

PEDAGOGY,
NOT POLICING
Positive Approaches to Academic
Integrity at the University

Edited by

Tyra Twomey
Holly White
and Ken Sagendorf

The Graduate School Press
Syracuse University

Contents

Acknowledgments	ix
<u>Foreword</u>	xi
<i>Patrick Drinan</i>	
<u>Editors' Introduction</u>	
<i>Tyra Twomey, Holly White, and Ken Sagendorf</i>	1
I: THEORY IN PRACTICE: WHAT IS ACADEMIC INTEGRITY, AND WHAT ARE ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHERS AND STUDENTS?	5
<u>Academic Integrity and Intellectual Autonomy</u>	
<i>David Horacek</i>	7
Freshman Composition as Disaster Response	
<i>James M. Pangborn</i>	19
An Air of Integrity: Building a Preventative Classroom Environment	
<i>Amy S. Roache-Fedchenko</i>	27
Buying A's and Counting FTEs: Plagiarism, Consumerism, and the Economics of Higher Education	
<i>Michael Murphy</i>	35
The Science of Cheating: A Psychologist's Perspective	
<i>Benjamin J. Lovett</i>	43
Atheists and Evangelical Zeal: The Dilemma of Plagiarism and Originality	
<i>Matthew Bertram</i>	49

II. GRADUATE STUDENTS AS STUDENTS	55
<u>Ethical Issues in Graduate Writing</u>	
<i>David Nentwick</i>	57
Academic Integrity in the Mentoring Relationship: A Sampling of Relevant Issues	
<i>Ryan Thibodeau</i>	67
III. THE PEOPLE BEHIND THE POLICIES	77
A Reflection on Plagiarism by a First-Time Instructor	
<i>Kimberly Ray</i>	79
Letter to My Teaching Assistant: Academic Integrity from the Student Athlete's Perspective	
<i>Lucy McGregor</i>	81
Learn to Hate Dishonesty Without Becoming Emotionally Involved	
<i>David Alan Bozak</i>	85
Academic Integrity from Behind the Administrator's Desk	
<i>Ruth Federman Stein</i>	91
Culture and Academic Norms: An Exploration of the Import of Cultural Difference on Asian Students' Understanding of American Approaches to Plagiarism	
<i>Sidney L. Greenblatt</i>	97
IV. INTEGRITY IN ASSESSMENT: STRATEGIES FOR TAS	107
<u>Ten Strategies to Encourage Academic Integrity in Large Lecture Classes</u>	
<i>Brian Udermann and Karrie Lamers</i>	111
Temptations in the Large Lecture Class: Concrete Measures to Help Students Practice Academic Integrity	
<i>Sarah L. Bolton</i>	117
Applying Intercultural Concepts to Academic Integrity	
<i>Michael Smithee</i>	125
The Dreaded Laboratory Report	
<i>Danielle Schuehler Sherwood</i>	135

Detecting and Preventing Cheating During Exams <i>Kevin Yee and Patricia MacKown</i>	141
What's the Deal with Turnitin? <i>Tyra Twomey</i>	149
<u>Contributors</u>	157

Foreword

Patrick Drinan

THE ACADEMIC INTEGRITY movement began in earnest in the early 1990s when Professor Donald McCabe of Rutgers University and a few like-minded individuals from across the country started a series of annual conferences that led to the formation of the Center for Academic Integrity. Professor McCabe had been doing massive surveys of the incidence of student cheating in American higher education.

Various student affairs administrators also were interested in diffusion of best practices in managing what was rightly perceived to be the growing problem of student academic dishonesty in the academy. The fortuitous combination of Professor McCabe's research and efforts to spread best practices led to a national, and now international, effort to promote student academic honesty and engage a wide public discourse about how to manage the issues associated with student academic dishonesty.

This discourse has increased its profile over the last 20 years, and many of the best colleges and universities in the country have become willing to address the issues instead of sweeping them under the rug.

This takes courage. It also takes coordination.

But why pay attention to student academic dishonesty when there are so many pressing concerns and distractions on our campuses? The answer comes in advancing the essential missions of teaching and research by increasing the radius of trust in our academic communities, both in the classroom and beyond. Effective and responsive teaching lowers the incidence of cheating and increases our confidence when determining merit. Even in research universities, faculty overwhelmingly report that teaching gives them most of their career satisfaction. But faculty cannot promote academic honesty—or reduce academic dishonesty—if they act like Robinson Crusoes on the desert islands of the classroom. We

need to learn from each other, support each other, and know that our institutions value these efforts. The editors and authors should be commended for the exercise of diligence and clarity of thought exhibited in this volume. It is another important step in a more robust definition of professionalism for all of us as teachers. It shows that we not only know we can do better, but are prepared to do so; this a very good sign.

Editors' Introduction

Tyra Twomey, Holly White, and Ken Sagendorf

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY is not a new topic in higher education. Honor codes and academic dishonesty are familiar concepts for guiding scholarly conduct. But why the emphasis on “integrity” instead of dishonesty, plagiarism, or just plain cheating?

“Integrity” often refers to one’s character. At the surface, it may seem easy to differentiate between people and actions with integrity and those without. And the public trust placed in academe would indicate that integrity in higher education should be at a high level. We expect our scholars, teachers, researchers, and leaders to be exemplary not only in knowledge but also in character and behavior—a premise that accords with the public outcry we encounter when integrity violations at the academy are made known.

Though the issues around integrity in higher education are not news, this topic has received a marked increase in attention as accountability in higher education has become more important. This increase can be understood in several ways. One could note that as our society focuses more and more on standardization and certification, educational institutions at all levels are under increasing pressure to communicate their methods and goals to governmental and corporate bodies. While this is one way to read the situation, another is to take note that institutions are having to become more transparent about the policies and practices that consolidate power. We would argue that this give-and-take between higher education and the public regarding the standards espoused at colleges and universities is overall a healthy development. The need for the “Ivory Tower” to respond to the call for thinking itself in its social context and to take less for granted is at the core of the philosophy behind the liberal institution and, arguably, higher education as a modern cultural value.

One method of reflecting these values implicit in higher education is to institutionalize them through policy. For example, the Syracuse University Academic Integrity policy lays its foundation on “a commitment to the values of honesty, trustworthiness, fairness, and respect.” We would agree that these are worthy values, and that their converses are not so. This agreement leads us, as educators, to feeling offended when someone lacks commitment to any one of these values. That reaction is probably at the core of why many think of academic integrity violations as repudiations of these values and why many think of academic integrity itself as an issue of enforcement. It is a matter of protecting what we hold dear.

This book explores academic integrity using a different approach. Instead of seeking out ways to identify, catch, and punish those who cheat or plagiarize, this book explores what universities, instructors, and students can do to create an environment that promotes honesty, trust, and respect.

This book is a product of the Future Professoriate Program (FPP) of the Syracuse University Graduate School. FPP has been responsible for identifying topics at Syracuse University, and in higher education more generally, ripe for rich examination and productive work toward making changes in approaches and practices. It has provided funding and direction to staff and students to not only collaborate in the creation of these works but also gain experience by editing and producing such volumes—experience that many of us will build upon as we pursue careers in higher education. We were invited to be editors by FPP because our graduate work and professional interests involve academic integrity, teaching, faculty life, interdisciplinarity, and the role of higher education in society.

This book is organized into four sections. The first asks us to reconsider our assumptions and basic definitions so as to think critically about both what we mean when we use the term academic integrity and what the implications of that thinking are for ourselves, our institutional practices, and the students we teach. The second draws attention to the particular position of the graduate student in the academy as a student—one hovering or oscillating between the poles of what is often described as a teacher/student binary—and the unique pressures for defining and practicing “integrity” that this position entails. The third section, titled “The People Behind the Policies,” offers elements ranging from personal reflections to programmatic descriptions, contributed by a range of writers including an undergraduate student, a TA, a faculty member, and two administrators from different campus offices, each sharing experience and advice from a localized perspective. Finally, the fourth section offers practical strategies for instructors and TAs to apply so as to promote a climate of integrity in their classrooms.

The primary goal of educators is not eliminating dishonesty, it is educating. And with this goal in focus, we can accept that the factors and pressures that lead to scholars *at any level* misrepresenting their work are not going away. As educators, while we may visualize a utopian environment of consistent, honest scholastic performance, we do better to recognize that such a pure place is not possible and to make choices in our pedagogies that move away from policing towards practicing the behaviors we say we value. We hope that this book inspires you to form your own pedagogical style in promoting academic integrity in your classrooms. But we also hope that, as you encounter familiar issues and suggestions, you will feel affirmed as a educator. It is good to remember that in many ways, promoting academic integrity is not something new we have to conform to: it is what happens naturally whenever we are active learners and thoughtful educators.

Academic Integrity and Intellectual Autonomy

David Horacek

WHEN ACADEMICS bring up academic integrity, it is usually a prelude to telling our students that they are not allowed to cheat or plagiarize. Thanks to the realities of teaching, our own reflections about academic integrity tend to focus on the important practical work of deterring cheaters, as well as catching those who would not be deterred. In this chapter I want to investigate some rather more philosophical questions about academic integrity. What is it? What good is it? What makes its codes obligatory? My answers to these questions suggest that the most basic justification for academic integrity is one not usually discussed among educators, nor is it described to students. I argue that it is possible, and not unusual, for dishonest academic work to be produced without cheating, plagiarizing, or doing anything that universities forbid. This sort of dishonest work is wrong for the same reason that cheating is, insofar as both violate core principles of academic integrity. We educators should do our best to eliminate all failures of academic integrity in students, both the forbidden and the allowed, because both interfere with the development of a student's intellectual autonomy.

Every university publication on academic integrity that I have surveyed declares academic dishonesty to be forbidden. Here is one representative paragraph, which comes from a document published by Purdue University called "Academic Integrity: A Guide for Students":

Purdue prohibits "dishonesty in connection with any University activity. Cheating, plagiarism, or knowingly furnishing false information to the University are examples of dishonesty." [Part 5, Section III-B-2-a, *University Regulations*] Furthermore, the University Senate has stipulated

that “the commitment of acts of cheating, lying, and deceit in any of their diverse forms (such as the use of substitutes for taking examinations, the use of illegal cribs, plagiarism, and copying during examinations) is dishonest and must not be tolerated. Moreover, knowingly to aid and abet, directly or indirectly, other parties in committing dishonest acts is in itself dishonest” [University Senate Document 72-18, December 15, 1972]. (Akers, 2003)

Universities that provide more elaborate descriptions of academic integrity will often mention reasons to justify their administrative policies. For example, the academic integrity policy of Syracuse University argues that cheating “is unfair to other community members who do not cheat, because it devalues efforts to learn, to teach, and to conduct research” (Preamble).

Universities set out to accomplish two important tasks with their academic integrity policies: the first is to describe the nature and scope of academic integrity while (in some cases) giving reasons why it should be respected. The second is to state clearly what sorts of activities are forbidden. I believe these are two very different tasks, but because they are almost always done within the same document, policy authors tend to conflate them. Doing so leads to two conceptual mistakes: one of them, made in the Purdue document, is to correctly describe academic integrity as avoiding “dishonesty in connection with any University activity” but then say something false—namely, that all such dishonesty is forbidden. In fact, neither Purdue nor any other academic institution would forbid everything that falls under this broad category. Though it describes cheating, plagiarism, and furnishing false information merely as examples of dishonesty in academic work, these specific types of dishonesty are *de facto* the only ones that are banned.

The more common and conceptually more pernicious mistake is to begin with a detailed list of the academic activities that are banned (cheating, plagiarism, falsified data), and then go on to suggest that academic integrity is achieved if these specific perils are avoided.

To undo these tempting mistakes, I want to first investigate which activities a university ought to ban, and why. After this, I undertake a separate investigation of academic integrity. Bringing these results together will reveal a more complicated relationship than university policies would probably care to discuss. But my goal in this chapter is to improve our understanding, not our policies.

First, I consider the question of how university policies on academic integrity are justified. Insofar as these policies focus on where students ought not trespass, they may appear to be nothing more than institutional rules, sanctioned perhaps by long tradition. If understood as an institutional code of

conduct, the rules of academic integrity are conceptually easy to make sense of. Each student sorority, for example, also has its own code of conduct. In joining the sorority, the student acknowledges that she accepts this code. Perhaps joining the university involves a similar acknowledgment.

But clearly, the two cases are not analogous. The code of a sorority may, after all, include many *arbitrary* restrictions on behavior, such as prohibitions on certain outfits and foods. The requirements of academic integrity are, and are clearly meant to be understood as, non-arbitrary. Treating the codes as brute rules with punitive consequences may come close to how many undergraduates understand the matter, but for our purposes it is inadequate. At best, it explains why it is in the interest of students to follow the codes, but does not explain why these codes are right, and why they should be internalized and revered.

Describing its opposite as “academic dishonesty” suggests that academic integrity is obligatory because dishonesty is morally wrong. Syracuse University uses of the word “unfair” to describe cheating, suggesting a moral weight behind the university’s codes. While cheating is clearly dishonest, this by itself not does not justify a ban. For one thing, it is unclear whether all dishonesty is immoral. Certain falsehoods and omissions of truth often expedite sensitive collaborations and harm neither the liar nor the victim. This point is relevant here because students who are caught cheating often wonder what the big deal is about appropriate citations and independent work. Many assignments that we require of them

There is no university prohibition on bullshitting, yet there is one on cheating. Both are obviously dishonest. Why is it not arbitrary that one sort of dishonesty is tolerated while the other is forbidden?

seem to them like exercises and mere formalities, the very sort of territory where “white lies” rarely do harm. There is no university prohibition on bullshitting,¹ yet there is one on cheating. Both are obviously dishonest. Why is it not arbitrary that one sort of dishonesty is tolerated while the other is forbidden?

Even if all dishonesty were immoral, why does the university mandate adherence to certain moral principles and not others? I claim the university does not have sufficient license to legislate any moral principles *simply because they are moral*. (If it did, *all* moral principles would require legislating.) Legislating the codes of academic integrity requires an independent rationale. In the extended argument below, I attempt to reconstruct this rationale, but also to call attention to aspects of academic integrity that are outside the scope of legislation. Once more is said about these unlegislated aspects of academic integrity, I will

examine its role in the education of students, concluding that it plays a privileged role in their intellectual maturation.

All Researchers Form a Community, One That Defines Itself Through Its Adherence to the Code of Academic Integrity

Students of medicine, law, carpentry, and many other praxis-oriented fields understand themselves as initiates to a community of practitioners. College students typically do not. For many reasons, however, they should. They are initiates to the *community of researchers*.

Since communities of practitioners typically follow certain codes of conduct, a part of the initiation into any community will require the initiates to internalize its codes. Future doctors, for example, must not only understand the Hippocratic Oath, but also embrace it as the necessary principle that must bind their conduct as doctors. This traditional set of codes has much in common with the codes of academic integrity. Adherence to each is *required* within its respective discipline. Each is supported by moral considerations. Each is a code that defines an institution and a community. In each case, personal internalization of the codes of the community is necessary for membership.

Someone who is trained as a doctor but does not abide by the Hippocratic Oath is not acting as a doctor, because she does not share in the primary priorities of medicine. For example, she may decide that one of her patients is immoral and deserves to suffer, so she uses her knowledge to cause him suffering. We can invent situations in which this sort of behavior might be understandable or even justifiable, but what is clear is that even if she is acting justifiably, she is not acting as a doctor. There are excellent reasons for the community of doctors to abhor anything that tempts them to make exceptions to their Hippocratic Oath. I will not list these reasons here. I bring up the topic only for the sake of drawing an analogy: the codes of academic integrity are to the community of inquirers what the Hippocratic Oath is to the community of medical practitioners.

It would be strange to call the Hippocratic Oath a code of honor, as though it would distinguish the honorable doctors from the rest. The oath does not outline a standard of excellence or virtue; it only sets out the *barest minimum* of what is required of a doctor. Yet it has been suggested that the code of academic integrity should be understood as a code of honor. I think this is wrong. As in the case of medicine, the code of academic integrity doesn't distinguish the honorable researchers from the rest. For that matter, the code also doesn't distinguish the honorable students from the rest. The code of academic integrity defines the ground floor of what is acceptable, whereas acting by any code of *honor* would clearly require going above and beyond the barest minimum of

acceptability. Therefore, the code of academic integrity is not a code of honor for researchers and students, and it is misleading to describe it as such.

I noted earlier the impression left by many university policies that academic integrity is achieved merely by avoidance of certain banned activities like cheating. The same mistake in the medical analogy would be this: thinking that being true to the Hippocratic Oath requires simply the avoidance of malpractice. No one would realistically think this, because we understand that only a small subset of the responsibilities in the Hippocratic Oath are explicitly legislated as bans of the sort that would trigger malpractice charges. The same mistake is easier to make in the academic case, though it is no less a mistake. There is more to following a community-defining code than merely the avoidance of some forbidden activities.

The code of academic integrity defines the ground floor of what is acceptable, whereas acting by any code of honor would clearly require going above and beyond the barest minimum of acceptability.

Why the Academy Needs the Code of Academic Integrity

There is no alternative to academic integrity, no standard perhaps less honorable or chivalrous, that will allow the community of researchers to accomplish its goals. It is *required* for productive interactions among researchers. This indispensability is the extra-moral component needed to justify *legislating* aspects of this code.²

Young people may not immediately appreciate the indispensability of academic integrity to getting research done. Because it is sometimes introduced as an honor code, some may suspect that academic integrity is a quaint idealism. Others might find it noble in principle, but also suspect that, like the wigs of English barristers, strict codes of academic integrity are vestigial, ornamental, and potentially cumbersome. Might we not be better served by a bit of flexibility? The answer is no. Consider a society in which researchers feel no compulsion to abide by the codes of academic integrity. Imagine, for example, that various corporations each support a flock of academics whose job is to act in the interest of their employer. They release studies vindicating the superiority and safety of the products of their benefactors, while casting doubt on the products of their competitors. They extol the virtues of a certain ideology, while sweeping its shortcomings under the rug. They make up titles and invent citations, while

taking credit for the work of others. In general, they feel no compulsion to be sincere in their work.

One obvious cost of this arrangement is that we laypeople wouldn't have anyone to trust. How would we make informed decisions about what policies we should support, what products were safe, or what diets were effective, if every available source felt free to make things up? But the problem would be more serious than just a lack of information for laypeople: experts would be in exactly the same situation. This sort of an intellectual climate would require every individual researcher to personally confirm the conclusions of others, since their accuracy could not be assumed. The situation would quickly become unmanageable, and no such system could survive for long before groups of researchers decided to pool their resources so that each one would not individually have to duplicate every result. Pooling resources in this way would absolutely require that the cooperating scientists be sincere with one another. If they were to put their cooperation agreement into the form of a contract, it would not only pledge a "formal" honesty of correct attribution, absence of plagiarism, etc., but would also forbid the researchers from bullshitting one another. This cooperating group of researchers would increase its effectiveness the larger it grew and as it merged together with various other research groups. The logical limit of this merging would be a global group of researchers bound by a contract to be sincere with one another. I claim that this is exactly what we have, though the contract is not an explicit document because the researching community coalesced rather naturally and without overt ceremony. Explicit or not, the contract that binds researchers to one another is the same as the one that would bind even a small group of collaborating researchers. These, then, are the codes of academic integrity. No matter how perverted a research community may become, need would force groups of researchers to bind themselves by these codes.

The primary point is this: our codes of academic integrity are not some sort of nostalgic fantasy about a culture of honesty that managed to avoid extinction in the zoo of academia. In fact, they are absolutely necessary for getting difficult things done. Secondly, we see that these necessary codes would have to include not only formal restrictions like agreeing to avoid plagiarism, but also a general requirement of sincerity, of aiming at getting the research right. This aim precludes lying as well as bullshit, pandering, and other failures to aim for truth.

Students are Research Initiates Who Should Accept the Necessity and Rightness of Academic Integrity Codes

Still, a student convinced that academic integrity is indispensable to research may wonder: "What does this have to do with me? Sure, if I ever become a

researcher, I will play by their rules, but tonight I'm only writing a term paper! Apart from making sure I cite my sources and compose my own sentences, the codes of researchers have no relevance to my situation, right?"

There is a rebuttal to this sort of understandable skepticism, and it has to do with the fact that, regardless of his eventual intentions, by virtue of conducting research even as "practice," the student is an initiate to the community that is structured by these codes. Unfortunately, this hypothetical student can easily fail to recognize his position with respect to the community, and perhaps also the role of academic integrity in structuring that community. Bringing students to these realizations is a goal very much worth aiming at. There is great intellectual value in internalizing the full codes of academic integrity, not merely their legislated subset.

One of my teaching strategies revolves around exposing the "insane conspiracy" of high school writing teachers and telling students that I expect them to write like real researchers, that is, in the first person. In high school, students are often encouraged to avoid using the first person in their writing, presumably because it undermines the tone of "objectivity" that they are told to aim for. This is quite strange, because almost all research articles in every field (including all in my field) are written in the first person. Since the students are stating their own conclusions, I require expressions like "I think" when they write about what they think. Students often wonder why we instructors care about their opinions. In one instance, a student expressed her surprise this way: "Why do you make me write about what I think? I mean, I guess I have some opinions, but I'm not really gonna figure this out. I'm just a sophomore and philosophy isn't even my major!" This was not an attempt to dodge responsibility but a genuine question raised by a talented student who felt intimidated by my request for sincere analysis. She was comfortable with exposition, but hesitant to express her own conclusion regarding a difficult topic (whether there is a solution to Hume's problem of induction) and defend it with her best reasons. Students who feel this way must be reassured that even if they have a hard time picturing it at the moment, they will eventually have something important to say about something—and assuming that mantle in speech and writing, even in "practice" scenarios, is a way of making sure that, when that time comes, they'll know how to say it. There is a danger in this strategy, in that it may encourage bullshit: students shouldn't come away with the impression that we just want them to *act as though* they have an opinion. We should want sincerity—not pretense—and must communicate this. For this, students must be able to get A's for "I don't know" papers, in which they defend why they think there is no adequately supported conclusion regarding a certain matter.

The point is that students should eventually awaken to the realization that in their research papers, they are speaking as themselves. They should be aiming

at developing and defending their views, not merely telling instructors what they want to hear. I picture this as a sort of intellectual adulthood, the stage at which the initiate inquires not only about the work of others, but also about what she thinks of that work. In doing this, she recognizes herself as a member of an inquiring community, not a mere consumer of its labors. Helping a student through this transition is perhaps the most important thing we do as educators. Once students see their writing as something said with their own voices, they realize their responsibility to say something they truly stand behind. Of course, a serious confrontation with one's own ideas and the reasons behind them is not easy. It takes courage as well as labor. The most banal way to resist this confrontation is for students literally to allow someone else's ideas to pose as their own. This is what the codes of academic integrity explicitly forbid, and such deception clearly does hinder intellectual progress.

Bullshitting, pandering, and other permitted strategies are copouts to the same extent. Successful students often rely on these strategies, and can get far without ever pausing to examine "their take" on a subject. When an instructor like me implores them to express their own views in their work, they take this as an instruction to write several paragraphs with sentences that contain the expression "I think that" while making references to the assigned texts. These sentences may be pure bullshit in Harry Frankfurt's (2005) sense—that is, statements asserted with a complete disregard for the truth (in this case, the truth of what the student really thinks about the subject, which may remain to them an unexamined matter). Nonetheless, well-written bullshit can compose a formally acceptable paper for a university course. Some such papers even earn A's, if students do a good enough job at faking genuine analysis and giving their instructor what he or she wanted to read. I am not suggesting we punish good bullshitters and panderers with bad grades. But because we care about their intellectual development, we should do our best to encourage them to reflect genuinely—to approach their subject like researchers.

Intellectual Autonomy Requires the Free Acceptance of Academic Integrity

Even though no prohibitions are violated, bullshitting and pandering (and other similar approaches) are not consistent with the full codes of academic integrity. I think this is an important point: there is more to the content of academic integrity than the rules that are listed in the university guidebooks.

Earlier, I considered a test of whether a doctor is acting as a doctor—that is, according to the foundational norms of the medical community. I distinguished between acting understandably and acting as a doctor, noting that a medical professional may do the former without doing the latter. There is a parallel for researchers: if a researcher bullshits his way through a research article, or merely

mirrors the perceived prejudices of a journal's editors, he is not acting as a researcher. There is space in the research community for devil's advocates, which shows that researchers may sometimes defend conclusions they personally do not believe. However, bullshitting and (mere) pandering are clearly out of bounds. Thus, the normative bounds that constrain the activities of researchers go beyond avoiding the prohibitions against incorrect attribution, falsified data, and so forth, since bullshitting and pandering don't violate any of these explicit prohibitions. When considering the contract that would bind a small group of collaborating researchers, it is clear that bullshitting and pandering would be proscribed. Since research in general should be viewed as a global, cooperative undertaking, the same implicit contract applies.

When I say that students should be encouraged to internalize the codes of academic integrity, I understand these codes to include all the norms that govern research, not merely the explicit prohibitions that are the focus of most discussions on academic integrity. The common thread that binds the codes into a unit is that they are the minimal norms which define the community of researchers, and thereby also their initiates, which is how I think we should see our students. This might be reason enough to encourage students, the research initiates, to adopt the codes. However, I think there is also a different and more powerful reason for this conclusion.

This reason has to do with intellectual autonomy, which requires the full codes of intellectual integrity to be internalized. Internalizing them coincides with the shift of self-perception that I described as the onset of intellectual adulthood. It is to approach the task of saying something with the same sense of responsibility that a researcher feels.

Of course, the bare request to "feel the same sense of responsibility as a researcher would" is not something that a student can simply follow. This is not to say that asking does no good, but it does need to be supplemented with reasons why he or she should feel that sense of responsibility. Those reasons, however, are familiar: they are the same reasons that require the community of researchers to abide by its own codes. The difficult thing for a student is often the realization that these same reasons *apply to her!*

Students should be encouraged to internalize the codes of academic integrity; these codes include all the norms that govern research, not merely the explicit prohibitions that are the focus of most discussions on academic integrity.

Asking students to write in the first person is one aspect of my strategy to encourage this realization. Introducing the notion of peer review is another. An effective way to do this is to teach a workshop on effective peer-reviewing and then expect students to apply what they learn to improving the drafts of their peers. Students who are taught how to point out shortcomings in the work of others, especially when they know that their own work will be subjected to similar scrutiny, tend to grasp more vividly their own intellectual responsibilities. I tell them that it is their responsibility as reviewers to point out to the author that a certain point is unclear, or inadequately supported, or seems uncertain because of an unexamined objection. My students know that if they allow the mistakes of their peers to slip by them, they are failing in their task as reviewers, and this failure will be reflected in their grades. (I read, comment on, and grade all of their reviews.) This has several positive effects: one is that this activity casts students in the role of apprentice researchers, making vivid to them in a participatory way the communal aspects of research. The second positive effect is that their papers tend to be written more carefully and reflectively when they know that peers will be combing over them. A further benefit is that in following my instructions for research review, students often refine their ideas of what is and isn't adequate research.

Creative instructors can come up with many other activities in which students are treated as apprentice researchers, highlighting the continuity between them and "real" researchers. The goal is ultimately to awaken a realization that the full codes of academic integrity are necessary for research to be possible, and that every serious research endeavor presupposes the good faith and sincerity of each participant. Ironically, published policies on academic integrity may hinder the appreciation of this point, since they present integrity too narrowly. Policies tell students not to cheat, plagiarize, or falsify data. What students need to know is that we expect them to aim far higher: their aim should be to get it right. Students reach intellectual adulthood when they feel a personal obligation to get it right in their work—and when the importance of getting it right contributes to the motivation for their effort. If we contrast these motivations with those of students who aim merely at abiding by the rules and getting good grades, the difference between them is this: the former have internalized the codes of academic integrity. They grasp that these are the very glue that binds an inquiring community, and they are thinking of themselves as members of that community. They have passed the transition point at which they realize that they are responsible—and should be held responsible—for the ideas they present as their own. If this is our aim, as I think it should be, we have not adequately addressed the issue of academic integrity when we have merely explained "the rules" and found strategies to enforce them vigilantly.

Notes

1. I use this term in Harry Frankfurt's sense, in order to describe a "lack of connection to a concern for truth" and statements expressed with an "indifference to how things really are" (Frankfurt, 2005, 3-4).

2. If this argument is right, it would also justify legislating a ban on bullshit in academic work. However, I am aware of no university that forbids bullshitting, nor would I advocate such a ban. I suspect that a ban on bullshit would indeed be morally justified, though impossible to enforce without unacceptable invasions of privacy. Another possibility, however, is that a higher principle is involved: bullshitting is a "thought crime" (while deliberate falsification is something more). If institutions have no right to legislate against mere thought crimes, we have a different reason for treating these two failures of honesty so differently.

Works Cited

- Akers, S. (2003). Academic integrity: A guide for students. Purdue University Office of the Dean. Available at <http://www.purdue.edu/ODOS/osrr/integrity.htm>
- Frankfurt, H. G. (2005). *On bullshit*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Syracuse University. (2006, July 1). Academic integrity policy. Available at http://supolicies.syr.edu/ethics/acad_integrity.htm

Ethical Issues in Graduate Writing

David Nentwick

THE ISSUE OF ACADEMIC integrity and student writing has taken on a particular urgency in the age of the Internet and Turnitin.com. The stakes are highest in graduate education, where the emphasis is on the production of individual and original research. Graduate-level writing demands that students negotiate a variety of unfamiliar genres, learn new disciplinary vocabularies and stylistic conventions, and establish complex relations with previously published disciplinary scholarship. In the most fundamental way, scholarship is writing, and the process of becoming an advanced-level academic writer is simultaneously an acculturation into the discourse community of the academy and part of a student's professional development. However, writing instruction at the graduate level is not often formalized in any sort of structured and directed way, and many graduate students must build and rely upon a support network of instructors, colleagues, writing tutors, and editors to help them meet these challenges successfully. In this essay I draw on the contemporary scholarship of writing specialists dealing with plagiarism, academic integrity, and graduate student writing to identify and examine issues of academic integrity that arise when graduate students get help with their writing. This chapter focuses on the importance of establishing and maintaining ethical relationships among teachers, students, and writing consultants in order to develop the atmosphere of collegiality necessary to teaching the practices of academic integrity to future scholars and teachers. First, I attempt to give readers a feel for the contemporary climate in academia by presenting tales from the field: real-life stories that reflect current trends in thinking about writing and academic integrity. I then go on to show how these trends are codified in the language of plagiarism policy and argue that these trends have resulted in the establishment of an unhealthy—perhaps even harmful—ethics of graduate student writing. I argue that these

ethics can be traced back to myths about writing, originality, and collaboration that have gained currency in academia, and I conclude by suggesting that teachers, students, and administrators alike are responsible for creating an alternative, more positive ethics of graduate writing.

“Plagiarism” and Academic Integrity

Graduate research and scholarship are typically presented in writing: in seminar papers, research reports, conference presentations, and published articles. While graduate-level research presents the opportunity for academic dishonesty, instances of such offenses as those listed on the Syracuse University Academic Integrity Office website under sections IIB and IID of the university Policy¹ are likely to be rare. Most often, the terms “cheating” and “academic dishonesty” are used when talking about plagiarism. Indeed, it is the potential for plagiarism that is greatest, since plagiarism is first and foremost an issue that arises from presenting research in written form, and writing is the primary, if not the only, medium in which research is presented. There are indeed some unscrupulous researchers out there, willing to falsify or manipulate data or break confidentiality and steal the work of others in order to pursue their own selfish goals. Unfortunately, the doors to research and scholarship that have been opened by the digital, computerized world of the Internet and word processing also lead to increased opportunities for the appropriation of others’ words and ideas, to the current jeremiad against cheating, and to the development of plagiarism detection software. More often than not, it is not appropriation itself that constitutes a violation of academic integrity; rather, it is unauthorized or unacceptable appropriation that leads to accusations of academic dishonesty.

The Syracuse University Office of Academic Integrity has adopted language from the Council of Writing Program Administrators’ position statement on plagiarism (“Defining and Avoiding Plagiarism: WPA Statement on Best Policies”) to define plagiarism as follows: “In an instructional setting, plagiarism occurs when a writer deliberately uses someone else’s language, ideas, or other original (not common-knowledge) material without acknowledging its source” (Council of Writing Program Administrators, 2003). Graduate student writing presents particular concerns to those who genuinely wish to promote an atmosphere of honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility among the graduate community and across the entire campus. At this advanced level of study, teachers tend to expect that graduate students are familiar with and well versed in the writing tasks they are asked to complete. However, many teachers do not have the time, the disposition, or the teaching tools required to offer the kind of writing instruction that many graduate students need to be successful

scholars. Thus graduate students are challenged to seek out and find the writing support they need.

Tales from the Field

Because many graduate students seek help with their writing, and because they are expected to produce original work, the problem of engaging in “unauthorized cooperation in completing assignments” (Syracuse University, 2005) takes on special urgency for faculty, students, and administrators, even more so given the current rhetoric of “crisis” that prevails in contemporary public debates about academic integrity. I offer two brief anecdotes from my own experience as someone who regularly works with graduate student writers in illustration of two particular aspects of this “crisis.”

Anecdote #1. In August of 2006, during the orientation for new graduate students at Syracuse University, I approached a representative of the Graduate School and asked if I could leave promotional flyers for the newly created Graduate Editing Center (GEC). I was asked a question or two about the GEC and then the conversation turned very serious, as I was advised to see to it that the GEC would run every piece of student writing it received through some kind of plagiarism detection software or service. I was informed that graduate students (in the sciences, especially) were cheating at epidemic levels, and that the GEC should be the “front line” in the fight against academic dishonesty. In short, regardless of the intentions of the GEC’s creators and editors, this stakeholder in graduate student education felt that GEC editors should place policing, rather than teaching, at the top of their priority list.

Anecdote #2. Several months later, near the end of the Fall 2006 semester, a Ph.D. student and teaching assistant in geography adamantly and somewhat resentfully demanded to know why the instructors of the university’s writing courses had not done something to take care of the plagiarism problem. This TA was frustrated by the dishonest behavior of his students and at a loss regarding what action ought to be taken in response. In the mind of this teaching assistant, the task at hand was to teach students the content of the course. Issues related to writing, such as plagiarism, were somehow not related to content and were, therefore, the responsibility of somebody else.

Brief as they are, these anecdotes highlight a number of remarkable perceptions about the “crisis” of academic integrity: 1) issues of academic integrity and plagiarism are frequently blurred together, so that in everyday terms they become one and the same thing; 2) graduate student cheating is an epidemic; 3) forensic technology should be employed to combat these offenders and bring them to justice; 4) teachers might not be adequately prepared to handle cases of suspected academic dishonesty; and, most significant, 5) the

responsibility for addressing issues of academic integrity and the prevention of plagiarism resides solely with writing instructors and consultants.

A Police State?

The current state of affairs illustrated by these examples is, at best, unhealthy and, at worst, damaging to efforts to establish a culture of academic integrity. However, we should not be surprised, since much of the language found in academic integrity statements and policies reinforces the notion that we are in a state of moral crisis. The definition of academic integrity included in the invitation to contribute to the present volume reads as follows: “Duke University’s Center for Academic Integrity defines academic integrity as ‘a commitment, even in the face of adversity, to five fundamental values: honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility.’” The experts at Duke² suggest that it will require some sort of heroic and noble effort to act honestly, responsibly, and fairly and to give and receive trust and respect in the current “adverse” climate where cheating is the norm.

The information publicly available on the Syracuse University Office of Academic Integrity website is similar. While “educational strategies” are listed among the procedures for preventing behavior that might be construed as dishonest, a closer look reveals that these strategies have not been developed or implemented to nearly the same extent as the procedures and policies for policing and punishing suspected dishonesty. And Syracuse University is not alone; most such statements of policy and procedure imply a discipline-and-punish model grounded in a commitment to uncovering and dealing with dishonest behavior that “interferes with moral and intellectual development, and poisons the atmosphere of open and trusting intellectual discourse” (Syracuse University, 2005).

As a result of the overemphasis on detecting, policing, and adjudicating, the call for a commitment to laudable values such as the one quoted above from the Duke University Center for Academic Integrity becomes more a call to join the police force than an attempt to raise consciousness about issues of academic integrity and to establish ethical, collegial relationships between teachers and students.

Myths About Writing, Originality, and Collaboration

As graduate student writers and teachers, how do we navigate the potentially dangerous waters that lie between “unauthorized” and “authorized” cooperation? Questions about what constitutes “authorized” and “unauthorized” cooperation in graduate-level writing arise from unrealistic and outdated notions

about the “individuality” and “originality” of researched writing and about writing in general. For example, consider the following:

1. If a graduate student is working on an article for publication or a dissertation chapter, and receives directions from a professional writing consultant or from a roommate on how to better organize an argument or craft a more persuasive presentation of data, is that student stepping over the line?
2. If a graduate student submits a paper to an editor or peer reviewer so that his or her written English more closely approaches Edited American English (EAE), is that student stepping over the line?

One unrealistic and outdated notion underlying these questions is: writing=thinking. Often, this assumption materializes during assessment: faulty writing=faulty thinking. As the historic body of literature on human thought and the growing body of literature on the complexities of writing and writing instruction have shown, we are far from understanding the nature of either enterprise—let alone the relationship between the two. The fear is that if

someone shows us how to present our argument better, then it just may be that someone else has done not only our writing for us, but has also done our thinking for us and has thereby rendered the knowledge/product “unoriginal.” However, those of us who have struggled to find the best way to communicate what we know to others (in other words, all of us)

understand that writing is an act of communication that aims at getting a *representation* of what we know into words on paper, and often times we miss the mark the first time around. A poorly organized text is not necessarily a window onto a poorly organized brain. By the same token, a revised draft that better presents an author’s ideas does not prove that, somehow, the author has miraculously become “a better thinker.” When we think about the relationship between writing, revision, and collaboration with a colleague or instructor, it is important to remember that working collaboratively to construct a better representation of a graduate student’s knowledge does not amount to tampering

Questions about what constitutes “authorized” and “unauthorized” cooperation in graduate-level writing arise from unrealistic and outdated notions about the “individuality” and “originality” of researched writing and about writing in general.

with that student's data, interpretations, or conclusions, or with how that student situates his or her work in relation to other scholars in the field. It may simply mean that the writing has improved.

Another myth that gives rise to concerns about "unauthorized cooperation" takes the demand for originality in research a step further: writing is a solitary act. Our cultural imagination is filled with images of the lone, struggling, misunderstood artist burning the midnight oil and waiting for inspiration from the muse to make it possible for just the right words to be written on the page. Further underlying this myth is the American tradition of "rugged individuality," the modern day version of which is "do it yourself!" Thus, as graduate student researchers, we must somehow find unclaimed territory on which to stake an intellectual claim and then mine that claim with our own bare hands if we expect to reap the rewards.

Of course, researchers will never be able to find this unclaimed territory without the exploration and mapping that has been done by previous researchers. After all, how does one discover a gap in the research without first coming upon a body of established work? As researchers and writers, we work, as Rebecca Moore Howard (1999) would say, "in the shadow of giants." We build on what is already there; we work alongside the already existing research to situate our own work in relation to what has come before. Moreover, there is not a single word of published research that does not come under the knife of the editor's blue pencil. Nobody believes that Einstein's editors tainted the originality of his work, but everyone is glad they made his research easier to read. And if Albert shared his work in progress with a friend who helped him better match his verb forms with the subjects of his sentences, no one would consider that writing to be someone else's. A good editor, mentor, or reviewer provides help and advice, but does not do the writer's work for him or her.

Whose Responsibility?

Contemporary research in writing assessment explodes the myth that quality of thinking and originality of work can be determined in a transparent way through assessment of a written product, and it provides a framework for a complex understanding of writing. As Roberta Camp reminds us,

Writing [is] a rich, multifaceted, meaning-making activity that occurs over time and in a social context, an activity that varies with purpose, situation, and audience and is improved by reflection on the written product and on the strategies used to create it. This understanding ... is not well served by our traditional [assessment] formats (1996, 135).

If writing is a social activity, something done in relation with others, and if writing is improved through processes of revisiting, revising, and reflection, then who decides which others we are authorized to cooperate with, and who decides what kinds of cooperation are acceptable?

The responsibility for making these determinations lies with teachers, as is clearly indicated in the Syracuse University Academic Integrity Office's educational strategies, which state that Syracuse University instructors (professors, instructors, lecturers, and teaching assistants alike) will:

- f. Implement pedagogical strategies for creating an environment that promotes academic honesty and have access to resources for necessary assistance
- g. Direct students to resources for assistance in ensuring academic honesty in their writing and researching. (Syracuse University, 2005)

Teachers must remember that their teaching is much more than the delivery of course content. Especially for graduate students, who are tomorrow's professors-in-training, the educational experience is a process of acculturation into the conventions of knowledge production within and outside the academy. Much of this acculturation work happens during the writing process, beginning with a student's introduction to research practices and continuing through such writing assignments as summary and synthesis of required readings, seminar papers, qualifying examinations, dissertation proposals, and theses and dissertations. Each of these written products comes with a set of conventions that frame the relationship between the writer, her knowledge, and disciplinary knowledge, all of which ultimately shape the written product itself. Producing written products, then, is practically equivalent with "scholarship." Quite often, though, the assumptions about knowledge, disciplinarity, and written representation that underlie the conventions of graduate-level texts are left unexamined—or unmentioned. In the current "crisis" atmosphere, teachers could easily be more likely to expend more

If writing is a social activity, something done in relation with others, and if writing is improved through processes of revisiting, revising, and reflection, then who decides which others we are authorized to cooperate with, and who decides what kinds of cooperation are acceptable?

effort searching for textual “crimes” than educating themselves and their students.

Donald McCabe and Gary Pavela make a compelling argument for teacher responsibility in promoting academic integrity. They write, “faculty members have primary responsibility for designing the educational environment and experience.... [I]t is important that faculty model, as well as clarify, desired standards” (2004, 14). What does this mean in terms of graduate student writing? First and foremost, it means that we must recognize that it is not only the responsibility of writing teachers and professional writing consultants to do the kind of acculturation work I have described. What the so-called crisis in academic integrity tells us is that writing is central to academic work and it is, therefore, the responsibility of the entire academic and administrative community on campus to establish, maintain, and support courses and programs that meet the challenges faced by grad students as they develop into professionals. Faculty can, if given to proper administrative support (such as professional development opportunities), increase their efforts to incorporate writing—and discussions of writing—into their courses in order to: 1) familiarize students with acceptable writing and research practices; 2) familiarize themselves with their students’ writing; and 3) clearly establish the connections between the generic conventions and constraints of research writing and relevant disciplinary expectations and practices.

If, as John Thomas Farrell argues, writing consultants (and, likewise, teachers) are responsible for establishing and maintaining “ethical adult, professional relationships” (1996, 1) with graduate students, then teachers must offer instruction in graduate student writing *as colleagues* in whom graduate students can place their trust to acculturate them properly. Of course, graduate students are often teachers themselves, and thus they find themselves in a particular situation: they must learn from their professors and advisors at the same time they are in the position to model behaviors for their undergraduate students. Thus, what is ultimately at stake is the production of new generations of scholars whose research practices are firmly grounded in the principles of academic integrity, who are fully equipped with the knowledge and teaching skills required to train the next generation and understand the weight of the responsibility to do so.

As teachers, before we think “academic dishonesty” we should be thinking “teaching opportunity.” At the bottom of any effort to foster an atmosphere of academic integrity is the establishment of an ethical relationship between teacher and student. More so than in undergraduate education, the opportunity to forge collegial relationships with graduate students abounds for faculty, since at the graduate level teachers and students typically work closely together. Rather than being constantly on the lookout for the naughty child with a hand in the

cookie jar, teachers, writing consultants, students, and administrators can work together to ensure that students receive the education they need in order to succeed as ethically minded scholars and teachers. To pass that responsibility on to Turnitin.com or writing instructors alone is to abdicate the most basic responsibility we have in creating a community of honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility: to be excellent teachers, mentors, and colleagues who care more about learning than policing.

Notes

1. “Fabrication, falsification, or misrepresentation of data, results, sources for papers or reports; in clinical practice, as in reporting experiments, measurements, statistical analyses, tests, or other studies never performed; manipulating or altering data or other manifestations of research to achieve a desired result; selective reporting, including the deliberate suppression of conflicting or unwanted data.... Expropriation or abuse of ideas and preliminary data obtained during the process of editorial or peer review of work submitted to journals, or in proposals for funding by agency panels or by internal University committees” (Syracuse University, 2005).

2. The Center for Academic Integrity, formerly at Duke University’s Kenan Institute for Ethics, has moved during the publication of this volume. The Center is now hosted by the Rutland Institute for Ethics at Clemson University. The Center can still be found online at the same address: <http://www.academicintegrity.org>.

Works Cited

- Camp, R. (1996). New views of measurement and new models for writing assessment. In E. M. White, W. Lutz, & S. Kamusikiri (Eds.), *Assessment of writing: Politics, policies, practices* (pp. 135-147). New York: MLA.
- Council of Writing Program Administrators. (2003). *Defining and avoiding plagiarism: WPA statement on best policies*. Available at <http://wpaouncil.org/positions/plagiarism.html>.
- Farrell, J. T. (1996, March). *The writing center professional and graduate students: Developing an ethical paradigm*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication. Available through the EDRS database.
- Howard, R. M. (1999) *Standing in the shadow of giants: Plagiarists, authors, collaborators*. Stamford, CT: Ablex.

McCabe, D. L., & Pavela, G. (2004). Ten (updated) principles of academic integrity: How faculty can foster student honesty. *Change*, 36(3), 10-15.

Syracuse University, Office of Academic Integrity. (2005). Syracuse University academic integrity policies and procedures. Available at http://provost.syr.edu/academicintegrity_office.asp.

Ten Strategies to Encourage Academic Integrity in Large Lecture Classes

Brian Udermann and Karrie Lamers

Introduction

Academic integrity has been and continues to be a lively topic of discussion on most college and university campuses. Many articles and books have been written about cheating and have explored such topics as why students cheat, how students cheat, ways to discourage cheating, and faculty and student attitudes towards cheating. Both students and faculty must take steps and assume some responsibility if the current culture regarding academic integrity in higher education is to change. This chapter presents ten strategies that can be used in large lecture courses (the authors consistently teach sections that have enrollments between 400 and 500 students). Some of the strategies discussed in the chapter are specific to large lecture courses, but many of the strategies would be appropriate to use in courses with smaller enrollments as well.

1. Promote your school's honor code.

Many faculty members do not even realize that their college or university has an honor code, and many who do fail to discuss and promote it with their students. A university's honor code or policy on academic integrity should be reviewed often and shared with students on a continual basis. It has been our experience that many students in our large lecture courses have never seen information on academic integrity on a syllabus or had open discussions on cheating in the classroom. If more faculty members would have open and frank discussions about integrity with their students, the overall attitude regarding cheating would likely start to change.

2. Respond to cheating in your class.

Taking action against a student cheating in your class is not a pleasant experience. Some faculty overlook cheating simply because they do not want the added stress in their life, and it can also become very time consuming (meetings with the student and school officials, written reports of the incident in question,

If more faculty members would have open and frank discussions about integrity with their students, the overall attitude regarding cheating would likely start to change.

hearings, etc.). One of the authors recalls the first time he confronted a student cheating in a class he was teaching as a graduate student. The student became very angry and upset, said there was no proof that any cheating had occurred, and threatened to file a complaint with the university. Understandably, this resulted in a great deal of stress. Ironically, it was a stress management course that was being taught! Luckily, the department chair-

person was extremely supportive, the complaint was never filed, and the student received a zero on the exam. One thing we are not shy about doing when giving exams in our large lecture courses is to respond quickly when we think someone may be cheating. If we find a student whose eyes appear to be wandering a bit, we require the student to move to a different section of the classroom, often from the back to the front. Shortly after moving the student, we usually make an announcement to the class and say something to the effect of “please keep your eyes on your own exam” or “please do your own work.” This sends a strong message—students are often a bit shocked to see this take place—to the other 400 or 500 students in the auditorium that cheating will not be tolerated. Over the course of the past few years, we have done this with dozens of students and not once has it resulted in a student complaint.

3. Individualize papers and assignments to the class if possible.

One strategy faculty can use to discourage cheating in large lectures is to individualize assignments and papers to their respective courses. For example, we recently created a civic engagement assignment for our large health and wellness course, in which students had to research and determine what avenues or resources were locally available to them to be physically active (e.g., bike trails, walking paths). For this assignment, students also had to list five potential avenues or resources for physical activity that were not available in their community and determine whom they would need to contact to see if the addition of such a resource would be feasible. This was a great assignment in

that it encouraged critical thinking and invited community involvement. It was also a unique assignment, one that could not be completed through any means other than conducting the necessary research.

Some faculty who teach large lectures will also frequently change assignments in order to discourage cheating. This makes it harder for students to use and turn in assignments from previous semesters. Also, an additional strategy that can be used if students write papers in your course is to make the topic more narrow or specific. So, instead of having students write a general paper on eating disorders, you could have them focus on one very specific component of the topic.

4. Give clear expectations for assignments and other course work required of students.

We have noticed that students are more confident and more likely to do their own work when they receive clear directions and expectations for assignments, papers, lab reports, class projects, etc. Sometimes it can feel like we are overcommunicating with our students and that we are holding their hands a bit too much, but clarity and communication are especially important in large lecture courses. If you teach a course of 500 students, you probably do not take attendance, and it is reasonable to assume that 50 to 100 students will miss any given lecture. Our assignments are all described in a lab manual that we give students.; they are also posted on the course management tool we use for the class. The assignments are always discussed in class, and e-mails are often sent regarding assignments to remind students of due dates and clarify details. The tremendous focus on group work in colleges and universities today can sometimes become problematic for students. Sometimes student collaboration becomes the norm, and students might not know when they are expected to do their own work or work in teams. Clear descriptions and expectations can certainly help clarify this.

5. Encourage student responsibility.

Faculty are in the ideal position to discuss academic integrity with their students, and more importantly to encourage and challenge students to change the culture surrounding cheating. One of the strongest motivators students have for avoiding cheating is sensing or experiencing strong peer disapproval. It is our responsibility as educators to stir up this desire in students to do what is right. That might include emphasizing to students that they are expected to do their own work or reporting other students who they know are cheating. Much has been written about the “millennial student.” Some believe the students we have in class today are more responsible, more open to our influence, and more

concerned with doing what is right. Within our large lecture course, we often have discussions with students about how harmful cheating can be and how much of an influence it could have on them once they graduate and get a job. Individuals who consistently cheat can certainly lack skills such as critical thinking and the ability to solve problems—both extremely helpful skills to have when entering the job market. The exciting thing about having such discussions in large lecture courses is having the potential to influence such a large number of students. Some faculty may mistakenly think that because they teach a large lecture course, students do not really listen to, care about, or pay attention to what they say. We have found just the opposite to be true. If you truly care for your students and show you are passionate about a topic, even academic integrity, you will impact students!

6. Get to know as many students as possible.

This may seem like a strange strategy for promoting academic integrity in your large lecture course, but we believe that learning the names of as many students as possible and getting to know your students will help deter cheating in your class. A few ways you can do this are by asking for students' names when you call on them to answer questions, paying close attention to their names when you hand back assignments or exams, and arriving to class five to ten minutes early to interact with your students. We teach in a very large auditorium and try to select different sections of the classroom in which to interact with students before class; that way we are meeting and interacting with a wide variety of students. It really is amazing, even in a class of 500, how many students we can get to know with a little bit of effort. Before a lecture one morning, one of the authors met a young lady sitting in the auditorium waiting for class and learned that she was a high-level power lifter. Two and a half weeks later, the topic of the day was resistance training and the importance of proper breathing. The young power lifter, who had just returned from overseas and had won a power lifting world championship, was more than happy to share her expertise on the topic. That interaction might not have occurred if the faculty member had not made an effort to get to know students. If students get the impression that you care about them and you are genuinely concerned about them learning the course material, we believe they will be less likely to cheat in class.

7. Separate students during exams, when space permits.

Nearly every seat in our auditorium is full during our exams. However, after approximately two-thirds of the students have finished with the exam, we require students to move so as to have at least one empty seat between them. Also, after approximately 75 or 80 percent of students have taken the exam, we require

students to move into one section of the auditorium as they complete their exam. Students who are very prepared to take the exam often complete it in less time than individuals who are not, or individuals who are attempting to cheat. Two additional strategies for deterring exam cheating are to encourage students to keep answer sheets covered as much as possible and to check IDs when students turn in their exams, making sure the name on the exam matches the name on the ID.

8. Have adequate proctors to help with exams.

When giving an exam to over 500 students, it is extremely important to ensure that there are enough proctors present. At a minimum, there are eight proctors present at each exam we give. Not only are these individuals responsible for monitoring the students while they are taking the exam, but the proctors can also hand out answer sheets as students enter the room and distribute tests to a specified section of the room. This can significantly reduce the amount of time spent on exam set-up. It is then the responsibility of the proctor to watch over the particular section for any unusual behavior. It is beneficial to put more than one proctor in the larger sections if numbers allow. The mere presence of the proctors seems to deter students from engaging in unethical behavior, making the job of the proctor relatively simple. The proctors should walk around the section designated to them rather than being stationary, as this enhances their presence. Another role the proctors play is collecting the exams. Typically, two versions of the exam are given, and these need to be collected separately. At a minimum, proctors check the Scantron forms to make sure the student has put the right version of the exam down and also included her student ID number.

9. Have multiple versions of exams.

As previously mentioned, we use multiple versions of exams when we give tests. As with the presence of the proctors, the mere awareness of the multiple exams seems to deter students from cheating. To keep the tests the same for every student taking the exam, the same questions are used on each test—they are just arranged in a different order. Many faculty develop a large bank of test questions and periodically rotate the questions on the exams. We always administer exams in at least two different colors. This helps the proctors who distribute the exams make sure students are not sitting next to someone with the same version of the test. If at all possible, we would recommend using exam formats other than multiple choice (e.g., short answer, essay). This may only be possible if adequate teaching assistants or graduate assistants are assigned to the class to help with grading.

10. Engage your students and be enthusiastic.

It is time that we educators also consider why students cheat and possibly accept some of the responsibility ourselves. While many students cheat due to the pressures to succeed and obtain higher grades, they are just as likely to cheat

While many students cheat due to the pressures to succeed and obtain higher grades, they are just as likely to cheat when assignments are boring as when they are difficult.

when assignments are boring as when they are difficult. We believe that many students cheat because they are not engaged in their classrooms. They are not being motivated to learn, and they are not being inspired by faculty members who are enthusiastic about the content they are teaching. This can be especially problematic in large

lecture courses, for obvious reasons. Some faculty members do an excellent job when it comes to engaging students and motivating them to learn, but the sad reality is that many do not. Many students sit in large lectures and are bored, or apathetic, or fall asleep. They are simply not stimulated by the course content or the individual delivering the material. It certainly can be challenging to prepare a course that encourages frequent student engagement, and some educators may not be comfortable teaching extremely large lecture courses. These are important factors to consider and can impact academic integrity. It is beyond the scope of this chapter to discuss strategies that can be used to engage students in large lecture courses; however, many articles and even some books have been written on the topic. Anecdotally, we can tell you that as we have tried to engage and stimulate students in our large lecture courses over the past few years, the amount of cheating we have encountered has decreased.

Conclusion

In this chapter we have presented a variety of strategies faculty can utilize to encourage academic integrity in large lecture courses. We believe that it is possible to have an impact on the amount of cheating that occurs on college and university campuses, but this will certainly take some effort on the part of both students and faculty. We believe that if we as faculty encourage student responsibility, have open and frank discussions about cheating, are more willing to respond when students cheat, and focus on ways to engage students and improve our teaching, the current culture surrounding cheating will start to change.

Contributors

Matthew Bertram is a graduate of the State University of New York at Oswego. He received his bachelor's degree in writing arts in 2005 and his master's degree in literature in 2007. His main writing focus is short fiction and poetry. He is not currently employed by any facet of academia, but always manages to find time to write.

Sarah L. Bolton graduated from SUNY Fredonia in 2003 and received her Ph.D. in chemistry from Syracuse University in 2008. While at Syracuse she participated in several research projects involving diruthenium molecular wires in the laboratory of Dr. Michael B. Sponsler and was a teaching assistant for General Chemistry. She is currently a visiting professor at Bucknell University, where she teaches organic chemistry.

David Alan Bozak is the associate dean of the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences at SUNY Oswego. He holds a joint appointment in computer science and psychology and is a recipient of the SUNY Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Teaching. He currently chairs the Committee on Intellectual Integrity at Oswego.

Patrick Drinan is professor of political science at the University of San Diego and was dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, USD, from 1989 to 2006. He is also a past president of the Center for Academic Integrity and holds a Ph.D. in government from the University of Virginia.

Sidney L. Greenblatt is the recently retired senior assistant director for advising and counseling at the Slutzker Center for International Services, serving

international students and scholars at Syracuse University and the SUNY College of Environmental Science and Forestry. In addition to holding faculty positions in sociology at both Syracuse and Drew University, Mr. Greenblatt has worked in China, Taiwan, and Hong Kong as an interpreter and specialist on contemporary Chinese society.

David Horacek is finishing his Ph.D. dissertation in philosophy at Syracuse University. In addition to his research on causation, chance, and time travel, David teaches philosophy at SUNY Oswego. He is currently writing the manuscript of a textbook tentatively titled *Critical Thinking for the Information Age*.

Karrie Lamers has earned a bachelor's of science degree in sport management from the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse (UW-L) and is currently pursuing a second undergraduate degree in accounting from UW-L.

Benjamin J. Lovett is an assistant professor of psychology at Elmira College in Elmira, NY. He teaches classes on a variety of topics in psychology, and his research interests include educational assessment, psychiatric diagnosis, and the history of psychology. Ben earned a Ph.D. in school psychology from Syracuse University in 2007.

Patricia MacKown is currently assistant vice president for student development and enrollment services at the University of Central Florida. She has been a member of UCF for 29 years, working in the area of student rights and responsibilities. Ms. MacKown has chaired efforts to develop and implement the UCF Creed as well as initiate ethical decision making opportunities.

Lucy McGregor is an honors student majoring in psychology and geography at the University of Canterbury in Christchurch, New Zealand. Lucy was an undergraduate study-abroad student at Syracuse University in 2006-07, taking courses unavailable to her at Canterbury, such as Religions of the World, Ancient History, and Clinical Psychology. She hopes to continue her studies in a clinical psychology graduate program after graduation.

Michael Murphy is the interim director of college writing and a visiting assistant professor of English at the State University of New York at Oswego. He has published articles on composition theory, cultural studies, and contingent faculty issues.

David Nentwick teaches writing at The College of Coastal Georgia in Brunswick, GA, and is also a Ph.D. candidate in composition and cultural rhetoric at

Syracuse University. His research interests include theories of literacy, critical literacy, ethics and writing, composition and citizenship, writing and the environment, the cultural politics of language, and World Englishes. His dissertation, which deals with writing assessment and curriculum, language policy, identity, and cultural rhetoric, is an ethnographic study of native French speakers in Québec learning academic literacy in English.

James M. Pangborn is adjunct instructor of English at SUNY Oswego and Cayuga Community College, Fulton campus. A long-time nontraditional student, he received his Ph.D. from the University at Buffalo in twentieth-century American literature and continues to cultivate a pragmatist perspective on reading, writing, and teaching. He also writes poems.

Kimberly Ray is a doctoral candidate in child and family studies at Syracuse University. She is currently an early childhood education instructor at Borough of Manhattan Community College.

Amy S. Roache-Fedchenko is a doctoral candidate in the Anthropology Department at Syracuse University. Her archaeological research centers on the role of the blacksmith within fur trading communities in the Great Lakes region. She is a Teaching Fellow with the Future Professoriate Program, and is an FPP Associate for the Anthropology Department.

Ken Sagendorf is the deputy director for faculty development and an assistant professor at the United States Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs, CO, where he mentors new and experienced faculty. He earned his Ph.D. in college science teaching (2007) from Syracuse University, where he worked in the Graduate School with graduate teaching and future faculty preparation programs.

Danielle Schuehler Sherwood is a University Fellow working on her doctorate in chemistry at Syracuse University. She has taught organic and honors general chemistry laboratories and organic chemistry recitation. Danielle has a B.S. in chemistry, with minors in physics, philosophy, and mathematics, from Le Moyne College, where she is currently a member of the alumni association.

Michael Smithee, retired from the Slutzker Center for International Services at Syracuse University, currently uses his experience to consult on international higher education, international education administration, and intercultural training with Smithee Associates. His teaching includes graduate and undergraduate courses on intercultural issues and seminars for Teaching Fellows and

teaching assistants on the nature of the intercultural classroom. He was awarded an Ed.D. in higher education from Syracuse University in 1990.

Ruth Federman Stein has a Ph.D. in instructional design, development, and evaluation and an M.A. in English literature. Coauthor of *Using Student Teams in the Classroom* and *Building and Sustaining Learning Communities*, she previously was a teaching consultant, taught in the Syracuse University Writing Program, served on the Syracuse Board of Education, and taught high school English.

Ryan Thibodeau is an assistant professor of psychology at St. John Fisher College in Rochester, NY. He teaches courses in introductory psychology, personality, the psychology of emotion, and history and systems of psychology. He is actively involved in research in the areas of emotion, psychophysiology, and health psychology. Ryan earned his Ph.D. from Syracuse University in 2008.

Tyra Twomey is a part-time editor at Syracuse University's Graduate Editing Center and full-time doctoral candidate in composition and cultural rhetoric. Her dissertation examines the intersection of student writers' use of outside sources with cultural notions of authorship, collaboration, and plagiarism; she has also recently published an article on rhetorical genre.

Brian Udermann is an associate professor in the Department of Exercise and Sport Science and the director of online education at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse.

Holly White has been a TA for three years while pursuing her Ph.D. in religion at Syracuse University. She has been a Teaching Fellow and was named an Outstanding TA at Syracuse in 2008. Her areas of interest are postmodern and feminist philosophy with special attention to art and justice. Holly received a master's in theological studies from Bethany Theological Seminary in 2004.

Kevin Yee is a faculty developer at the University of Central Florida. Though his Ph.D. is in German, he currently researches classroom teaching and learning methods. His recent publications include an article on best practices for preparing adjunct faculty members to teach at the university, and he also works extensively with graduate teaching assistants.