responsibility, and trust on the part of the faculty

and students (First in 2009 Academic Integrity Subcommittee Final Report, 2006). In a survey administered to Miami University by the Center for Academic Integrity of Duke University, of the 308 faculty participants, 21% indicated that they did not communicate to students in syllabi and/or assignments information about academic dishonesty. This seemed like a faux pas especially since it has been shown that students accept forms of academic dishonesty that faculty do not (First in 2009 Academic Integrity Subcommittee Final Report, 2006; Graham et al., 1994; Whitley & Keith-Spiegel, 2002).

Table 8. Percentage of Faculty Addressing Academic Dishonesty with Students at Specified Times

The time in which students are informed	N	Percentage of Faculty
On Syllabus and Discuss	145	75.5
When a Violation of Academic Integrity Occurs	63	32.8
Before Major Assignments	52	27.1
On Syllabus and Do Not Discuss	33	17.2
Other	25	13.0
Never	5	2.6

4.1.2.2 Faculty Success and Failure with Maintaining Academic Integrity within the Classroom

Research Question #3: How extensive is the problem of academic dishonesty in the classroom?

A. In the past year, what types of academic integrity violations have faculty observed in their classrooms?

For this research study, Table 9 shows that of the 192 survey respondents, over half (51.6%) reported that they did not observe any cheating in their classes during the past year. Plagiarism seems to plague approximately one-quarter of the faculty, especially in writing courses. This study also showed that students copying from other students, student lying about reasons for late assignment submission, and student collaboration on individual work were

reported by 17.2%, 13.5%, and 11.5% of the faculty, respectively. Over 16% of the faculty cited other types of student cheating which included ghost exam takers, falsely claiming group participation, copying computer programs and music compositions, and making up bibliographical sources. Also, the instructors noted that a large portion of the copying involved homework. Several faculty members stated that they were convinced of the dishonest behavior but could not prove it. One professor noted that a student had forged his signature for grade changes in courses in which he did not teach.

Table 9. Percentage of Faculty Observing Academic Integrity Violations in Their Classrooms within the Past Year

Integrity Violation	N	Percentage of Faculty
None	99	51.6
Plagiarism	49	25.5
Copied from Another Student	33	17.2
Other	31	16.1
Lied about Reason for Late Assignment Submission	26	13.5
Collaborated on Individual Student Work	22	11.5
Gave Answers to Another Student	19	9.9
Used Forbidden Materials during Assessment	19	9.9
Altered Graded Solutions for More Credit	9	4.7
Turned in Paper from Previous Class without Consent	9	4.7

How serious of a problem did the faculty members perceive that they had within their classrooms on a scale of zero to 10 with zero meaning no problem within the past year and 10 meaning a severe problem within the past year? Referring to Table 10, on exams of the 179 respondents, 103 (~58%) had no trouble with cheating with the mean perceived problem of cheating on exams being low (1.01), standard deviation of 1.6. This study suggested that faculty rated having more problems with cheating on homework and papers than on exams and lab assignments. The higher rating on papers showed consistency of respondent results since

plagiarism was reported by these University of Pittsburgh undergraduate Arts and Sciences faculty as the largest academic foul. Cheating on class quizzes and students not sharing in group assignments were also cited as academic integrity violations that plagued faculty.

Table 10. Mean Faculty Perception of Severity of Cheating during the Past Year on Assessment Items

Assessment	Faculty Perceived No Cheating (N,%)		Faculty Perceived Cheating (N, %)		Mean Perception*	STD
Papers	68	48.6	72	51.4	1.71	2.4
Homework	85	58.6	60	41.4	1.44	2.2
Exam	103	57.5	76	42.5	1.01	1.6
Lab	33	75.0	11	25.0	0.70	1.5

* Scale 0-10, zero = no problems with cheating, 10 = severe problems with cheating.

Research Question #4: What techniques do faculty members employ to prevent cheating on exams in their classes?

Within the past year, of the 192 faculty respondents, 179 administered examinations. Table 11 represents techniques used by faculty in this study to prevent cheating during testing situations. This study indicated that over 69% of the faculty change exams from year to year to prevent student cheating. Seating student apart and creating essay tests were also popular with 45.8% and 43.0% of the faculty employing these techniques, respectively. Although less than one-third of the faculty used exam proctors, many faculty stated that they proctored their own examinations. As previous stated in Chapter 2, the usage of exam proctors appears to reduce academic dishonesty. Biernacki (2004) surveyed faculty in relation to testing behaviors and found that "utilizing the same testing instrument without revisions in consecutive semesters and also in multiple sections of the same course" (p. 148) were chosen as behaviors that faculty thought had the most influence on student cheating. Biernacki's survey of faculty at the University of Southern Florida also suggested that allowing students to leave the testing room was one of the behaviors that faculty perceived had less influence on student cheating. Arts and

Sciences faculty at the University of Pittsburgh share the same thinking with slightly over 10% enforcing such a policy during examinations.

Table 11. Exam Techniques used by Faculty (n=179) to Uphold Academic Integrity

Technique	N	Percentage of Faculty
Change exam annually	124	69.3
Seat students sufficiently apart	82	45.8
Create essay tests	77	43.0
Use exam proctors	56	31.3
Create different exam versions	52	29.0
Other	43	24.0
No restroom breaks during assessment	19	10.6
Ask questions regarding individualized work	14	7.8

Genereux and McLeod (1995) assessed the beliefs and behaviors associated with cheating. In their study, students rated widely spaced exam cheating as one of the circumstances most likely to decrease cheating. However, only 45.8% of the Arts and Sciences faculty seat students purposely apart. This lower percentage may be due to the crowded classroom situations that exist on this urban campus. At the University of Pittsburgh, classroom space is at a premium and when examinations are being administered, it is often not possible to find an available classroom with a seat-to-student ratio of at least 2-to-1 during prime class times.

Roughly one-quarter of the undergraduate Arts and Sciences faculty used other or additional means during testing situations to prevent cheating. Techniques used included:

- Administered exams that demonstrated process and/or thinking
- Administered oral or open book/note examinations
- Asked for larger exam classrooms
- Did not place the emphasis of grading on one or two examinations
- Issued verbal warnings during the exam for wandering eyes

- Placed incoming bags, books, caps, coats, water bottles, calculators, papers, phones, and mp3 players away from the testing area
- Randomized seating assignments or moved suspected cheaters to the front row
- Self-proctored – with movement about the classroom and/or never leaving the testing area
- Submitted take-home written work to Turnitin.com
- Used a computing center so that exam question order could be randomized.

According to the theory of planned behavior, human action is guided by three kinds of beliefs: behavioral (beliefs about the likely consequences of the behavior), normative (beliefs about the normative expectations of others), and control (beliefs about the presence of factors that may facilitate or impede performance of the behavior) (Ajzen, 1991b). As a general rule, the more favorable the attitude and subject norm and the greater the perceived control, the stronger should be the student's intention to perform the behavior (Ajzen, 1991b). The stronger the intention to engage in the dishonest behavior, the more likely the student will perform the behavior (Ajzen, 1991a). Although the central factor in the theory of planned behavior is the individual's intention to perform the dishonest behavior, the performance of the behavior depends on some non-motivational factors as well. For example, the opportunity to cheat must exist. If a student is asked to sit in a room with no students close to him/her in front of the teacher during an examination, all the intention in the world to cheat is foiled. If students rely on class friends for exam answers, then randomly assigning exam seating arrangements may prevent best class friends from congregating. Resources may also be necessary. If students enter a testing area and their possessions are placed at the front of the room, they cannot glance under their seats at their texts or notes. Only concealed methods then apply. Shon (2006) classified into four thematic categories innovative and illicit means that students use to import

unauthorized materials to an exam site. The categories are body parts, articles of clothing, technological gizmos, and ordinary objects. The undergraduate Arts and Sciences faculty at the University of Pittsburgh showed the most concern about articles of clothing and technological gizmos such as programmable calculators and cell phones. When cell phones are placed at the front of the testing room, text messaging for answers is not a possibility. This study suggested that the undergraduate Arts and Sciences faculty used strategies to prevent potential student exam schemes.

One strategy in particular that was suggested was to give frequent opportunities for students to display their knowledge rather than two major testing situations, namely a midterm and final examination. In courses in which there are few exams or papers, students are under extreme pressure to perform well. Academic dishonesty is bred in this "all or nothing" testing situation (Academic Dishonesty—Classroom strategies for reducing dishonesty, 1994). Frequent writing and testing situations allow faculty to gain better insight into the achievement level capabilities of their students. One Arts and Sciences faculty member stated that he was not concerned about cheating in his classes since he has upper division courses and via frequent writing assignments "knows the writing of his students."

Research Question #5: What actions do faculty members take when they encounter academic dishonesty on examinations, homework, and papers in their classrooms?

A. In the past year, what has prevented faculty from taking any disciplinary action whenever they observed cheating on examinations?

Tables 12-14 reflect the actions that faculty have taken over the past year when they observed academic integrity violations on exams, homework, and papers, respectively. The open-ended other responses for cheating on exams, homework, and papers are also summarized.

In this study, of the faculty who gave exams and observed academic integrity violations, over 65% gave the offender(s) a verbal warning, while almost 35% lowered the score on the exam. In a study by Biernacki (2004), 51% of the faculty used verbal reprimand/warning as their method of action against observed or suspected cheating within the past year, while almost 38% awarded a zero grade on the test or assignment. In the case of the University of Pittsburgh's undergraduate Arts and Sciences faculty, roughly 24%, 36%, and 50% of the faculty who took action chose to give a zero grade to a student who was observed cheating on an examination, paper, or homework assignment, respectively.

How do professors handle cheaters? Schneider (1999) reported that when Donald L. McCabe surveyed 800 professors at 16 institutions, the most frequent answer was quickly and quietly. These sanctions were popular.

> Roving eyes during an examination: A stern warning should do the trick. Copying on a homework assignment: Force the student to do it again. Plagiarizing a paper: Give the student an F. (p. A8)

In this study, before taking action, some Arts and Sciences faculty members wrote that they preferred to meet one-on-one with the student(s) and penalize him/her/them according to the circumstances surrounding the dishonest situation. Coren (2006) found that 87.4% of the faculty surveyed favored meeting privately with the dishonest student or with another university employee present (60.2%) before taking action. The School of Arts and Sciences Academic Integrity Policy asks that the faculty member and the student(s) involved to resolve the incident "privately" along with a written documentation of the incident to the Academic Integrity Board Chair long before it is a necessary issue to bring before the Associate Dean or the Academic Integrity Hearing Board.

Table 12. Percentage of Faculty (n=76) taking Actions when Observing Cheating on Exams during the Past Year

Action Taken	N	Percentage of Faculty
Gave student a verbal warning	50	65.8
Lowered assignment score	26	34.2
Gave a zero for the assignment	18	23.6
Other	15	19.7
Failed student in the course	12	15.8
Allowed to redo/rewrite assignment	8	10.5
Reported incident to Department Chair	6	7.9
Did nothing	5	6.6
Reported before Academic Integrity Hearing Board	1	1.3

Table 13. Percentage of Faculty (n=60) taking Actions when Observing Cheating on Homework during the Past Year

Action Taken	N	Percentage of Faculty
Gave a zero for the assignment	30	50.0
Gave student a verbal warning	26	43.3
Lowered assignment score	22	36.7
Allowed to redo/rewrite assignment	19	31.7
Other	10	16.7
Did nothing	7	11.7
Failed student in the course	2	3.3
Reported incident to Department Chair	2	3.3
Reported before Academic Integrity Hearing Board	1	1.7

Table 14. Percentage of Faculty (n=72) taking Actions when Observing Cheating on Papers during the Past Year

Action Taken	N	Percentage of Faculty
Gave a zero for the assignment	26	36.1
Allowed to redo/rewrite assignment	25	34.7
Lowered assignment score	24	33.3
Gave student a verbal warning	21	29.2
Other	19	26.4
Failed student in the course	14	19.4
Reported incident to Department Chair	9	12.5
Did nothing	5	6.9
Reported before Academic Integrity Hearing Board	2	2.8

Faculty took additional actions when they observed cheating on exams, homework, and papers. A common other action taken for an undergraduate Arts and Sciences faculty member was to meet with the student and his or her advisor and discuss the situation. This resulting aftermath was an embarrassment to the student involved and often ended with the student redoing the exam, homework assignment, or class paper with no repeat of the incident again during the term. Faculty also indicated that they had difficulties with tutors completing assignments or a large portion of the assignment for students. The submitted material that faculty members reviewed was clearly not the work of their students. In such cases, a meeting between the student, tutor, and faculty member cleared up the situation. Tutors were often upper division students themselves who did not want to be involved in a situation that would mark their own academic records. According to the other category faculty comments, a fair number of papers and homework assignments were required to be redone as a result of tutors and students working too closely together.

According to Assistant Dean of Undergraduate Studies and Chairman of the Academic Hearing Board, Fred Whelan, faculty are to fill out an Academic Integrity Report Form pertaining to the cheating incident and file it with the Dean's Office to track offenders, some of which may be repeat. Such forms are destroyed when the student graduates or permanently terminates registration. Faculty members may perceive that they are "actually in reality" giving students a "break" when they do not file such forms, but resolve the matter privately. However, such a faculty member does not know whether his or her student is cheating in other classes as well unless proper procedure is followed (Whelan, personal communication, November 5, 2008). Generally when the form is received and the determination is made that the student is not a repeat offender, the faculty sanction is accepted and a warning letter is issued (Whelan, personal communication, November 5, 2008). Whelan receives an average of three to four dozen report forms each year with one case going through an Academic Integrity Board Hearing.

Faculty in this study indicated that Internet citations were lacking in papers. Some deducted percentage points from the paper or overall class score whenever this was discovered. Other faculty chose to spot plagiarism on drafts. Students were asked to rewrite the draft long before it was time for the final submission. One cheating type was not mentioned as a direct question by the investigator, but was listed in the "other" comments from the faculty. It was cheating on computer lab assignments. Faculty indicated that they gave zeroes for the assignment or significantly lowered the score. Lastly, students admitting to have slept through exams sometimes meant that the subsequent exam counted double, thus placing additional pressure on the student for a good performance.

Coren (2006) asked faculty whether they had ever ignored a suspected incident of cheating. "Yes" was answered by 40.3% (n=83) of the faculty. As shown in Table 15, in this

study, 45.3% of the 161 faculty respondents stated that something had prevented them from taking action on an incident of academic dishonesty within the last year. At least faculty initiated some type of dialog with the offenders whenever students negotiated a good excuse or whenever students denied the incidents. McCabe (1993) found it disturbing that faculty members often failed to report academic integrity violations and suggested that "the phenomenon is fairly universal" (p. 654). Biernacki (2004) found that 57.7% of faculty members who reported either observed or suspected cheating within the past year did not take action, and law suits seemed to be overrated as only 4.3% of the faculty indicated fear of litigation that prevented them from taking action. Faculty members seem to be at a greater risk of being sued whenever they take matters into their own hands and ignore their institution's established procedures. Less than six percent of the Arts and Sciences undergraduate faculty indicated that fear of litigation preventing them from taking action against dishonesty. When cheating was not serious or evidence was lacking, almost 11% and 48% of the faculty respectively just ignored the situation (Biernacki, 2004). In this study, the major reasons for ignoring the incidents were that undergraduate Arts and Sciences faculty members were afraid that they could not prove the cases (24.2%) and when confronted, students denied the incidents (11.8%) causing the faculty to drop the pursuit.

Seventy-one percent of University of North Colorado faculty believed that pursuing incidents of dishonesty took too much time (Flannigan, 1999). The University of Pittsburgh's Arts and Sciences undergraduate faculty did not echo this notion since less than 10% reported that it was too time consuming to pursue. Approximately six percent of the faculty passively ignored cheating incidents because of fear of administrative repercussions or the faculty member "bought" (accepted) the student's excuse. Rather than ignore incidents of cheating, Whitley and

Keith-Spiegel (2002) recommend that faculty make an announcement that they will confront cheaters in private so that students do not get the impression that particular faculty members are non-confrontational.

Table 15. Percentage of Faculty (n=161) taking Passive Actions against Observed Cheating in the Past Year

Action Taken	N	Percentage of Faculty
Nothing would have prevented faculty from acting	88	54.7
Afraid could not "prove" case	39	24.2
Student denied the incident	19	11.8
Too time consuming to pursue	16	9.9
Afraid of law suits	9	5.6
Feared hassle faced from administration	9	5.6
Student negotiated a good excuse	9	5.6
Laziness	7	4.3
Management skills would be perceived as lacking	6	3.7
Student was making decent progress in the course	6	3.7
Thought the student would become violent	4	2.5
Did not want to damage relationship with student	3	1.9
Found out after grade was given to student	3	1.9

Research Question #6: Does tenure stream or non-tenure stream faculty report having more problems with student cheating on examinations, papers, homework, and lab assignments?

The final data analyses considered the faculty perception of the severity of cheating within their classrooms by tenure stream versus non-tenure stream faculty and the faculty perception of the severity of cheating within their classrooms by gender. Tables 16 and 17 display these analyses. As shown in Table 16, more non-tenured faculty perceived that they had experienced cheating within their classrooms over the past year than tenure stream faculty. Faculty were to rate their perceived problem with student cheating on a scale of 0-10 (no student cheating problems to severe student cheating problems). Faculty indication of no cheating meant

that a zero was included as the perception of the problem. On exams, the mean perceived problem with cheating was less than one for tenure stream faculty, while non-tenure steam faculty perceived that they had larger problems with student cheating with a mean perception of 1.4. Similarly, non-tenure stream faculty reported having more problems with academic dishonesty on homework, lab assignments, and papers than the tenure stream faculty. Both tenure and non-tenure stream faculty reported having more problems with students cheating on homework and papers than lab assignments, while academic integrity on paper assignments proved to be the biggest challenge for both groups. As suggested in the literature review, students cheat less when they have a tenured faculty member as the instructor rather than a GTA (Kerkvliet & Sigmond, 1999). This University of Pittsburgh research study suggested that this was also the case when the instructor is non-tenured.

Table 16. Faculty Mean Perceived Severity of Cheating on Assessment Items during the Year by Tenure Track

Assessment	Faculty reported no cheating		Faculty reported cheating		Mean Perception*	STD
	N	%	N	%		
Exam						
Non-tenure stream	29	46.0	34	54.0	1.43	2.0
Tenure stream	74	66.1	38	33.9	0.78	1.3
Homework						
Non-tenure stream	29	52.7	26	47.3	1.80	2.3
Tenure stream	56	62.2	34	37.8	1.22	2.1
Lab Assignments						
Non-tenure stream	9	69.2	4	30.8	0.85	1.7
Tenure stream	24	77.4	7	22.6	0.64	1.4
Papers						
Non-tenure stream	22	45.8	26	54.2	1.77	2.4
Tenure stream	46	50.0	46	50.0	1.67	2.5

* Scale 0-10, zero = no problems with cheating, 10 = severe problems with cheating.

Research Question #7: Are there gender differences in the amount of faculty reporting student cheating on examinations, papers, homework, and lab assignments?

What about gender and perception of severity of student cheating? For this Arts and Sciences undergraduate faculty study, Table 17 echoed similar sentiment. One grouping reported perceiving more problems with academic dishonesty. In this case, it was the female faculty. In each case over the year, a larger percentage of females reported experiencing more problems with cheating. For example, on paper assignments, 62% of the female faculty had problems with cheating, whereas 42% of the male faculty reported problems with cheating. For paper assignments, male faculty perceived a cheating problem of 1.3 on a scale of 0-10, whereas female faculty perceived a cheating problem of 2.2. On exams, homework, and lab assignments, Table 17 reflected that females perceived dealing with larger academic integrity issues within their classrooms.

Bies (1998) found that male faculty observed significantly fewer incidents of academic misconduct than female faculty during the academic year. Coren (2006) in a campus survey in which 206 faculty responded, found that all faculty perceived that the male faculty were more effective in dealing with students suspected of cheating. Female faculty was significantly more likely than male faculty to feel that students would become emotional when confronted about academic dishonesty. Female faculty also felt significantly more strongly that the suspected cheater would use intimidation or retaliation. In face-to-face confrontations, female faculty indicated significantly more concern regarding their personal safety than did the male faculty. In this School of Arts and Sciences study, only 2.8% (n=2) of the female faculty and 2.3% (n=2) of the male faculty did not act on student academic dishonesty because they were concerned that the student would become violent.

Could it be that female faculty members were having more difficulty due to female faculty being less confident in the administration? Simon et al. (2001) suggested that faculty members who were confident in their institutions were more likely to use formal processes when dealing with academic dishonesty. Regardless of rank, female faculty were significantly more likely to be skeptical of the institution, hence eschewing administrative processes and dealing with cases of academic dishonesty in a more private manner. When this happens, the female faculty were limiting themselves to just classroom-based management and not the full range of institutional power. Gambill (2003) indicated that female faculty members perceive significantly more benefit from additional academic integrity training issues than do the male faculty.

Table 17. Faculty Mean Perceived Severity of Cheating on Assessment Items during the Year by Gender

Assessment	Faculty reported no cheating		Faculty reported cheating		Mean Perception*	STD
	N	%	N	%		
Exam						
Female	42	54.5	35	45.5	1.12	1.6
Male	60	62.5	36	37.5	0.89	1.6
Homework						
Female	38	56.7	29	43.3	1.48	2.2
Male	46	60.5	30	39.5	1.42	2.3
Lab Assignments						
Female	10	71.4	4	28.6	1.00	1.8
Male	22	75.9	7	24.1	0.59	1.3
Papers						
Female	25	37.9	41	62.1	2.17	2.5
Male	43	58.1	31	41.9	1.30	2.2

* Scale 0-10, zero = no problems with cheating, 10 = severe problems with cheating.

Research Question #8: What should the University do to promote academic integrity in the classroom?

In this study, one hundred twenty six of 192 (65.6%) Arts and Sciences undergraduate faculty offered suggestions for promoting academic integrity at the institutional level. The open-ended question was concerned with what the University should do to promote academic integrity in the classroom. The data was interpreted into four categories: changes to existing academic integrity policies, sanctions for academic integrity violations, academic integrity training classes for faculty and students, and environmental changes. Table 18 displays each of the four categories and actions that were offered by the faculty.

Table 18. Faculty's Suggestions on Promoting Integrity in the Classroom – Themes and Actions

Changes to existing academic integrity policies • Make the academic integrity policy easy to find on the school's web site. • Have one well-publicized, enforced academic integrity policy that is communicated to the university community. • Spell out what constitutes a violation and the punishment that will be incurred. • Create an honor code of conduct.
Sanctions for academic integrity violations • Address suspected cases of cheating with consistent sanctions that apply across the university and keep a central depository of files on students who have been found guilty of cheating. • No tolerance policy for cheating or more severe punishments. • Have administration support faculty who enforce penalties for cheating. • Make the process easier for faculty to enforce penalties. • The responsibility for the cheating rests with the student who made a bad choice with punishment at a level higher than the faculty.
Classes/training for students and faculty • Develop a program on plagiarism using web resources that could be taught during student and faculty orientation. • Better train foreign students who have different norms. • Mandatory academic integrity discussion during freshman orientation and in introductory classes.

Classes/training for students and faculty - continued

- Educate faculty and students about academic ethics.
- Mandatory information literacy workshops.
- Teach students what in their "own words" means.
- Discussion between the Student Government Board and faculty regarding the importance of an earned degree.
- Create resource/help centers for all major subjects.
- Deans should conduct a workshop for department chairs who conduct workshops annually for their faculty.
- Mandatory on-line academic integrity test which all faculty must pass.
- Tell students real stories about students who are caught and the consequences of their actions.

Environment

- Less crowded classrooms where teachers can know the work of their students.
- Hire more faculty.
- Make the classrooms bigger to allow for more space between students.
- Reward teachers who are effective in teaching who do not have problems with cheating.
- The Internet is here. Design writing assignments accordingly.
- Don't over emphasize testing by allowing students to throw away their lowest exam score and homework score.
- Change textbooks often so faculty cannot ask the same exam questions.
- Make students take exams in a monitored environment, possibly within the library system.
- Create a culture where honesty and above-board behavior are the expectation.
- Submit all writing assignments to Turnitin.com.
- Post cheating incidents and outcomes on a website so that parents and students get the message.
- Give students sufficient time to ask questions and study before exams.

One theme concerning promotion of institutional academic integrity focused on academic integrity policies and procedures. Although the faculty overall struggled with knowledge of the Arts and Sciences Academic Integrity Code, they offered numerous suggestions as to how to change the existing policy to make it more user friendly. The code is rather lengthy and many faculty dutifully listed the code on their syllabi, but failed to know the proper steps involved in the adjudication process. As shown in Table 18, a change to the existing code could be to make

it well-publicized and enforced across the university. Some faculty asked for the penalties to be laid out alongside the violations. Perhaps a "one-size fits all" mentality may be in order so that individual student circumstances do not excuse the actions. Formal sanctions have some kind of deterrent effect on deviant behavior (Salem and Bowers, 1970). Behaviors "can be modified by the prospect of informal [negative] social sanctions" (Salem & Bowers, 1970, p. 22).

A second theme concerning promotion of institutional academic integrity was the enforcement of sanctions for cheating. The University of Pittsburgh Arts and Sciences undergraduate faculty supported both faculty and peer informants. "The students see more than we do within the classroom." Some faculty stated that they had taught in previous academic settings under an "effective" honor system. One faculty member wanted "an honor code with meaning," while another wanted an honor code emphasized at student orientation with the code being made into "an integral part of student pride in their university." Other faculty wanted to pilot an honor system "since students see more cheating than faculty." Numerous faculty thought that there should be consistent sanctions across the institution for the various types of cheating. University of Pittsburgh faculty members currently determine their own penalties for infractions of the academic integrity code when the students admit that they cheated (Gillogly, 2008). The University of Pittsburgh lacks a standardized set of penalties. The faculty indicated that administrative support is needed for faculty who fill out the Academic Integrity Report Form. Boehm (2006) suggested that a best practice initiative would be to "recognize those faculty members who properly confront and process instances of cheating" (p. 87). Boehm surmised that appreciation could be demonstrated through "student newspaper announcements, annual awards, campus mailings, and appreciation luncheons" (p.87).

In the University of Pittsburgh study, a faculty member suggested requiring the "reporting of all cheating incidents" and the posting of "these on a website so that students and parents can see that cheating is not to be taken lightly." Some Arts and Sciences undergraduate faculty wanted it to be easier to enforce penalties when they observed cheating, but it was their word versus the cheating student's word. One faculty member summed it up, "I do not pursue violations of academic integrity because I know the burden of proof is so great that it's not worth my time." Other faculty members prefer to hand the matter to a higher authority or central office to handle.

According to the Arts and Sciences undergraduate faculty, a popular solution to minor academic integrity violations was for faculty to handle first-time cheating offenses one-on-one with an enforced penalty of having the assignment redone by the student or giving the student an "F" on the assignment without record of the incident being sent to the Academic Hearing Board Chairman. One of the top best practices among chief academic officers or provosts at institutions across the United States was the "creation of a user-friendly settlement process in which faculty can resolve first-time minor cheating offenses directly with the student through a mutually-endorsed settlement that carries a maximum sanction of an 'F' for the course" (Boehm, 2006, p. 88). Although popular at other universities, none of the University of Pittsburgh respondents suggested placing an "XF" (denoting failure due to academic dishonesty) on the official transcript. Some of the Arts and Sciences faculty took a hard stance of "no tolerance for cheating," while others preferred a softer approach whereby the student could make amends for his or her behavior with the final penalty not tracking the student over time.

Training for both faculty and students were a favorite among the faculty as a third way of promoting institutional academic integrity. These occasions were most often listed as potential

prime times for focusing on academic integrity: student orientation, new faculty orientation, syllabus distribution during the first day of class, and department chair meetings. Some faculty members with more years of service thought that they were not as trained as younger faculty especially when it came to the usage of plagiarism detection software. The department chairs need to make their faculty aware that CIDDE offers a faculty software detection course. Department chairs can also suggest to faculty that they "can use Google searches or [other] Internet detection programs to screen papers for plagiarism."

A creative solution of informing faculty about academic integrity was the creation of a mandatory on-line academic integrity course with the "principal purpose of informing and getting faculty more or less on the same page about educating students, implementing pedagogical strategies for preventing plagiarism, and responding productively to incidents." Another creative solution for informing students about academic integrity was an assembly of the Student Government Board and a panel of faculty discussing the importance of an earned degree and the damage caused to an institution and to the careers of those involved when cases become public domain.

A fourth theme of institutional changes that would positively prevent cheating was a change in the teaching environment. A reduction in the teacher-student ratio was called for. According to Hanson (1990), "large enrollment adds certain anonymity to classes" (p. 199), this affords students more opportunities to participate in academic deviant behavior. Some of the Arts and Science undergraduate faculty reported that they proctored their classes alone in crowded classroom situations so they asked for the "setting of class limits." Smaller classes afforded the faculty chances to know their students and the work that each is capable of doing.

As best put by one faculty member, "keep classes small enough to permit students to have a sense of the university as more than an assembly line."

Another environmental change called for was a change in the administrative climate within the classroom. There was a call for the administration to "reward effective teaching rather than giving all rewards to research." This recommendation is in effect at the University of Pittsburgh with the annual Chancellor's Distinguished Teaching Awards recognizing up to five awardees for their excellence in teaching. In addition, along the lines of teaching was a demand for modernizing teaching by making faculty aware of a) the Internet with its potential ready-made writing assignments, b) the dangers of using the same text over the years, and c) the need for potential testing sites across the campus with proctors. Faculty thought that the library system could be expanded to include proctored exam classrooms. Finally, a campus culture change was suggested as a way to promote academic integrity. Simply, "the faculty should expect scholarly excellence without exception." Dick et al. (2003) recommends improving the culture of the student body and academics in such a way that academic dishonesty becomes unacceptable.

Some School of Arts and Sciences faculty thought that testing was overemphasized, thus contributing to students "need" to cheat for higher scores. "I allow students to throw away their lowest exam score and homework scores so that one bad day doesn't ruin their final grade." "Do away with grades and require students to master material demonstrated by a project and/or comprehensive exam." "Stress learning instead of performance." "Educational institutions should foster an environment that emphasizes intellectual growth, not grades."

4.1.2.3 Faculty Knowledge of Academic Integrity Policy and University Programs

Research Question #9: What is the level of faculty familiarity with the School of Arts and Sciences Academic Integrity Code and University programs?

A. Do faculty members know the content of the School of Arts and Sciences Academic Integrity Code?

B. Are faculty members familiar with the University's academic integrity programs?

In general, this study has suggested that faculty members are, on the one hand, very conscientious in presenting an academic integrity statement in their syllabi and/or in discussing the student obligations' section of the Arts and Sciences Academic Integrity Code with their students but, on the other, that they are were not so familiar with the procedures for the adjudication section of the policy. This is consistent with other research study findings in which faculty often indicated discomfort dealing with issues of academic dishonesty especially when there is relatively low familiarity with the formal process for dealing with academic integrity violations (Simon et al., 2001). A series of academic integrity procedural questions that the faculty was asked appears in Table 19.

Consider Question 1 in Table 19. According to the Arts and Sciences Academic Integrity Code (2006), which appears in Appendix E,

> If the accused student and the instructor accept a specific resolution offered by either of them, and if this is a first offense, the matter shall be considered closed if both parties sign a written agreement to that effect, and submit it to the appropriate Assistant Dean. These records are not to be added to the student's individual file and are to be destroyed when the student graduates or permanently terminates registration. (p. 2)

This research study indicated that only 41% of the faculty responding to the Academic Integrity Code questions knew that first offenses are not part of a student's permanent record.

From this documentation of the offense, the Assistant Dean can identify repeat offenders. Faculty fills out forms on offenders, one purpose of which is the identification of repeat offenders. This is standard practice at many institutions. For example, consider that the Missouri State University (MSU) academic integrity procedure requires the instructor to provide a written description of the incident and sanction(s) imposed to the student, the department head, and the Chair of the Academic Integrity Council. The Academic Integrity Council at MSU keeps record of cheating incidents so that repeat offenders may be identified (Missouri State University Academic Integrity Procedures, 2008).

To answer Question 2 in Table 19, according to the Arts and Sciences Academic Integrity Code (2006), "if the instructor elects not to pursue a complaint submitted by a member of the University community, the complaint can be submitted to the appropriate Assistant Dean who may pursue the matter in place of the instructor" (p. 11). Only 14.5% of the undergraduate Arts and Sciences faculty knew that they could ask the Assistant Dean to act on their behalf to pursue an academic integrity complaint from the University community.

Procedural step 3 of the Arts and Sciences Academic Integrity Code (2006) states that "if a resolution cannot be reached, a meeting should be scheduled with the student, faculty member, and department chair (or his/her representative) for a final attempt at an informal resolution" (p. 3). For Question 3 in Table 19, 63.7% did not know the correct answer or answered incorrectly. Slightly over 14% of the faculty knew that when an academic integrity case requires a hearing that legal counsel was not permitted for Question 4 of Table 19. According to the Arts and Sciences Academic Integrity Code, for students and faculty, a non-attorney, non-law student representative is permissible. For Question 5 in Table 19, almost one-third of the faculty knew

that students have the right to elect to have a public (or private) hearing in proceedings before an Academic Integrity Hearing Board.

How did the faculty fair in terms of the timeliness questions? Referring to Question 6 in Table 19, only eight percent knew that prompt action on academic integrity matters spanned more than one term. The policy states that "failure to initiate these procedures within a maximum of two terms from the time of the alleged incident may constitute grounds for dismissal of charges" (p. 6). Only 6.4% of the faculty knew that "parties have the right to seek review by the Provost or to petition the University Review Board for an appeal from a decision of an academic integrity hearing board or investigatory committee within five working days of the decision letter" (p. 6). The Arts and Sciences Academic Integrity Code states that parties have 10 working days of the date of the decision letter of an Assistant Dean to appeal to the Associate Dean. Almost one-quarter of the faculty knew that faculty members are elected to serve two-year terms on the Academic Integrity Board.

"The Pitt Promise" question proved to be an additional stumbling block for faculty as well. This research suggested that less than one-fifth of the faculty knew what "The Pitt Promise" was. As addressed on the Student Affairs web site, "The Pitt Promise" is a student's duty as a member of the University student population to live according to common values, one of which is commitment "to the pursuit of knowledge with personal integrity and academic honesty" (The Pitt Promise: A Commitment to Civility, 2005). A hyperlink to this web address is on the School of Arts and Sciences Undergraduate web site under the header Academic Expectations. Chancellor of the University of Pittsburgh, Mark Nordenberg, made reference to "The Pitt Promise" in his April 17, 2007 memo to the University community in response to the Virginia Tech tragedy. In the memo, Chancellor Mark Nordenberg stated that The Pitt Promise

was a vow taken by incoming freshmen at the opening convocation each year. In addition, The Pitt Promise appears in the Student Code of Conduct and Judicial Procedures, and this booklet is addressed during the Freshman Seminar.

Table 19. Faculty Familiarity with the School of Arts and Sciences Academic Integrity Code by Researcher's Questions

Researcher's Academic Integrity Code Questions	Yes (%)	No (%)	Don't Know (%)	Correct Answer
1. For a first offense, does a signed statement of cheating and its sanctions become part of a student's permanent record?	30 (16.1)	76 (40.6)	81 (43.3)	No
2. Can a faculty member elect not to pursue a documented complaint of academic dishonesty that is submitted by a member of the University community?	27 (14.5)	53 (28.3)	107 (57.2)	Yes
3. If a one-on-one resolution between the faculty member and a student cannot be reached, next should a meeting be scheduled between the faculty member, student, and the Dean (or his/her representative)?	60 (32.1)	68 (36.3)	59 (31.6)	No
4. In proceedings before the Academic Integrity Hearing Board, can students hire legal counsel?	71 (38.0)	27 (14.4)	89 (47.6)	No
5. Can students choose to have public hearings before the Academic Integrity Hearing Board?	61 (32.5)	25 (13.3)	102 (54.2)	Yes
6. Could there be grounds for dismissal of charges if procedures are not indicated within one term from the time of the alleged incident of academic dishonesty?	45 (24.1)	15 (8.0)	127 (67.9)	No
7. Do parties have 10 working days from the date of the decision letter to seek review by the Provost or petition the University Review Board for an appeal from a decision of an academic integrity hearing board?	44 (23.5)	12 (6.4)	131 (70.1)	No
8. Do faculty serving on the Academic Integrity Board serve two-year terms?	46 (24.6)	6 (3.2)	135 (72.2)	Yes
9. Do students sign "The Pitt Promise" upon entrance to the University?	65 (34.8)	33 (17.6)	89 (47.6)	No

The faculty was also asked about their familiarity with the school's software for plagiarism detection. With the explosion of information on the Internet, the downloading of text

into papers becomes an avenue for an easy written assignment. The University of Pittsburgh's CIDDE houses faculty licenses for Turnitin.com which stores submitted papers into its database while checking for text similarities with other documents. As shown in Table 20, more than 70% of the Arts and Sciences undergraduate faculty have heard of this software that screens in particular for plagiarism. Almost 12% have used this academic integrity tool, with 6.3% of the faculty using the software regularly. One explanation for the knowledge of such software is that CIDDE offers two faculty development courses on plagiarism, "Plagiarism Prevention Software" and "Preventing Cheating and Plagiarism." The software prevention class offers faculty access to two-Web-based tools: Turnitin and SafeAssign. Links to source documents are provided when similarities are found between the student paper and other student papers, paper mill documents, and on-line electronic sources. The other class offers faculty strategies to detect plagiarism within the world of cell phones, personal digital assistants, and computers. In the optional comment boxes within the survey, faculty mentioned using various search engines to check for plagiarized text. Search engines such as Google, Altavista, and Clusty (developed at Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA) were used by the faculty.

Table 20. Percentage of Faculty Familiar with Turnitin.com Software by Level of Familiarity

Level	N	Percentage of Faculty
Heard of / Never used	101	53.2
Never heard of	55	28.9
Have used	22	11.6
Use regularly	12	6.3

Turnitin.com offers an extension beyond Google searches which includes papers from "paper mills" and student shared papers. However, the software has it critics because it does not find plagiarism, rather "what it does is find sequences of words in submitted documents which

match sequences of words in documents in its database, or sequences of words in documents on the Internet" (Royce, 2003).

4.1.3 Additional Findings

Faculty was asked one final open-ended question if they had anything further to add to the data collected on the questionnaire. Sixty-three (32.8%) of the 192 faculty respondents gave parting thoughts. Four major themes arose: fear of negative teacher evaluations, student morals, plagiarism problems, and faculty training in academic integrity.

Fear of negative teaching evaluations hindered some faculty from effectively dealing with classroom problems that included cheating. "I do find the heavy weight given to teaching evaluations has a hobbling effect on discipline across the board." "I tried to clamp down and received negative and retaliatory evaluations internally and on Rate My Professor." "If you are the only faculty member being vigilant about cheating, then students think you are the mean bad guy."

A second concern for faculty was that cheating was a habit heard to break. "Cheating seems to be a carryover from the schools years." "Cheating is a gray matter. Students get others to do their work for them and do not consider it cheating, but I do." "I think that all institutions of higher learning should require a course on morality and professional ethics, not just religious affiliated institutions." "Students need to be taught to value integrity before reaching the college level. By then, it seems too late." "Students no longer worry too much about integrity, just getting through the course."

As stated previously, for engineering students, Harding et al. (2004) suggest that past deviant behavior in high school may be a strong predictor of future deviant behavior in college.

Going to college to obtain a job or for high income rather than for the love of learning, discovery, or self-development is a factor associated with cheating (Hanson, 1990). Hanson suggests that "the student who is most likely to be academically honest is a woman from a well-educated family who had good grades in high school, spends long hours studying, has a strong academic self-concept, …" (p. 183). Bower (1998) who received survey data from 405 faculty from two institutions suggested that there may be "a general naiveté among some faculty on the current state of moral and ethical education occurring in the home, schools, and churches prior to a student coming to college" (p. 96). In spite of student influences prior to the collegiate experience, faculty can take hold of their opportunities to serve as role models and encourage ethical behavior by punishing cheaters.

A third concern for undergraduate Arts and Sciences faculty was plagiarism. "Plagiarism from the Internet is a huge problem." "Copying from books without properly citing the source or using quotation marks is also a significant problem." This wise faculty member offered a solution which would prevent students from copying from a book, article, or online document and then fabricating the source. "I used to have serious problems with plagiarism on term papers. Since I started lecturing students on plagiarism and requiring them to turn in a copy of the first page of every source they use in their papers, the problems have stopped." Foss (2006) is an advocate of making students accountable for incremental bits and pieces that are due at specified dates across the semester. It is harder to fake smaller products that encompass the entire writing. A paper trail of the final product can be inspected by the instructor.

"Plagiarism problems in papers have definitely changed the way I structure writing assignments and the number that I am willing to give." "The Web is a huge challenge – cheating is easier than ever. But with Google I can usually identify non-student phrasing and copied

materials within a few seconds." "Most of the trouble I have had has to do with plagiarism. Old papers, other's papers, and material from books, journals, and the web provide students with enough material to cut and paste together a paper on any topic. Goggling some passages from the paper is a way of detecting uncited sources. Good luck!"

"Plagiarism is more likely to come up in cases of poor time management – students haven't given themselves enough time to research, write, and revise (too often they imagine you can research and write at the same time) – or in cases where they do not understand the conventions of documenting their sources." According to Loran Bieber, Interim University Intellectual Integrity Officer at Michigan State, "People know that they can't copy a full paragraph, but I think a lot of them don't realize that when you copy a sentence or two, especially a critical sentence or two, that really you should give due credit." (Plagiarism, 2005-2006, p. 13). To aid in giving credit to the source, Saunders (1993) advises colleges to require every student to purchase a copy of a standard referencing and style textbook to aid them in proper citations.

The University of Pittsburgh Arts and Sciences faculty offered the following comments. "Oftentimes, instructors remember what it was like to be kids or have children themselves and see how easy it is for them to copy materials and go on to activities in which they are more interested." "Faculty can't make students like all subjects. Kids cheat more when they are disinterested." "Students do not have a good understanding of, or are too casual about, the seriousness of committing plagiarism." "My observation: a) Plagiarism from the Internet has become the biggest problem and can be time consuming to track and b) in the most severe incidents of plagiarism, I referred them to the next higher level [of authority]."

Faculty also indicated lack of training in dealing with cheating as a fourth concern. Faculty asked for more training because they felt that they "didn't get much guidance unless they searched for it." Other faculty thought that is would be a good idea to "periodically train faculty in academic integrity and what is expected of the students." "Perhaps I'd benefit from an online course raising my knowledge and awareness of Pitt [academic integrity] policies." "I don't know anything about academic dishonesty and the law." "The appeals process through the instructor/Chair/Assistant Dean hierarchy, and the reporting requirement (submitting the Academic Integrity Violation Report form). It's clear that most faculty do not know about this system, or choose not to use it." "All faculty members should be given ideas on how to make it difficult for students to cheat." June Youatt, Dean of Undergraduate Studies at Michigan State University, demands faculty investigate and pursue cases of cheating with the backing of the university administrators because it is too easy to become "too uninformed, too busy, too frustrated, or too disengaged" (Plagiarism, 2005-2006, p. 5) to make a strong statement about academic values for undergraduates.

In this study, one female faculty member who did address cheating with her class summed up her frustration with the actual Arts and Sciences Integrity Statement for Syllabi due to her lack of training in academic integrity. "The sample statement on plagiarism that Arts and Sciences provides on its website and requires us to put on our syllabi used to be incoherent, but now it is merely useless. It doesn't actually state what the policy is; it just says it will be enforced. … This is empty. Where is the actual policy? And what is the outlined procedural process? I actually don't know. Am I supposed to look it up in the 1974 document?" This faculty member shouldn't feel alone since instructors generally receive little information on how to effectively deal with prevention of cheating or the procedures to follow whenever they suspect

incidents of academic dishonesty (Whitley & Keith-Spiegel, 2002). Whitley and Keith-Spiegel suggest as a preventive measure that faculty should review the institution's policy on academic integrity in the classroom. At this time, gray areas could be addressed, and students would clearly know the institution's policy if they so choose to violate it.

4.1.4 Summary of Findings

This chapter presented data on the findings of the questionnaire. The undergraduate Arts and Sciences faculty who completed the survey were full-time (81.2%), of the tenure stream (65.1%), and taught an average of 16.6 years. The faculty respondents taught an average of 3.4 courses per year. This study found that under half (48.4%) of the faculty had experienced incidents of academic dishonesty in their classrooms during the past academic year. The largest amount of cheating reported by faculty was on paper assignments.

The most frequent academic integrity violations were plagiarism, copying from other students (both examinations and homework), and lying about reasons for late assignment submissions. The faculty (92.7%) included information on their syllabi about academic integrity, but few understood the nuances of the University of Pittsburgh's Arts and Sciences Academic Integrity Code especially the reporting procedure.

Favorite deterrents among the faculty to academic dishonesty included changing the exam annually (69.3%), allowing ample space between student classroom seats (45.8%), and the creation of essay test questions (43.0%). Less than one-third (31.3%) used exam proctors. Almost 71% of the faculty had received some type of academic integrity training at the university level, although the majority was by word of mouth.

Almost 55% of the faculty indicated that nothing would prevent them from confronting and adjudicating students for cheating, whereas one-quarter did not confront the student because they feared that they could not prove the case. When students were caught cheating, the favorite sanction for academic dishonesty on homework and papers was a zero for the assignment. For dishonesty on exams, the issuance of a verbal warning was the top sanction followed by the lowering of the exam score.

Finally, in this age of information sharing, over 71% of the faculty members were familiar with Turnitin.com for plagiarism detection, whereas only about 18% were familiar with the "Pitt Promise" to uphold academic integrity. It seems that better administrative communication is needed with the faculty, especially the older faculty, to align them with the University of Pittsburgh's anti-cheating goals.

5.0 CHAPTER FIVE

Chapter Five represents an interpretation of the findings in Chapter Four which includes theoretical implications, limitations of the study, recommendations to the School of Arts and Sciences administration, and recommendations for future research.

5.1 THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS

This research study added to the literature on academic dishonesty in three ways. First, it illuminated a group of faculty's attempts to combat a norm of cheating. Second, it emphasized a need for better test surveillance conditions, and finally it established a need for the importance of attention to be paid to the School of Arts and Sciences Academic Integrity Code.

First, the faculty at times struggled against preventing cheating. Honor codes alone and tougher penalties rarely result in significant reductions in collegiate cheating (Code of Academic Integrity, 2006). It is faculty and students that sit in the best seats to "beat the cheats" and create a culture where it is not okay to be academically dishonest. What if the culture dictates that collaboration is acceptable? Even though faculty indicated that students accept working together as a norm, a fair number of faculty members in this study indicated the problems that they have had with academic norms of international students. Some international students – those who readily share and acknowledge the work of others as their own – find it difficult to adjust to the

idea that it is morally wrong to take ownership of the words and ideas of others and that a severe penalty may be incurred by doing so (Usick, 2004). Some students blame the need to imitate the sentence structures from English because of their poor writing skills (Myers, 1998). Peter Briggs, Director of the Office for International Students and Scholars at Michigan State University, suggested that "an open discussion of the boundaries of group and individual work would help international students better understand our ways and help prevent any misunderstandings on issues of academic integrity" (Plagiarism, 2005-2006, p. 11).

Second, better surveillance seems to be needed in testing situations. To the credit of the University of Pittsburgh Arts and Sciences undergraduate faculty, none of the faculty in their responses to the open-ended questions mentioned that the social status of students had an impact with regard to how cheating cases would be handled. This is often not the case. Usick (2004) found personality and academic performance had an impact. If the student was popular and performing academically well, the infraction was dealt with in a non-punitive manner. However, if the student was underachieving, he or she would be dealt with in a more formal way. In general, the Arts and Sciences undergraduate faculty rather shifted their foci to surveillance which has a strong influence on cheating behaviors (Corcoran & Rotter, 1987).

Cheaters must weigh the possibility of gain versus the probability of detection and censure. Although a perceived norm with college students, cheating still carries negative social connotations (Covey, Saladin, & Killen, 2001). Both deterrence theory and rational choice theory suggest that "subjects reduce their likelihood to engage in deviant acts as a result of the assessment of the negative consequences (i.e., deterrence theory), or the utility of both positive and negative consequences (i.e., rational choice theory)" (Crown & Spiller, 1998). The Arts and Sciences faculty suggested that if they properly monitored testing situations, then the risk of

detection and its consequences of negative character markings on the individuals involved would cause students to think twice. A potentially shameful situation created among peers, parents, faculty, and the university's administration is a powerful suppressor (Covey et al., 2001).

A third addition to the literature was the need for attention to be given to academic integrity policies. According to Seirup-Pincus (1995), academic integrity policies need to be reviewed often, "taking into consideration that faculty view academically dishonest behaviors on a continuum of seriousness." As stated previously, some faculty thought that giving students a zero on assignments for academic integrity violations was too harsh in many circumstances. More severe sanctions belong to the offender with the larger offenses. An ever evolving policy should take into consideration the changing college climate where many students do not take cheating seriously because the campus academic climate is such that it embraces society's "succeed at all costs" mentality (First in 2009 Academic Integrity Subcommittee Final Report, 2006). Hiring and many scholarships are competitive. Likewise, graduate and professional school admissions are competitive. Setting standards of intellectual integrity and personal honesty means countering negative societal values. Changing the campus culture against the tide of society is difficult at best, and often uncomfortable and disruptive. However, the price may be worth the effort because future academic and business leaders sit within the ranks of the undergraduates. Students need to be pushed to positively contribute to intellectual development in the Commonwealth, the nation, and the world (Fact Book, 2005).

5.2 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

- Since every institution is unique, the results of this academic integrity study might not be generalizable to other institutions. Since only undergraduate Arts and Sciences faculty contributed to this study, the voice of graduate faculty and faculty at smaller public or private institutions of higher learning were not considered. In addition, since this site of data collection is at a non-honor code campus, the specific characteristics of the faculty might not be reflective of faculty from honor code institutions. Therefore, the academic integrity issues expressed in this study may be addressed differently in those settings.
- GTAs sometimes teach the lecture and often teach recitation classes for a primary instructor. From the literature review, it was suggested that more students cheat who are supervised by teaching assistants than those supervised by higher ranking faculty. A truer picture of the amount of perceived student cheating in the Arts and Sciences undergraduate courses would have included surveying instructors who are teaching assistants.
- Since academic dishonesty is a sensitive subject, even with guaranteed anonymity, some faculty may be reluctant to reveal how they handle the matter within their own classrooms. Since the literature suggested that most cheating incidents are handled one-on-one by faculty, faculty may be hesitant to reveal that they went to the next institutional protocol step (possibly involving the judicial board) because they fear exposure. Also, faculty may fear that revealing passive options taken toward suspected cases of cheating may expose lack of classroom management skills.

5.3 RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE SCHOOL OF ARTS & SCIENCES

- Based on the response rate, it seemed that faculty members have an interest in maintaining academic integrity within the classroom. Most of the faculty initiated some actions against cheating, and faculty awareness was high in plagiarism detection software. However, not all the departments have made efforts to educate faculty about this real fact of student college life. Many faculty had some familiarity with the subject due to word of mouth only. Faculty may seem more secure in their dealings with the matter if they knew how others addressed this problem.
- A few faculty members who correctly answered the subparts of the academic integrity code question (Research Question #10) commented about the lengthy and sometimes confusing academic integrity code. In my personal conversation with Fred Whelan, the present academic integrity board chairman, he stated that faculty may benefit from the code being rewritten to emphasize more than just the adjudication process. I found that the usage of a standard form to report incidents was not explicitly stated for the faculty. I also recommend a rewriting of the Academic Integrity Code.
- The faculty has done an appropriate job on their syllabi to refer students to the Arts and Sciences Academic Integrity Code, but the faculty lack knowledge about the code itself. Perhaps this could be addressed at future faculty meetings.
- The classroom seating across the University of Pittsburgh campus is tight allowing easily for wandering eyes. Separate testing locations, perhaps as suggested within the library system could be used whereby students would be monitored by proctors who were University staff members. Another classroom issue highly addressed was class size. The

reduction of anonymity may reduce cheating. However there is a financial cost involved. Possibly have a set of "responsible" teaching assistants accountable for a portion of the class or reduce faculty teaching loads so to allow instructors to better know the work that their students are capable of producing.

- Although not a "legitimate" step in the adjudication reporting sequence, a number of faculty indicated that cheating was halted when the student's academic advisor was involved in process. The drawback was that cheating was not being reported so that repeat offenders would be punished. If this is a significant deterrent to cheating, then it could be incorporated into the adjudication reporting sequence.
- Faculty, in particular in writing courses, stressed the need for students to have clear examples of what was and was not plagiarism, the proper way to list citations, and a set of style expectations to guide their writings. Faculty struggled with fine line cases of "innocent plagiarism" where the students were perhaps ignorant due to lack of training.

5.4 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

- Although a response rate of 48.5% was achieved, it would seem appropriate to poll faculty who did not respond to the initial survey and follow-up invitation to determine whether they had not observed any cheating within their classrooms.
- A license to Turnitin.com has been purchased by the University of Pittsburgh for usage by faculty members. To date the usage of this detection program remains small at this institution. Only 6.3% of the undergraduate Arts and Sciences faculty reported currently using the program, with 11.6% having used the program in the past. Research is needed

to determine the success that faculty have had with this plagiarism detection tool. Some faculty members have used the detection tool but are not using it currently in classes. Is this because they are not offering classes that require writing assignments, or is the program not an effective detection tool for them? If it is not effective, what do they deem to be better?

- Replication of this study in other schools on the University of Pittsburgh campus would serve as a comparison how well the faculty knew the University of Pittsburgh's Academic Integrity Code or their school's modified version of the policy versus that of the Arts and Sciences faculty.
- The augmentation of the study with phone interviews or face-to-face interviews would serve to probe faculty's thoughts and perceptions of academic dishonesty at a deeper level.
- This study did not investigate faculty leadership which has been a "most powerful force in shaping students' attitudes and behaviors in relation to academic integrity" (Biernacki, 2004, p. 219). The addition of an open-ended question pertaining to faculty modeling integrity both within and outside the classroom would capture a way of promoting academic integrity through the faculty role model.
- Lessening the incidence of academic dishonesty is not dependent on the actions of faculty alone. Students certainly play a role. The addition of a student component to the survey would bear light on how the teaching expectations and teacher mannerisms (including testing environments) of faculty persuading students to not risk gambling with academic dishonesty might impact student behavior.

- Although faculty members need means of assessing individual work to differentiate grades of students, the workplace for the Twenty-first Century demands the applied skills of teamwork, communication, and critical thinking (Partnership for 21st Century Skills, 2004). Students need to prepare by "exercising flexibility and willingness to be helpful in making necessary compromises to accomplish a common goal" (Partnership for 21st Century Skills, 2006, p. 1). It would seem appropriate to ask the faculty which academic dishonesty offenses would be considered old fashioned since work is now collaborative. Perhaps homework and other assignments should be collaborative.

5.5 CONCLUSIONS

The undergraduate Arts and Sciences teaching faculty seemed to have the most difficulty with students plagiarizing writings or copying from one another on homework and examinations. Plagiarism comes from the Latin word plagiarus, which means kidnapper (Saunders, 1993). Students kidnap another person's ideas, opinions, theories, graphs, or drawings and present it as their own without giving due credit to the author. This cheating may occur when students are faced with the too many choices of collegiate activities, one of which is assignment or test preparation, when the students prefer more favored activities. Since the prevalence of self-reported cheating is high among collegiate undergraduate students (Bies, 1998), faculty members are steadily relied upon by their university's higher education administration to prevent acts of academic dishonesty.

The University of Pittsburgh Arts and Sciences faculty have answered this call by adhering to their School's desire to announce to students that cheating will not be tolerated and

that it comes with a penalty, the minimum grade of a zero for the exam or quiz. A process is then to be initiated whereby the accused student will be interrogated by a hierarchical chain of faculty, then increasing levels of administration if the student chooses to repeatedly appeal his or her accusation. Many faculty members did not indicate any problems with failing a student on an assignment, while others indicated that circumstances surrounding the case should be examined and preferred remediation.

For the most part, it appears that the Arts and Sciences undergraduate faculty could benefit from academic integrity training other than that afforded during new faculty orientation. Some Arts and Sciences faculty members have successfully searched for outside training in addition to or in place of departmental training, while others asked for it throughout the survey's questions. The faculty also seems to be searching for ways to discuss ethical issues with their students.

I believe that the Arts and Sciences Academic Integrity Code should be discussed with the administration and faculty present and also discussed within the classrooms. I believe that this policy should be rewritten so that the adjudication process is clear. This is not a harsh criticism of the School, when in fact, this condition of academic integrity policy ignorance exists on a fair number of others campuses (Gambill, 2003; Whitley & Keith-Spiegel, 2001). The University of Pittsburgh's School of Arts and Sciences was just chosen to test the hypothesis.

From the response rate and the positive comments received in regards to preventive measures taken against academic dishonesty, it appears that the undergraduate Arts and Sciences faculty have a strong interest in promoting scholarship across their fields. Class size and whether there were teaching assistants involved seemed to be factors determining whether faculty members had "proper" control on the achievement levels of their individual students. The fewer

the courses taught and the lower the student to instructor ratio, the higher the degree of faculty intimacy with student scholastic work.

In general, female instructors and non-tenure stream faculty indicated having more difficulty with student academic dishonesty. This would certainly lend itself to more investigation as to why. It would also be interesting to have asked faculty who have engaged in dialogs with students following suspected violations of academic integrity, what tactics work to mold a student into confessing. In addition, it was beyond the scope of this research to gather data understanding academic dishonesty through the eyes of the GTAs. These individuals are often in the position to grade more papers and projects than the faculty member who may just perform the lecture. Thus these GTAs are in very good positions to make front line observations about academic integrity.

To conclude, I do not believe that the School of Arts and Sciences undergraduate faculty are facing an insurmountable, daunting job preventing students from cheating. Faculty members just need to realize that students will be human and succumb to academic behavior that is not in line with standards of scholarship. Unfortunately, this behavior has become a nationwide norm. Facing reality, these undergraduate faculty members have proctors, search engines, computer software, and the adjudication process at their disposal to weed out the offenders.

APPENDIX A

E-MAIL INVITATION

This e-mail was sent to the undergraduate Arts and Sciences teaching faculty.

June 30, 2008

Dear Professor:

Over the past 40 years, research literature has reported that 40-80% of higher education students admit to some type of academic dishonesty. Academic dishonesty appears to have become commonplace under the right circumstances. Is faculty addressing this problem? Only a limited number of research studies have considered faculty's training in academic integrity and faculty responses to student academic misconduct.

Since you taught undergraduate students during Spring Term 2084, I would appreciate 10 minutes of your time to complete my academic integrity survey regarding what measures you took to encourage academic integrity in your classroom. These data are for my dissertation. I am asking faculty teaching undergraduate courses in the School of Arts and Sciences to participate. Please click on this link http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=elnMtNaSAQBs2lKJIP1buw_3d_3d to confidentially enter your data into my survey. I can in NO WAY identify you with your responses.

Thank you in advance.

Sincerely,

Pat

Pat Wehman

Office of the University Registrar, Manager Course and Classroom Scheduling
Doctoral Candidate School of Education, Administrative and Policy Studies

APPENDIX B

FOLLOW-UP E-MAIL

This follow-up reminder was sent to the Arts and Sciences teaching faculty.

July 14, 2008

Dear Professor:

Several weeks ago you received an invitation to participate in my 10-minute survey ("Faculty Prescriptions for Academic Integrity") regarding maintaining academic integrity in the classroom. I hope that you have chosen to participate. If you participated, thank you.

If you haven't completed the survey, I encourage you to do so and it would be much appreciated. I can in no way identify you with your responses. The link follows: http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=elnMtNa_SAQBs2lKJIP1buw_3d_3d. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me 412-624-7600 or wehman@pitt.edu.

Thanks again and have a great summer,

Pat Wehman

Pat Wehman

Doctoral Student, School of Education, Administrative and Policies Studies
Office of the University Registrar, Manager Course and Classroom Scheduling

APPENDIX C

IRB APPROVALS

University of Pittsburgh
Institutional Review Board

Exempt and Expedited Reviews

University of Pittsburgh FWA: 00006790
University of Pittsburgh Medical Center: FWA 00006735
Children's Hospital of Pittsburgh: FWA 00000600

3500 Fifth Avenue
Suite 100
Pittsburgh, PA 15213
Phone: 412.383.1480
Fax: 412.383.1508

TO: Ms. Patricia Wehman

FROM: Christopher M. Ryan, PhD, Vice Chair

DATE: March 5, 2007

PROTOCOL: Faculty Perspectives of Academic Dishonesty and Prescriptions for Prevention: An Urban Campus Perspective

IRB Number: 0702043

The above-referenced protocol has been reviewed by the University of Pittsburgh Institutional Review Board. Based on the information provided in the IRB protocol, this project meets all the necessary criteria for an exemption, and is hereby designated as "exempt" under section 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2).

- If any modifications are made to this project, please submit an 'exempt modification' form to the IRB.
- Please advise the IRB when your project has been completed so that it may be officially terminated in the IRB database.
- This research study may be audited by the University of Pittsburgh Research Conduct and Compliance Office.

Approval Date: March 5, 2007

CR:kh

University of Pittsburgh

Institutional Review Board

3500 Fifth Avenue
Ground Level
Pittsburgh, PA 15213
(412) 383-1480
(412) 383-1508 (fax)
http://www.irb.pitt.edu

Memorandum

TO:	PATRICIA WEHMAN
FROM:	SUE BEERS PHD, Vice Chair
DATE:	4/23/2008
IRB#:	PRO08030332
SUBJECT:	Faculty Prescriptions for Academic Integrity: An Urban Campus Perspective

---

The above-referenced project has been reviewed by the Institutional Review Board. Based on the information provided, this project meets all the necessary criteria for an exemption, and is hereby designated as "exempt" under section 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2).

Please note the following information:

- If any modifications are made to this project, please contact the IRB Office to ensure it continues to meet the exempt category.
- Upon completion of your project, be sure to finalize the project by submitting a termination request.

Please be advised that your research study may be audited periodically by the University of Pittsburgh Research Conduct and Compliance Office.

APPENDIX D

FACULTY SURVEY

1. Faculty in Pursuit of Academic Integrity

The purpose of this research is to investigate issues in maintenance of academic integrity within faculty classrooms. My dissertation will gather information about academic integrity training and academic integrity practices of Arts and Sciences faculty instructing undergraduates at the University of Pittsburgh. (Completion Time: 10 minutes)

The responsibility of the faculty can be a significant component in maintaining integrity within the classroom. The extent to which faculty address cheating may determine the success of an institution's efforts to combat the problem.

If you are willing to participate, this survey will gather faculty responses concerning academic dishonesty, investigate the faculty's level of familiarity with the Arts and Sciences Academic Integrity Policy, investigate how faculty disseminates academic integrity expectations to students, and investigate faculty means to prevent or reduce Incidents of academic dishonesty. There are no foreseeable risks associated with this study. By reading my online dissertation, instructors could benefit from this study by learning how others combat academic dishonesty.

Your honest and candid responses to this survey are essential to the success of the research. Your participation is voluntary and appreciated. You may withdraw at any time. No compensation will be given. ANONYMITY OF RESPONSES IS GUARANTEED. Your responses will in no way be shown to other course instructors and will be kept under lock and key. I will obtain this confidential data from SurveyMonkey.com. Direct questions to Pat Wehman, Manager Course and Classroom Scheduling, Office of the University Registrar, 220 Thackeray Hall, Pittsburgh, PA, 15260; 412-624-7600; or wehman@pitt.edu.

2. Faculty in Pursuit of Academic Integrity

1. What types of training have you had on academic integrity at the University? Check all that apply.

- ☐ None (Skip to #2.)
- ☐ Department Chair briefing
- ☐ Department taught workshops
- ☐ Faculty development course
- ☐ Training during New Faculty orientation
- ☐ Word of mouth

Other (please specify)

2. When do you address academic integrity with your students? Check all that apply.

- ☐ Never (Skip to #3.)
- ☐ On syllabus and discuss with students
- ☐ On syllabus but do not discuss with students
- ☐ Before major assignments
- ☐ When a violation of academic integrity occurs

Other (please specify)

3. Do you inform your students what the penalties are for cheating in your classes?

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

4. In the past year, which student academic integrity violations have occurred in your classes? Check all that apply.

- ☐ None (Skip to #5.)
- ☐ Altered graded solutions so to ask for more credit
- ☐ Collaborated on work that was to be done by an individual student
- ☐ Copied from another student
- ☐ Gave answers to another student
- ☐ Lied about reason for late assignment submission
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ Turned in a paper from another class without faculty consent
- ☐ Used forbidden materials during assessment

Other (please specify)

5. In the past year, on a scale of 0 to 10 (0=no problem, 10=large problem), how much of a problem did you have with student cheating in your classrooms on examinations, papers, homework, lab assignments, and other specified assignments? Choose NA for non-applicable.

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	N/A
Exams	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Papers	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Homework	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Lab Assignments	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Other (please specify and rank problem 0-10)

6. During exams, what techniques do you use to uphold academic integrity in your classes? Check all that apply.

- ☐ Do not give exams (Skip to #7.)
- ☐ Ask questions on exams specific to individualized student work
- ☐ Change exam from year to year
- ☐ Create different exam versions
- ☐ Make essay tests
- ☐ No restroom breaks during assessment
- ☐ Seat students sufficiently apart
- ☐ Use exam proctors

Other (please specify)

7. What should educational institutions do to promote academic integrity?

8. In the past year, what actions have you taken whenever you observed cheating on exams, homework, and papers in your classrooms? Check all that apply.

	Exams	Homework	Papers
Allowed student to redo/rewrite assignment	☐	☐	☐
Did nothing	☐	☐	☐
Failed student in the course	☐	☐	☐
Gave student a verbal warning	☐	☐	☐
Gave a zero for the assignment	☐	☐	☐
Lowered assignment score	☐	☐	☐
Reported incident to Department Chair	☐	☐	☐
Reported before Academic Integrity Hearing Board	☐	☐	☐

Other (please specify for exams, homework, and papers)

9. In the past year, which of the following has prevented you from acting on a case of observed cheating on an examination? Check all that apply.

- ☐ Nothing would have prevented me from acting against cheating (Skip to #10.)
- ☐ Afraid could not "prove" case
- ☐ Afraid of law suits
- ☐ Did not want to damage relationship with student
- ☐ Feared hassle faced from administration
- ☐ Found out after grade was given to the student
- ☐ Laziness
- ☐ Management skills would be perceived as lacking
- ☐ Student denied the incident
- ☐ Student negotiated a good excuse
- ☐ Student was making decent progress in the course
- ☐ Thought the student would become violent
- ☐ Too time consuming to pursue

Other (please specify)

10. Indicate your level of familiarity with the School of Arts and Sciences Academic Integrity Code and "The Pitt Promise".

	Yes	No	Don't Know
For a first offense, does a signed statement of cheating and its sanctions become part of a student's permanent academic record?	◯	◯	◯
Can a faculty member elect not to pursue a documented complaint of academic dishonesty that is submitted by a member of the University community?	◯	◯	◯
If a one-on-one resolution between the faculty member and a student cannot be reached, next should a meeting be scheduled between the faculty member, student, and the Dean (or his/her representative)?	◯	◯	◯
In proceedings before the Academic Integrity Hearing Board, can students hire legal counsel?	◯	◯	◯
Can students choose to have public hearings before the Academic Integrity Hearing Board?	◯	◯	◯
Could there be grounds for dismissal of charges if procedures are not indicated within one term from the time of the alleged incident of academic dishonesty?	◯	◯	◯
Do parties have ten working days from the date of the decision letter to seek review by the Provost or to petition the University Review Board for an appeal from a decision of an academic integrity hearing board?	◯	◯	◯
Do faculty serving on the Academic Integrity Board serve two-year terms?	◯	◯	◯
Do students sign "The Pitt Promise" upon entrance to the University?	◯	◯	◯

11. What is your level of familiarity with Turnitin.com software?

◯ Never Heard of ◯ Heard of/Never Used ◯ Have Used ◯ Use Regularly

12. Types of undergraduate courses taught? Check all that apply.

☐ Clinical ☐ Internship ☐ Recitation
☐ Colloquium ☐ Laboratory ☐ Seminar
☐ Correspondence ☐ Lecture ☐ Workshop
☐ Directed Study ☐ Mass Media
☐ Independent Study ☐ Practicum

Other (please specify)

13. Gender?

◯ Male ◯ Female

14. Years of undergraduate teaching?

#

15. Tenure Tracking with Academic Rank? Choose one.

◯ Tenure Stream Full Professor ◯ Non-Tenure Stream Full Professor
◯ Tenure Stream Associate Professor ◯ Non-Tenure Stream Associate Professor
◯ Tenure Stream Assistant Professor ◯ Non-Tenure Stream Assistant Professor
◯ Tenure Stream Lecturer ◯ Non-Tenure Stream Lecturer
◯ Tenure Stream Instructor ◯ Non-Tenure Stream Instructor

◯ Other (please specify Rank and Tenure Tracking)

16. Typical teaching status?

◯ Full-time ◯ Part-time

17. Average number of undergraduate COURSES taught per year?

[ ]

18. Arts and Sciences Disciplinary Classification? Choose one.

◯ Humanities ◯ Natural Sciences ◯ Social Sciences

19. Any additional comments regarding academic integrity?

APPENDIX E

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY CODE

Academic Integrity

These guidelines pertain to academic integrity issues related to student-faculty interactions in the classroom and other academic contexts. This document outlines Student Conduct and Faculty Conduct.

Student Conduct

I. Student Obligations

A student has an obligation to exhibit honesty and to respect the ethical standards of the academy in carrying out his or her academic assignments. Without limiting the application of this principle, a student may be found to have violated this obligation if he or she:

1. Refers during an academic evaluation to materials or sources, or employs devices, not authorized by the instructor.
2. Provides assistance during an academic evaluation to another person in a manner not authorized by the instructor.
3. Receives assistance during an academic evaluation from another person in a manner not authorized by the instructor.
4. Engages in unauthorized possession, buying, selling, obtaining, or using of any materials intended to be used as an instrument of academic evaluation in advance of its administration.
5. Acts as a substitute for another person in any academic evaluation process.
6. Utilizes a substitute in any academic evaluation procedure.
7. Practices any form of deceit in an academic evaluation proceeding.
8. Depends on the aid of others in a manner expressly prohibited by the instructor, in the research, preparation, creation, writing, performing, or publication of work to be submitted for academic credit or evaluation.
9. Provides aid to another person, knowing such aid is expressly prohibited by the instructor, in the research, preparation, creation, writing, performing, or publication of work to be submitted for academic credit or evaluation.
10. Presents as one's own, for academic evaluation, the ideas, representations, or words of another person or persons without customary and proper acknowledgment of sources.
11. Submits the work of another person in a manner that represents the work to be one's own.
12. Knowingly permits one's work to be submitted by another person without the instructor's authorization.
13. Attempts to influence or change one's academic evaluation or record for reasons other than achievement or merit.

14. Indulges, during a class, examination session, or any other academic setting, in conduct that is so disruptive or disrespectful as to infringe upon the rights of the instructor or fellow students.
15. Fails to cooperate, if called upon, in the investigation or disposition of any allegation of dishonesty pertaining to another student, or any other breach of a student's obligation to exhibit honesty.

II. Procedures for Adjudication

No student should be subject to an adverse finding that he or she committed an offense related to academic integrity, and no sanction should be imposed relating thereto, except in accordance with procedures appropriate for disposition of the particular matter involved. The degree of formality of proceedings, the identity of the decision maker or decision makers, and other related aspects should properly reflect such considerations as the severity of the potential sanction, its probable impact upon the student, and the extent to which matters of professional judgment are essential in arriving at an informed decision. In all cases, however, the objective is to provide fundamental fairness to the student as well as an orderly means for arriving at a decision, starting first with the individual instructor and then with designated administrative officers or bodies.

These Guidelines are not meant to address differences of opinion over grades issued by faculty in exercising good faith professional judgments of student work. They are meant to address ways in which a faculty member deals with a student regarding an alleged breach of academic integrity.

In matters of academic integrity the succeeding procedural steps must be followed:

1. Any member of the University community who has evidence may bring to the attention of the instructor a complaint that a student has failed, in one or more respects, to meet faithfully the obligations specified in Section I.[2] Acting on his or her own evidence, and/or on the basis of evidence submitted to the instructor, the instructor will advise the student that he or she has reason to believe that the student has committed an offense related to academic integrity, and the student will be afforded an opportunity to respond. If the accused student and the instructor accept a specific resolution offered by either of them, and if this is a first offense, the matter shall be considered closed if both parties sign a written agreement to that effect, and submit it to the appropriate Assistant Dean (see f.n.1). These records are not to be added to the student's individual file and they are to be destroyed when the student graduates or permanently terminates registration. The Assistant Dean may provide such information identifying an individual student for the following uses:
   a. to an instructor who is involved with a student integrity violation at the initial stage and who wishes to use this previous record in determining whether a resolution between the faculty member and the student or an academic integrity hearing board may be most appropriate, especially in the case of repeat offenders; and,
   b. to a college or school Academic Integrity Hearing Board after a decision of guilt or innocence has been made in a case, but before a sanction has been recommended.
2. If this is a second or further offense the matter will be closed between the faculty member and the student, but the School of Arts and Sciences can still impose a further sanction. If a student agrees that he or she is guilty of the second or further offense, sanction appeals will be made directly to the Associate Dean.
3. If a resolution between the faculty member and the student cannot be reached, a meeting should be scheduled with the student, faculty member and department chair (or his/her representative) for a final attempt at an informal resolution. If this meeting does not result in a mutually agreeable outcome, the faculty member will file a written statement of charges with the appropriate Assistant Dean. Complaints involving undergraduate students should be directed to the Office of the Arts and Sciences Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies, 140 Thackeray Hall, and complaints involving graduate students should be directed to the Office of the Arts and Sciences Associate Dean for Graduate Studies and Research, 5141 Sennott Square. Such a statement should set forth the alleged offenses that are the basis of the charges, including a factual narrative of events and the dates and times of occurrences. The statement should also include the names of persons having personal knowledge of circumstances or events, the general nature and description of all evidence, and the signature of the charging party. If this occurs at the end of a term, and/or the last term of enrollment, the "G" grade should be issued for the course until the matter is decided. In situations

involving the student's last term before graduation, degree certifications can be withheld pending the outcome of the investigation that should be expedited as quickly as possible.

4. The appropriate Assistant Dean will conduct an investigation of the charges, talking with the student, faculty member and department chair. The Assistant Dean will reach a decision regarding the case and this decision will be sent to all the parties involved in the case.
5. If either party wishes to appeal the Assistant Dean's decision, the Appeal will be made in the first instance to the Arts and Sciences Academic Integrity Officer. At this time the formal written charges and all other collected material will be turned over to the Arts and Sciences Academic Integrity Officer. The Arts and Sciences Academic Integrity Officer will review the case and make a final attempt at resolving the issue informally. If this fails, the appeal will be transmitted to the Academic Integrity Hearing Board.
6. If the Arts and Sciences Academic Integrity Officer convenes the Academic Integrity Hearing Board, he/she will transmit a written statement of charges to the student, together with a copy of these regulations.
7. The letter of transmittal to the student, a copy of which shall also be sent to the instructor or charging party, will provide reasonable notice of the time and place when a hearing on the charges will be held by the Academic Integrity Hearing Board.[3]

In proceedings before an Academic Integrity Hearing Board, the student shall have the right:

a. to be considered innocent until found guilty by clear and convincing evidence of a violation of the Student obligations of academic integrity;
b. to have a fair disposition of all matters as promptly as possible under the circumstances;
c. to elect to have a private or public hearing;
d. to be informed of the general nature of the evidence to be presented;
e. to confront and question all parties and witnesses except when extraordinary circumstances make this impossible;
f. to present a factual defense through witnesses, personal testimony and other relevant evidence;
g. to decline to testify against himself or herself; and
h. to have only relevant evidence considered by the Academic Integrity Hearing Board.

8. The hearing should provide a fair inquiry into the truth or falsity of the charges, with the charged party and the instructor or charging party afforded the right to cross-examine all adverse witnesses. Legal counsel shall not be permitted, but a non-attorney representative from within the University community shall be permitted for both faculty and students. A law student cannot be used as a representative at the Academic Integrity Hearing Board.
9. Any member of the University community may, upon showing relevancy and necessity, request witnesses to appear at the hearing. Witnesses who are members of the University community shall be required to appear and other witnesses may be requested to appear at a hearing. When necessitated by fairness or extraordinary circumstances, the Academic Integrity Hearing Board may make arrangements for recorded or written testimony for use in a proceeding.
10. HEARING PROCEDURE: The hearing will be conducted as follows:

a. the Chair of the Hearing Board will not apply technical exclusionary rules of evidence followed in judicial proceedings nor entertain technical legal motions. Technical legal rules pertaining to the wording of questions, hearsay and opinions will not be formally applied. Reasonable rules of relevancy will guide the Chair of the Hearing Board in ruling on the admissibility of evidence. Reasonable limits may be imposed on the number of factual witnesses and the amount of cumulative evidence that may be introduced;
b. the Chair of the Academic Integrity Hearing Board shall read the alleged offense or offenses upon which the complaint is based;
c. objections to procedure shall be entered on the record, and the Chair of the Academic Integrity Hearing Board shall make any necessary rulings regarding the validity of such objections;
d. the charging party shall state his/her case and shall offer evidence in support thereof;
e. the accused or representative for the accused shall have the opportunity to question the charging party;
f. the charging party shall be given the opportunity to call witnesses;

g. the accused or representatives for the accused shall be given the opportunity to question each witness of the charging party after he/she testifies;

h. the charging party shall inform the Chair of the Academic Integrity Hearing Board when his/her presentation is completed, at which time the Academic Integrity Hearing Board members shall be given an opportunity to ask questions of the persons participating in the hearing;

i. the Academic Integrity Hearing Board shall recess, and the Chair shall make a determination as to whether the charging party has presented sufficient evidence to support a finding against the accused if such evidence is uncontroverted. The parties may be required to remain in the hearing room during the recess or may be excused for a time period set by the Chair of the Academic Integrity Hearing Board;

j. depending upon the determination of the Chair of the Academic Integrity Hearing Board, the matter shall be dismissed or the accused shall be called upon to present his/her case and offer evidence in support thereof;

k. the accused may testify or not as he/she chooses;

l. the charging party shall have the opportunity to question the accused if the accused voluntarily chooses to testify;

m. the accused or a representative for the accused shall have the opportunity to call witnesses;

n. the charging party shall have the opportunity to question each witness of the accused after he/she testifies;

o. the accused shall inform the Chair of the Academic Integrity Hearing Board when his/her presentation is complete, and the Academic Integrity Hearing Board members shall have an opportunity to ask questions of the accused as well as the accused's witnesses;

p. the Chair of the Academic Integrity Hearing Board shall have an opportunity to address the Hearing Board on University regulations or procedure in the presence of all parties, but shall not offer other comments without the consent of all parties; and,

q. the hearing shall be continued and the members of the Hearing Board shall deliberate in private until a decision is reached and recorded.

11. A suitable record (audio recording) shall be made of the proceedings, exclusive of deliberations to arrive at a decision. (An audio tape or written transcript of the hearing will be made available to the student at his or her own expense.)

12. The proposed decision, which shall be written, shall include a determination whether the charges have been proven by clear and convincing evidence, together with findings with respect to the material facts. If any charges are established, the proposed decision shall state the particular sanction or sanctions to be imposed. Prior violations or informal resolutions of violations may be considered only in recommending sanctions, not in determining guilt or innocence. Once a determination of guilt has been made, and before determining sanctions, the Chair of the Academic Integrity Hearing Board should find out from the appropriate Dean(s) whether prior offenses and sanctions imposed have occurred.

13. The proposed decision shall be submitted to the appropriate Associate Dean (in cases involving undergraduate students to the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies, and in cases involving graduate students to the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies), who will make an independent review of the hearing proceedings in consultation with the Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences. He/she may require that the charges be dismissed, or that the case be remanded for further proceedings whenever he or she deems this to be necessary. Upon completion of such additional proceedings, if any, and within a reasonable time he/she shall issue a final decision. He/she may reject any findings made by the Academic Integrity Hearing Board adverse to the student, and may dismiss the charges or reduce the severity of any sanction imposed but may not make new findings adverse to the student or increase the severity of a sanction, except in the case of repeat offenders of the Academic Integrity Guidelines.

14. The Associate Dean shall then transmit to the charged party and the instructor copies of all actions taken. If a sanction is imposed, the notice to the student will make reference to the student's opportunity, by petition filed with the Provost, to appeal to the University Review Board (see V. Review and Appeal below).

III. Timeliness

It is the responsibility of all parties, including administrative officers, to take prompt action in order that charges can be resolved quickly and fairly. Failure to initiate these procedures within a maximum of two terms from the time of the alleged incident may constitute grounds for dismissal of charges. Parties have the right to appeal the decision of an Assistant Dean to the appropriate Associate Dean within ten (10) working days of the date of the decision letter. Parties have the right to seek review by the Provost or to petition the University Review Board for an appeal from a decision of an academic integrity hearing board or investigatory committee within five (5) working days of the date of the decision letter.

IV. Sanctions

The sanctions that may be imposed upon a finding that an offense related to academic integrity has been committed are the following:

1. For the School of Arts and Sciences, the sanction for a first violation of the Academic Integrity Code will normally be a failing grade in the course.
2. Once the Arts and Sciences Dean's Office learns of a second offense, even if a sanction has been agreed to between the instructor and the student, an additional sanction may be imposed. A second violation will normally result in suspension or dismissal from the School.

The imposition of such sanctions may be part of any report concerning a student submitted to a government agency, accrediting body, or other person or institution in accordance with the requirements of law or the written consent of the student.

V. Review and Appeal

A student or faculty member may seek to have the Associate Dean's final decision (or a determination that the charges are not subject to adjudication) reviewed by the Provost, who may seek the advice of the University Review Board, or the student may appeal to the University Review Board, whose recommendation shall be made to the Provost. The action of the Provost, taken with or without the advice of the University Review Board, shall constitute an exhaustion of all required institutional remedies.[4]

Faculty Conduct

I. Faculty Obligations

A faculty member accepts an obligation, in relation to his or her students, to discharge his or her duties in a fair and conscientious manner in accordance with the ethical standards generally recognized within the academic community (as well as those of the profession).

Without limiting the application of the above principle, members of the faculty are also expected (except in cases of illness or other compelling circumstance) to conduct themselves in a professional manner, including the following:

1. To meet their classes when scheduled.
2. To be available at reasonable times for appointments with students, and to keep such appointments.
3. To make appropriate preparation for classes and other meetings.
4. To perform their grading duties and other academic evaluations in a timely manner.
5. To describe to students, within the period in which a student may add and drop a course, orally, in writing, or by reference to printed course descriptions, the general content and objectives of a course; and announce the methods and standards of evaluation, including the importance to be assigned various factors in academic evaluation and, in advance of any evaluation, the permissible materials or references allowed during evaluation.
6. To base all academic evaluations upon good-faith professional judgment.
7. Not to consider, in academic evaluation, such factors as race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, age, national origin, and political or cultural affiliation, and lifestyle, activities, or behavior outside the classroom unrelated to academic achievement.

8. To respect the confidentiality of information regarding a student contained in University records; and to refrain from releasing such information, except in connection with intra-University business, or with student consent, or as may be permitted by law.
9. Not to exploit their professional relationship with students for private advantage and to refrain from soliciting the assistance of students for private purposes in a manner which infringes upon such students' freedom of choice.
10. To give appropriate recognition to contributions made by students to research, publication, service, or other activities.
11. To refrain from any activity which involves risk to the health and safety of a student, except with the student's informed consent, and, where applicable, in accordance with the University policy relating to the use of human subjects in experimentation.
12. To respect the dignity of students individually and collectively in the classroom and other academic contexts.

II. Grievance Policies

Any member of the University community having evidence may bring to the attention of the department Chair and/or Dean a complaint that a faculty member has failed, in one or more respects, to meet faithfully the obligations set forth above. The Chair or Dean, in his or her discretion, will take such action by way of investigation, counseling, or action—in accordance with applicable University procedures—as may appear to be proper under the circumstances. The faculty member's and student's interest in confidentiality, academic freedom, and professional integrity in such matters will be respected.

III. Grievance Procedures

In order to provide a means for students to seek and obtain redress for grievances affecting themselves individually, the following procedures should be followed. These are not intended and shall not be used to provide sanctions against faculty members.

Where an individual student alleges with particularity that the actions of a faculty member have resulted in serious academic injury to the student, the matter shall (if requested by the student) be presented to the Academic Integrity Hearing Board for adjudication. Serious academic injury includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the awarding of a lower course grade than that which the student has earned, or suspension from a class. **However, this is not intended to address normal grading decisions of faculty in exercising good-faith professional judgment in evaluating a student's work.**

It is the responsibility of the student, before seeking to have a grievance adjudicated, to attempt to resolve the matter informally by personal conference with the faculty member concerned, and, if such attempts are unavailing, to call the matter to the attention of the Department Chair (or his/her designated representative) for consideration and adjustment by informal means. The student may take the case to the appropriate Assistant Dean. The Assistant Dean will review the student's concerns, investigate the charges and render a decision. If the student or faculty member disagrees with the Assistant Dean's decision, either may appeal to the Arts and Sciences Academic Integrity Officer. The following grievance procedure will be followed:

1. The aggrieved student will file a written statement of charges with the Arts and Sciences Academic Integrity Administrative Officer.
2. If the Academic Integrity Administrative Officer determines that the charges are subject to adjudication under the terms of the Academic Integrity Guidelines, he or she will transmit the charges to the faculty member, together with a copy of these regulations.
3. The letter of transmittal to the faculty member, a copy of which shall also be sent to the student, will state the composition of a committee that has been named to meet with the involved parties to make an informal inquiry into the charge. The purpose of this committee is to provide a last effort at informal resolution of the matter between the student and the faculty member. The committee will be appointed by the appropriate Associate Dean and composed of one faculty member and one student drawn from either the current membership of the Arts and Sciences Undergraduate Council or the Arts and Sciences Graduate Council. It will serve on a case by case basis. Members of this informal committee must recuse themselves from further participation should the case proceed to a formal hearing.

4. The committee shall meet with the faculty member, the student, and others as appropriate, to review the nature of the problem in an attempt to reach a settlement of the differences. **This is not a formal hearing and formal procedural rules do not apply.** On completion of these meetings, if no mutually agreeable resolution results, the committee may produce its own recommendation for a solution to the conflict.
5. Should the committee recommend that the faculty member take some corrective action on behalf of the student, its recommendations shall be provided to the faculty member. As promptly as reasonable and at least within five working days after the faculty member receives the recommendations of the committee, the faculty member shall privately take that action which he or she elects, and so advise the student and chairman of the committee of that action.
6. Should the committee conclude that the faculty member need take no corrective action on behalf of the student; this finding shall be forwarded to both the faculty member and the student.
7. If the student elects to pursue the matter further, either because he or she is dissatisfied with the resulting action of the faculty member or the conclusion of the committee, he or she should discuss this intent with the chair of the committee who should review the procedures to be followed with the student. If the student wishes to proceed with a formal hearing, the chair of the committee shall advise the Arts and Sciences Academic Integrity Officer that the case appears to involve a student's claim of serious academic injury, and that the formal hearing procedure must be initiated. The Arts and Sciences Academic Integrity Officer will convene a panel from the appropriate Academic Integrity Board and charge its members.
8. The formal hearing should provide a fair inquiry into the truth or falsity of the charges, with the faculty member and the student afforded the right to cross-examine. Legal counsel shall not be permitted, but a non-attorney representative from within the University community shall be permitted for both faculty and students. A law student cannot be used as a representative at the Academic Integrity Hearing Board.
9. A suitable record (audio recording) shall be made of the proceedings, exclusive of deliberations to arrive at a decision. (An audio tape or a written transcript of the hearing will be made available to the faculty member at his or her own expense.)
10. The proposed decision, which shall be written, shall include a determination of whether charges have been proven by clear and convincing evidence, together with findings with respect to the material facts. If any charges are established, the proposed decision shall state the particular remedial action to be taken.
11. The proposed decision shall be submitted to the appropriate Associate Dean, who will make an independent review of the hearing proceedings in consultation with the Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences. The Associate Dean may require that the charges be dismissed, or that the case be remanded for further proceedings whenever he or she deems this to be necessary. The Associate Dean may limit the scope of any further proceedings or require that a part or all of the original proceedings be reconvened. Upon completion of such additional proceedings, if any, the Associate Dean shall issue a final decision. The Associate Dean may reject any findings made by the Academic Integrity Hearing Board, dismiss the charges, or reduce the extent of the remedial action to be taken. If the Associate Dean believes remedial action to be taken may infringe upon the exercise of academic freedom, he/she will seek an advisory opinion from the Senate Committee on Tenure and Academic Freedom before issuing his/her own decision. The decision of the Associate Dean shall be in writing, shall set forth with particularity any new findings of fact or remedies, and shall include a statement of the reasons underlying such action.
12. The Associate Dean shall then transmit to the faculty member and to the student copies of all actions affecting them taken by the hearing authority and the dean. Suitable records shall be maintained as confidential and retained in the office of the Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences.

IV. Remedial Action

Remedies in a student's behalf should usually be those agreed to willingly by the faculty member. Other remedial action to benefit a student may be authorized by the Associate Dean only upon the recommendation of the Academic Integrity Hearing Board and limited to: Allowing a student to repeat an examination; allowing a student to be evaluated for work that would otherwise be too late to be considered; directing that additional opportunities be afforded for consultation or instruction; eliminating a grade that had been assigned by a faculty member from the transcript; changing a failing letter or numerical grade to a

"pass" or "satisfactory" grade, so as not to adversely affect a student's grade average; allowing a student to repeat a course without paying tuition or any other penalty, schedule and program permitting.

No action detrimental to the faculty member will be taken, except as in strict accordance with established University procedures. An adjustment hereunder in the student's behalf shall not be deemed a determination that the faculty member was in any way negligent or derelict.

V. Review and Appeal

A student or faculty member may seek to have the Associate Dean's final decision (or a determination that the charges are not subject to adjudication) reviewed by the Provost, who may seek the advice of the University Review Board, or the student may appeal to the University Review Board, whose recommendation shall be made to the Provost. The action of the Provost, taken with or without the advice of the University Review Board, shall constitute an exhaustion of all required institutional remedies.

If any such determination may be deemed to have a possible adverse effect upon the faculty member's professional situation, the faculty member may seek the assistance of the Tenure and Academic Freedom Committee of the University Senate.

VI. Timeliness

It is the responsibility of all parties, including administrative officers, to take prompt action in order that grievances may be resolved quickly and fairly. Failure to initiate these procedures within two terms of the alleged incident may constitute grounds for denial of a hearing or other relief, especially if prejudice results. Parties have the right to seek review of the Provost or to petition the University Review Board for an appeal from a decision of an academic integrity hearing board or investigatory committee within five (5) working days of the date of the decision letter.

GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES AGAINST SENIOR ADMINISTRATORS

A student complaint of arbitrary or unfair treatment against the principal officer of an academic unit (e.g., the Dean) should be made to the Provost or appropriate Senior Vice Chancellor. There must be a prompt review and decision on the grievance. Members of the faculty who may be called upon to review and advise on the grievance should be drawn from outside the jurisdiction of the administrator against whom the charge is made.

Footnotes

1. Throughout this document, reference will be made to the appropriate Assistant and Associate Deans. For undergraduates, the Assistant Dean is Frederick Whelan and the Associate Dean is Juan J. Manfredi. Both Deans are located in 140 Thackeray Hall, (x4-6480). For graduate students, the Assistant Dean is Stephen Carr and the Associate Dean is Nicole Constable. Both Deans are located in 5141 Sennott Square, (x4-6094). The Arts and Sciences Academic Integrity Officer is the Assistant Dean for Graduate Student Programs and Academic Integrity, Lorie Johnson-Osho. She is located in 5141 Sennott Square, (x4-6094).
2. If the instructor elects not to pursue a complaint submitted by a member of the University community, the complaint can be submitted to the appropriate Assistant Dean who may pursue the matter in place of the instructor.
3. For cases involving undergraduates, the Academic Integrity Board consists of four faculty (three members and one alternate) and four undergraduate students (three members and one alternate). Faculty members serving on this committee are elected by the faculty and serve a two-year term. One faculty member is chosen by the Board to serve as Chair. Students are appointed by Student Government Board. For cases involving graduate students, the Academic Integrity Board consists of a non-voting president and five voting members. The president is elected by the Arts and Sciences Graduate Council at the beginning of each academic year. The five board members (three faculty and two students) are chosen by the president in consultation with the Associate Dean for Graduate Studies and Research for each case as it arises from the current members and the members of the previous two years of the Arts and Sciences Graduate Council.

4. In implementation, the decision of the Provost shall be binding also on matters of interpretation of codes and procedures, determination of serious injury, and determination that an allegation is subject to adjudication by the procedures provided herein.

Retrieved January 6, 2009 from http://www.as.pitt.edu/faculty/policy/integrity.html.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Academic Dishonesty—Classroom strategies for reducing dishonesty. (1994). Academic Services. Adrian College, Adrian, MI. Retrieved October 15, 2008 from http://www.adrian.edu/academic_services/academic_dishonesty.pdf.

Academic Integrity Code. (2006). *Arts and Sciences Undergraduate Student Handbook*. University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA. Retrieved February 13, 2008 from http://www.as.pitt.edu/undergraduate/expectations/handbook/academic-standards.html#ai.

Academic Integrity Guidelines. (2005). Chattanooga State Technical Community College. Chattanooga, TN. Retrieved February 17, 2005 from http://www.chattanoogastate.edu/Campus_Life/pdf/Academic%2520Integrity%2520Guidelines%25202005.pdf.

Academic Integrity Policy (2000). The Pennsylvania State University. *Policy 49-20 Academic Integrity*. Retrieved February 13, 2008 from http://www.psu.edu/dept/ufs/policies/47-00.html.

Academic Integrity Statement for Syllabi (2006). School of Arts and Sciences. University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA. Retrieved October 15, 2008 from http://www.as.pitt.edu/faculty/teaching/syllabi-integrity.html.

Ajken, I. (1991a). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 179-211.

Ajken, I. (1991b). *Theory of planned behavior*. Retrieved July 6, 2007 from http://www.valuebasedmanagement.net/methods_ajzen_theory_planned_behaviour.html.

American University. (2002). *American University academic integrity FAQ*. American University, Washington, DC. Retrieved October 22, 2007 from http://www.american.edu/academics/integrity/FAQ.htm.

Ashworth, P., Bannister, P., & Thorne, P. (1997). Guilty in whose eyes? University students' perceptions of cheating and plagiarism in academic work and assessment. *Studies in Higher Education, 22*(2), 187-203.

Barlow, D. (2006). The teachers' lounge. *Education Digest, 71*(9), 40-43.

Biernacki, C. H. (2004). An investigation of faculty teaching behaviors that may influence students' decisions to engage in acts of academic dishonesty in higher education. University of Central Florida, Orlando, FL. Digital Dissertations. *UMI Proquest Dissertations*. (UMI No. AAT 3144880).

Bies, J. B. (1998). Faculty attitudes toward academic dishonesty: A private Midwestern college perspective. University of South Dakota, Vermillion, SD. Digital Dissertations. *UMI Proquest Dissertations*. (UMI No. AAT 9916197).

Boehm, P. J. (2006). Promoting academic integrity in institutions of higher education. Texas A&M University-Commerce, Commerce, TX. Digital Dissertations. *UMI Proquest Dissertations*. (UMI No. AAT 3240552).

Boselovic, L. (2006, October 1). Heard off the street: Study suggests Cheating 101 more prevalent at business schools. *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*. Retrieved October 3, 2006 from http://www.post-gazette.com/pg/06274/726256-28.stm.

Bower, D. J. (1998). Responding to academic dishonesty: Faculty and student perspectives. University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, Champaign, IL. Digital Dissertations. *UMI Proquest Dissertations*. (UMI No. AAT 9904395).

Brilliant, J. J., & Gribben, C. A. (1993). A workshop for faculty and counselors on academic dishonesty. *Journal of College Student Development, 34*(6), 437-438.

Brown, V. J., & Howell, M. E. (2001). The efficacy of policy statements on plagiarism: Do they change students' views? *Research in Higher Education, 42*(1), 103-118.

Carter, S. L., & Punyanunt-Carter, N. M. (2006). *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 33*(3), 212-216.

Cizek, G. J. (1999). Cheating *on tests: How to do it, detect it, and prevent it*. Mahaw, NJ: Lawrence R. Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Cizek, G. J. (2003). *Detecting and preventing classroom cheating: Promoting integrity in assessmen*t. Thousand Oaks, CA: Dorwin Press, Inc.

Code of Academic Integrity. (2006). Wittenberg University, Springfield, OH. Retrieved December 18, 2006 from http://www4.wittenberg.edu/academics/academicintegrity/rationale.html.

Corcoran, K. J., & Rotter, J. B. (1987). Morality-conscience guilt scale as a predictor of ethical behavior in a cheating situation among college females. *The Journal of General Psychology, 114*(2), 117-123.

Coren, A. (2006). Faculty responses to academic integrity violations. University of Nebraska, Lincoln, NE. Digital Dissertations. *UMI Proquest Dissertations*. (UMI No. AAT 3236909).

Covey, M. K., Saladin, S., & Killen, P. J. (2001). Self-monitoring, surveillance, and incentive effects on cheating. *The Journal of School Psychology, 129*(5), 673-679.

Crown, D. F., & Spiller, M. S. (1998). Learning from the literature on collegiate cheating: A review of empirical research. *Journal of Business Ethics, 17*(6), 683-700.

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.

Davis, S. F., & Ludvigson, H. W. (1995). Additional data on academic dishonesty and a proposal for remediation. *Teaching of Psychology, 22*(2), 119-121.

Definitions of Academic Dishonesty. (1999). Teaching Guide for Graduate Student Instructors. Berkeley, CA. Retrieved February 17, 2008 from http://gsi.berkeley.edu/resources/honesty/definitions.html.

Dick, M., Sheard, J., Bareiss, C., Carter, J., Joyce, D., Harding, T., & Laxer, C. (2003). Addressing student cheating: Definitions and solutions. *ACME SIGCSE Bulletin, 35*(2), 172-184. Retrieved November 21, 2006 from http://www.cs.kent.ac.uk/pubs/2003/1645/.

Diekhoff, G. M., LaBeff, E. E., Clark, R. E., Williams, L. E., Francis, B., & Haines, V. J. (1996). College cheating: Ten years later. *Research in Higher Education, 37*(4), 487-503.

Dillman, D.A. (2000). *Mail and Internet surveys: The tailored design method*. New York, N Y: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Educational Testing Service. (1999). *Cheating is a personal foul*. Cheating fact sheet. R & B Communications, Inc. Retrieved on September 29, 2006 from http://www.glass-castle.com/clients/www-nocheating-org/adcouncil/research/cheatingfactsheet.html.

Fact Book. (2005). University of Pittsburgh Fact Book 2005. University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA. Office of Institutional Research. Mission statement. Retrieved on November 21, 2008 from http://www.ir.pitt.edu/factbook/fbweb05/general/MISSION.PDF.

Fact Book. (2008). University of Pittsburgh Fact Book 2008. University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA. Office of Institutional Research. Retrieved February 23, 2008 from http://www.ir.pitt.edu/factbook/fbweb08/fb08.pdf.

First in 2009 Academic Integrity Subcommittee Final Report. (2006). Miami University, Oxford, OH. Retrieved September 1, 2008 from http://www.units.muohio.edu/firstin2009/Documents/AcademicIntegrityFinalReport.pdf.

Flannigan, P.D. (1999). The comparison of attitudes and practices of teaching faculty regarding student academic dishonesty at a two-year and four-year institution. University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, CO. Digital Dissertations. *UMI Proquest Dissertations*. (UMI No. AAT 9902416).

Foss, K. (2006). The myth of the plagiarism – proof paper. *CLSA Journal, 30*(1), 12-13.

Foster, A. L. (2002). Plagiarism-detection tool creates legal quandary. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 48*(36), A37-A38.

Gambill, T. (2003). Discouraging academic dishonesty: Perceived best practices for one liberal arts college. University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA. Digital Dissertations. *UMI Proquest Dissertations*. (UMI No. 3097284).

Genereux, R. L., & McLeod, B. A. (1995). Circumstances surrounding cheating: A questionnaire study of college students. *Research in Higher Education*, 36(6), 687-705.

Gillogly, K. (2008, October 21). Plagiarism and Pitt. *The Pitt News*, pp. 1,-2, 4.

Graham, M. A., Monday, J., O'Brien, K., & Steffen, S. (1994). Cheating at small colleges: An examination of student and faculty attitudes and behaviors. *Journal of College Student Development, 35*(4), 255-260.

Greene, A. S., & Saxe, L. (1992). *Everyone (else) does it: Academic cheating.* Paper presented at the meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association Convention, Boston, MA: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED347931).

Groark, M., Oblinger, D., & Choa, M. (2001, September/October). Term paper mills, anti-plagiarism tools, and academic integrity. *EDUCAUSE Review*. Retrieved October 18, 2007 from http://net.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/erm0153.pdf.

Hall, T. L. (1996). Honor among students: Academic integrity and student cultures. Indiana University, Bloomington, IN. Digital Dissertations. *UMI Proquest Dissertations*. (UMI No. AAT 9640120).

Hanson, A. C. (1990). Academic dishonesty: The impact of student and institutional characteristics on cheating behaviors. University of California, Los Angeles, CA. Digital Dissertations. *UMI Proquest Dissertations*. (UMI No. AAT 9016110).

Hard, S. F., Conway, J. M., & Moran, A. C. (2006). Faculty and college student beliefs about the frequency of student academic misconduct. *Journal of Higher Education, 77*(6), 1058-1080.

Harding, T. S., Carpenter, D. D., Finelli, C. J., & Passow, H. J. (2004). Does academic dishonesty relate to unethical behavior in professional practice? An exploratory study. *Science and Engineering Ethics, 10*(2), 311-324.

Hardy, R. J. (1982). Preventing academic dishonesty: some important tips for political science professors. *Teaching Political Science, 9*(2), 68-77.

Harris, S. P. (2003). Promoting academic integrity in university students. Mount Saint Vincent University, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada. Digital Dissertations. *UMI Proquest Dissertations*. (UMI No. AAT MQ90898).

Henderson, E. E. (2007). Faculty perceptions of and responses to academic dishonesty: An analysis from an ethical perspective. Temple University Philadelphia, PA. Digital Dissertations. *UMI Proquest Dissertations*. (UMI No. AAT 3268154).

Higbee, J. L., & Thomas, P. V. (2002). Student and faculty perceptions of behaviors that constitute cheating. *NASPA Journal, 40*(1), 39-52.

Hinman, L. M. (1997, October 2). *Cultivating integrity to combat plagiarism*. San Diego Union-Tribute. Retrieved November 13, 2007 from http://ethics.sandiego.edu/lmh/op-ed/combat-plagiarism/index.asp.

Hinman, L. M. (2002). Academic integrity and the World Wide Web. *Computers and Society, 32*(1), 33-42.

Jackson, J. A. (2007). Community college and university students: Who's cheating and why? University of Missouri, Saint Louis, MO. Digital Dissertations. *UMI Proquest Dissertations*. (UMI No. AAT 3269679).

Jendrek, M. P. (1989). Faculty reactions to academic dishonesty. *Journal of College Student Development, 30*(5), 401-406.

Jendrek, M. P. (1992). Students' Reactions to Academic Dishonesty. *Journal of College Student Development, 33,* 260-273.

Jensen, L. A., Arnett, J. J., Feldman, S. S., & Cauffman, E. (1992). It's wrong, but everybody does it: academic dishonesty among high school and college students. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 27*(2), 209-228.

Johnson, D., Patton, R., Bimber, B., Almeroth, K., & Michaels, G. (2004). Technology and plagiarism in the university: Brief report of a trial in detecting cheating. *AACE Journal, 12*(3), 281-299.

Jordan, A. E. (2001). College student cheating: The role of motivation, perceived norms, attitudes, and knowledge of institutional policy. *Ethics & Behavior, 11*(3), 233-247.

Josephson, M. (2004, May 13). Reprint of archive of radio address from the Josephson Institute of Ethics. In A. Lathrop & K. Foss, *Guiding students from cheating and Plagiarism to honesty and integrity* (p. 10). Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited.

Just Ask Perspective. (2004, December). Answer of question: What more can we do to promote collegiate integrity and discourage cheating? *Perspective*, p. 8.

Kerkvliet, J. (1994). Cheating by economics students: A comparison of survey results. *Journal of Economics Education, 25*(2), 121-133.

Kerkvliet, J., & Sigmund, C. L. (1999). Can we control cheating in the classroom? *The Journal of Economic Education, 30*(4), 331-343.

Koljatic, M., & Silva, M. (2002). Comparison of students' and faculty's perceptions of occurrence of dishonest academic behaviors. *Psychological Reports, 2002*(90), 883-888.

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

Levy, E. S., & Rakovski, C. C. (2006). Academic Dishonesty: A zero tolerance professor and student registration choices. *Research in Higher Education, 47*(6), 735-753.

McCabe, D. L. (1992). The influence of situational ethics on cheating among college students. *Sociological Inquiry 62*(3), 365-374.

McCabe, D. L. (1993). Faculty responses to academic dishonesty: The influence of student honor codes. *Research in Higher Education, 34*(5), 647-658.

McCabe, D. L., & Makowski, A. L. (2001). Resolving allegations of academic dishonesty: Is there a role for students to play? *About Campus, 6*(1), 17-21.

McCabe, D. L., & Pavela, G. (2004, May/June). Ten (updated) principles of academic integrity. *Change, 36*(3), 10-16.

McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (1993). Academic dishonesty: Honor codes and other contextual influences. *The Journal of Higher Education, 64*(5), 522-538.

McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (1996). What we know about cheating in college. *Change, 28*(1), 28-33.

McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (1997). Individual and contextual influences on academic dishonesty: A multicampus investigation. *Research in Higher Education, 38*(3), 379-396.

McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (2002). Honesty and Honor Codes. *Academe, 88*(1), 37-41.

McCabe, D. L., Trevino, L. K., & Butterfield, K. D. (1999). Academic integrity in honor code and non-honor code environments: A qualitative investigation. *Journal of Higher Education, 70*(2), 211-234.

McCabe, D. L., Trevino, L. K., & Butterfield, K. D. (2001). Dishonesty in academic environments: The influence of peer reporting requirements. *The Journal of Higher Education, 72*(1), 29-45.

McMurty, K. (2001, November). E-cheating: Combating a 21st century challenge. *T. H. E. Journal, 29*(4), 36-41.

Miller, A., Shoptaught, C., & Parkerson, A. (2008, Part A.). Under reporting of cheating in research using volunteer college students. *College Student Journal, 42*(2), 326-339.

Missouri State University Academic Integrity Procedures. (2008). Summary for instructors. Retrieved October 10, 2008 from http://www.missouristate.edu/assets/provost/AcademicIntegrityPolicy-InstrSummaryRev-1-08.pdf.

Mixon, F. G., Jr., & Mixon, D. C. (1996). The economics of illegitimate activities: Further evidence. *Journal of Socio-Economics, 25*(3), 373-381.

Murdoch University Assessment Policy. (2004). Definition collusion. Retrieved on September 5, 2006 from http://www.murdoch.edu.au/admin/policies/assessment.html.

Mustaine, E. E., & Tewksbury, R. (2005). Southern college students' cheating behaviors: An examination of problem behavior correlates. *Deviant Behavior, 26*(5), 439-461.

Myers, S. (1998). Questioning author(ity): ESL/EFL, science, and teaching about plagiarism. *TESL-EJ, 3*(2). Retrieved November 21, 2008 from http://www-writing.berkeley.edu/TESl-EJ/ej10/a2.html.

O'Leary, D. P. (1999). *12 Professional Ethics*. University of Maryland. Department of Computer Science. College Park, MD. Retrieved February 19, 2009 from http://www.cs.umd.edu/~oleary/gradstudy/node13.html.

Parlour, J. (1995). Thou shalt honour thy sources. *The Times Higher Education Supplement, 117*, 19.

Partnership for 21st Century Skills (2004). *Communication and collaboration – Important skills for the 21st Century*. Retrieved January 5, 2009 from http://www.education.com/reference/article/Ref_Collaboration_2/.

Partnership for 21st Century Skills (2006, October 2). *Most young people entering the U.S. workforce lack critical skills essential for success*. Retrieved January 5, 2009 from http://www.conference-board.org/UTILITIES/pressDetail.cfm?press_ID=2971.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Pavela, G. (1978). Judicial review of academic decision-making after Horowitz. *NOLPE School Law Journal, 55*(8), 55-75.

Plagiarism. (2005-2006). Research Integrity, 9(2), 1-20. Michigan State University. Retrieved December, 8, 2008 from http://grad.msu.edu/res_integrity/ri_s06.pdf.

Plagiarize. Let no one else's work evade your eyes. (2002). *Economist, 362*(8264), 81-82.

Redden, C. A. (2008, October 12). Emotions in the cyber classroom. eCollege eNewsletter. *Educator's Voice, 6*(10). Retrieved January 5, 2009 from http://www.ecollege.com/Newsletter/EducatorsVoice/EducatorsVoice-Vol6Iss10.learn

Rettinger, D. A., Jordan, A. E., & Peschiera, F. (2004). Evaluating the motivation of other students to cheat: A vignette experiment. *Research in Higher Education, 45*(8), 873-890.

Robinson, E., Amburgey, R., Swank, E., & Faulkner, C. (2004). Test cheating in a rural college: Studying the importance of individual and situational factors. *College Student Journal, 38*(3), 380-395.

Roig, M., & Ballew, C. (1994). Attitudes toward cheating of self and others by college students and professors. *Psychological Record, 44*(1), 3-12.

Royce, J. (2003). Has Turnitin.com got it all wrapped up? *Teacher Librarian, 30*(4), pp. 26-30.

Saddlemire, M. T. (2005). Faculty perceptions of undergraduate academic dishonesty. Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH. Digital Dissertations. *UMI Proquest Dissertations*. (UMI No. AAT3160371).

Salem, R. G., & Bowers, W. J. (1970). Severity of formal sanctions as a deterrent to deviant behavior. *Law & Society Review, 5*(1), 21-40.

Saunders, E. J. (1993). Confronting academic dishonesty. *Journal of Social Work Education, 29*(2), 224-231.

Schneider, A. (1999). Why professors don't do more to stop students who cheat. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 45*(20), A8-A10.

Seirup-Pincus, H. J. (1995). Academic dishonesty: Faculty perspectives. Hofstra University, Hempstead, NY. Digital Disserations. *UMI Proquest Dissertations*. (UMI No. AAT 9530156).

Sheard, J., Markham, S., & Dick, M. (2003). Investigating differences in cheating behaviors of IT undergraduate and graduate students: The maturity and motivation factors. *Higher Education Research & Development, 22*(1), 91-108.

Shon, P. C. H. (2006). How college students cheat on in-class examinations: Creativity, strain, and techniques of innovation. *Plagiary: Cross-Disciplinary Studies in Plagiarism, Fabrication, and Falsification, 1*(10), 1-20.

Showghi, G. D. (2004). A tradition of honor. University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA. Digital Dissertations. *UMI Proquest Dissertations*. (UMI No. AAT3137313).

Simon, C. A., Carr, J. R., DeFlyer, E., McCullough, S., Morgan, S., Oleson, T., & Ressel, M. (2001, October 10-13). *On the evaluation of academic dishonesty: A survey of students and faculty at the University of Nevada, Reno*. 31st ASEE/IEEE Frontiers in Education Conference, Session F4A, Reno, NV. Retrieved October 14, 2007 from http://fie-conference.org/fie2001/papers/1050.pdf.

Sims, R. L. (1995). The severity of academic dishonesty: A comparison of faculty and student views. *Psychology in the Schools, 32*, 233-238.

Sistrunk, B. D. (1997). Academic misconduct: Methods of influencing undergraduates' perceptions of the seriousness and frequency of cheating. Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA. Digital Dissertations, *UMI Proquest Dissertations*. (UMI No. AAT 9808781).

Smith, T. R. (2000). Challenging academe's mystique: Applying criminological theories to college student cheating. State University of New York, Albany, N. Y. Digital Dissertations, *UMI Proquest Dissertations*. (UMI No. AAT 9997555).

Spiller, S., & Crown, D. F. (1995). Changes over time in academic dishonesty at the collegiate level. *Psychological Reports, 76*(3), 763-768.

Stover, M., & Kelly, K. (2002). *Institutional responses to plagiarism in online classes: Policy, prevention, and detection.* Paper presented at the 18th Annual Conference on Distance Education and Learning. Retrieved October 10, 2006 from http://www.uwex.edu/disted/conference/Resource_library/proceedings/02_73.pdf.

Strike, K., & Soltis, J. F. (2004). *The teaching of ethics*. Thinking about education series. Teachers College Press, New York, NY.

Strom, P. S., & Strom, R. D. (2007). Curbing cheating, raising integrity. *The Education Digest, 72*(8), 42-50.

TAP Multi-Community. (1998/1999). Chapter 11. *Instrument development, reliability and validity.* University of New Hampshire Cooperative Extension. Retrieved on October 28, 2006 from http://extension.unh.edu/4H/TAP/mc98_11.pdf.

The Pitt Promise: A Commitment to Civility. (2005). Division of Student Affairs. University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA. Retrieved September 1, 2007 from http://www.studentaffairs.pitt.edu/resources/pittpromise.html.

Usick, B. L. (2004). Is plagiarism an issue in graduate education? An examination of two graduate programs. University of Manitoba, Canada. Winnipeg, Manitoba. Digital Dissertations, *UMI Proquest Dissertations*. (UMI No. AAT MQ97208).

Verschoor, C. C. (2007). Who is responsible for college student cheating? *Strategic Finance, 89*(1), 15-16, 61.

Warger, T. (2005, October). Catching copy cats. *University Business, 8*(10), 33-34.

Whitley, B. E., Jr. (1998). Factors associated with cheating among college students. *Research in Higher Education, 39*(3), 235-274.

Whitley, B. E., Jr., & Keith-Spiegel, P. (2001). Introduction to the Special Issue. *Ethics and Behavior, 11*(3), 217-218.

Whitley, B. E., Jr., & Keith-Spiegel, P. (2002). *Academic dishonesty: An educator's guide*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Wilhoit, S. (1994). Helping students avoid plagiarism. *College Teaching, 42*(4), 161-166.

Zimmerman, J. (1998). Academic dishonesty attitudes and self-reported behaviors in a university population. University of New Orleans, Baton Rouge, LA. Digital Dissertations. *UMI Proquest Dissertations*. (UMI No. AAT 9912682).