

**Understanding and Reducing Academic Misconduct
at the University of Guelph**

A TSS & Learning Commons Project

Julia Christensen Hughes, Barbara Christian, Jeanette Dayman, Janet Kaufman, Nancy Schmidt

**University of Guelph
Revised - November, 2002**

For further information contact: jchrste@uoguelph.ca

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. What is Academic Misconduct?	3
3. Why is Academic Misconduct so Prevalent?	4
a. Student Characteristics.....	4
b. Faculty Attitudes and Behaviours.....	6
c. Institutional Environments	7
4. Fostering a Culture of Academic Integrity	9
5. Policies and Procedures at Canadian and US Universities.....	11
6. Strategies for Faculty.....	12
7. Implications for the University of Guelph	15
8. References	17
9. Appendix 1.....	21

Introduction

Concern with academic misconduct at the University of Guelph is growing. This concern pertains to both the perception that rates of academic misconduct are increasing and that policies and procedures pertaining to academic misconduct are not being consistently followed at the departmental level.

Research suggests that Guelph's concerns are well founded. In their 1990-1991 study involving 6000 students across 31 U.S. campuses, McCabe and Trevino (1996) found that as many as 84 percent of students engage in some form of academic dishonesty. They also found that rates of some types of cheating are increasing. In comparison with a similar study conducted by Bowers (1964) thirty years earlier, McCabe and Trevino (1996) found that the number of students who engage in "the most serious test cheating behaviors – copying from another student during a test or examination, helping another to cheat, and using crib notes – have all increased substantially" (p. 31). Other research has found that as many as 80 percent of college and university-bound high school students have cheated at least once, think cheating is commonplace, and "more than half do not consider cheating a serious transgression" (The Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity, 1999, p. 2). Effectively addressing academic misconduct has arisen as a major concern at universities across North America.

The purpose of this report is to serve as a first step in helping the University of Guelph better understand and reduce incidents of academic misconduct. It provides an overview of the literature, a summary of approaches taken at other universities, and provides initial suggestions for reducing academic misconduct at the University of Guelph.

What is Academic Misconduct?

The terms academic dishonesty and academic misconduct are often used interchangeably in reference to a range of unethical behaviours that students sometimes engage in, in the completion of their academic work (whether course work or research). A recent article in *University Affairs* (Mullens, 2000, p. 23) defined academic dishonesty as:

Anything that gives a student an unearned advantage over another. It includes any of the following: purchasing an essay; plagiarizing paragraphs or whole tests; impersonating another to take a test; sneaking a peek at another student's answers; smuggling crib notes into a test; padding a bibliography; fudging laboratory results; collaborating on an assignment when the professor asks for individual work; or asking for a deadline extension by citing a bogus excuse.

At the University of Guelph, academic misconduct is "broadly understood to mean offenses against the academic integrity of the learning environment" (Undergraduate Calendar, 2001-

2002, p. 28). Guelph's Undergraduate Calendar includes three broad categories of academic misconduct (one being academic dishonesty) and provides examples of each (p. 28). These are summarized in part below:

1. Academic dishonesty
 - Copying from or using prohibited material
 - Copying another person's answers
 - Improper academic practices (falsification, fabrication or misrepresentation of material or data)
 - Plagiarism (i.e., misrepresenting the work of others as one's own)

2. Misrepresentation of personal performance
 - Submitting false, fraudulent or purchased assignments or academic documents
 - Impersonation
 - Submitting a false medical or compassion certificate
 - Improperly obtaining access to privileged information
 - Submitting the same course work on more than one occasion
 - Violation of other conditions specified in writing by the course instructor (e.g., ban of editorial services)

3. Damage to the Integrity of Scholarly Exchanges
 - Restricting access to academic materials for general use
 - Obstructing the academic activities of others
 - Aiding or abetting academic misconduct

Why is Academic Misconduct so Prevalent?

The literature provides many reasons why academic misconduct has become so prevalent. Some explanations focus on student characteristics, others on faculty attitudes and behaviours, and some on institutional cultures and environments.

Student Characteristics

A considerable amount of research has explored the relationship between individual student characteristics and incidents of academic misconduct. The most comprehensive study to date was carried out by McCabe and Trevino (1997) who surveyed students at nine public U.S. universities. They found self-reported levels of academic misconduct to be positively correlated with a number of characteristics including age, gender, level of academic achievement, and involvement in extracurricular activities. Research has also looked at differences in self-reported levels of academic misconduct by discipline (as reported in Meade, 1992 and Mullens, 2000). Collectively, this research suggests the following:

- Younger students cheat more than older students.
- Male students cheat more than female students.
- Students with lower grade point averages cheat more than students with higher grade point averages.
- Students who are involved with extracurricular activities cheat more than those who are not.
- Students in business and engineering cheat more than students in other disciplines.

Two other student groups that may require particular attention with respect to understanding academic misconduct are graduate students and students for whom English is a second language (ESL). Most research on academic misconduct has focused on undergraduate students. This may be partially due to the fact that most academics appear to think that graduate students ought to know the rules of academic conduct by the time they arrive at graduate school. It may also be because there are not as many graduate students as undergraduates, and thus the problem does not appear to be as great. The relative lack of research, however, does not mean that academic misconduct by graduate students does not exist. More research is needed to determine if there are differences between the expectations and behaviours of graduate and undergraduate students with regard to academic misconduct.

Understanding the challenges that may be unique to students for whom English is a second language (ESL), particularly if they have been raised in non-Western cultures is also important. According to the literature, dominant Western notions of plagiarism are based on intellectual property considerations and reflect individualistic cultural norms which students from collectivist cultures may have difficulty accepting (Scollon, 1995; Pennycook, 1996; Myers, 1998). According to Pennycook “plagiarism needs to be understood within the particular cultural and historical context of its development, it also needs to be understood relative to alternative cultural practices” (p. 218).

With respect to language, research suggests that some ESL students experience difficulty writing in a manner that is free of plagiarism. Silva (1993) reviewed 72 empirical studies that looked at the issue of language and writing, and concluded that holding second language writers accountable to the same standards as first language writers is inappropriate. Researchers have found that second language writers employ a variety of strategies to assist them in their writing, some of which may contravene plagiarism policies. These strategies include: copying expressions; imitating sentence structures; paraphrasing superficially; and engaging in “chunking” or “patch writing” (i.e., assembling large segments of prose from a variety of sources) (Myers, 1998; Percorari, 2000).

Despite these general categories, and the need to understand the challenges of particular student groups, it is important to realize that academic misconduct occurs throughout the entire student population, even amongst top students.

Sometimes it is the best students, accustomed to obtaining good marks and doing

well, who resort to cheating. When they are overwhelmed with work and are afraid they won't be able to produce their usual results, some feel they have so much to lose that they take a risk and cheat (Mullens, 2000, p. 26).

There are many reasons that students offer in explanation of academic misconduct. In a study of student perceptions at 31 U.S. colleges and universities, McCabe, Trevino, and Butterfield (1999) found a common set of justifications and excuses including (p. 224):

- “intense academic and family expectations and pressures;
- societal expectations;
- the desire to excel;
- the pressure to get high grades;
- the pressure of getting a good job or gaining acceptance into graduate school;
- high levels of stress;
- a highly competitive environment;
- laziness;
- lack of preparation, and;
- apathy.”

Others have suggested that increasing rates of academic misconduct reflect shifting societal values, including an increase in moral cynicism, the devaluation of the intrinsic worth of higher education, and a growing emphasis on career preparation (Dalton, 1998; McCabe & Pavela, 1998). According to Dalton (1998, p. 2) “the self-interested values of much of collegiate peer culture today support a utilitarian approach to personal ethics, which condones cheating as a necessary means to a desirable end.” There is also some evidence to suggest that not all students who cheat are necessarily aware that they are doing so. For example, some students are uncertain about the differences between complicity and appropriate collaboration and between plagiarism and properly acknowledged paraphrases (Maramark & Maline, 1993). Other students are simply unaware of institutional policies pertaining to academic misconduct (Dalton, 1998).

Faculty Attitudes and Behaviours

Faculty attitudes and behaviours can also have a significant impact on academic misconduct. “Those who refrain from discussing the importance of academic integrity or look the other way when students engage in academic dishonesty, alienate honest students and foster a climate of moral cynicism on campus” (McCabe & Pavela, 1998, p. 101).

The research is clear that cheating levels are higher among students who perceive that their peers cheat and are not penalized for doing so (McCabe & Trevino, 1993, 1997; Dalton, 1998). Not only does peer cheating provide a normative model condoning academic misconduct, but honest students may feel that if others are cheating and not being caught or reprimanded, that they have no choice but to cheat as well, in order to remain competitive.

Exacerbating this problem, research has also found that many faculty who are aware of cheating in their courses do nothing or little in response. In one study, for example, McCabe found that between 47 and 60 percent of faculty “go to little or very little effort to document an incident” of academic misconduct (McCabe, 1993, p. 343). When faculty who are aware of cheating in their courses do nothing about it, they “send the message that a core value of academic life, honesty, is not worth any significant effort to enforce” (Mullens, 2000, p. 26).

One reason suggested in the literature for the failure of faculty to deal with academic misconduct is lack of buy-in to formal policies and procedures (Cole & Kiss, 2000). Faculty who perceive the process too cumbersome, the penalties inappropriate, or a lack of institutional support for cases brought forward are more likely to do nothing or to negotiate a private agreement with the student (Schneider, 1999). Other reasons include (Pavela, 1997; McCabe & Pavela, 1998; Schneider, 1999):

- lack of emphasis on teaching;
- lack of time;
- fear of confrontation and litigation;
- fear of harassment and retribution;
- negative prior experiences; and,
- uncertainty about the appropriateness of dealing with ethical and moral issues in the classroom.

In addition to how they respond to incidents of academic misconduct when they do arise, the behaviour of faculty in other domains can also have an affect (Davis, 1993; Gross Davis, 1993; McCabe, Trevino & Butterfield, 1999). For example, faculty serve as important role models for student behaviour and when they are perceived to engage in integrity violations themselves (e.g., copyright violations, misrepresentation of other’s work in their teaching or research, falsifying research results), students are more likely to do the same. This may be particularly true at the graduate level where faculty and students work closely together. Other types of faculty behaviour that can influence academic misconduct include: inadequate precautions to guard against academic misconduct (e.g., using the same exam or assignment from year to year); expectations that are thought to be overly demanding or unfair; an indifferent or uncaring attitude; and the failure to specifically address the issue of academic integrity in their teaching.

Institutional Environments

Institutional environments can also significantly affect the prevalence of academic misconduct. One important aspect is *institutional size* (Davis, 1993; McCabe & Trevino, 1996; McCabe, Trevino & Butterfield, 1999). In larger institutions, students are more likely to feel anonymous or alienated and therefore are more likely to engage in academic misconduct. Another important factor is the availability of *learning technologies*. While the Internet has introduced some novel forms of cheating, it also increases the opportunity for standard types.

For example, students now have easy access to entire term papers; “One website providing free term papers to students has averaged 80,000 hits per day” (The Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity, 1999, p. 2). Quite apart from deliberate misconduct, students may also be overwhelmed by the quantity of electronic resources available to them and be unsure of how to assess their validity or reference them appropriately (Rocklin, 1996; Van Hartesveldt, 1998).

Learning technologies also challenge traditional boundaries of academic misconduct. Many people regard Internet resources as being in the public domain. It is unclear to what extent debate over Internet resources such as Napster may be influencing student opinion about using other forms of web-based material. Thoughtful strategies are needed for dealing with this issue. Understanding the link between learning technologies and academic misconduct is an important first step. Types of academic misconduct that may be associated with learning technologies are summarized below (Gray, 1998; Mullens, 2000; Rocklin, 1996; Van Hartesveldt, 1998):

- *On-line papers.* The Internet can facilitate finding an existing paper for copying or purchase (e.g., paper mills) and/or a writer.
- *Cut-and-paste papers.* Students can easily incorporate large portions of text from a variety of sources.
- *Verification.* It may be harder for a professor to verify a website or web resource with such a broad range of available search engines, the vast number of web pages currently online (more than 320 million), and the temporary nature of many on-line resources.
- *Referencing.* The lack of education on how to properly reference Internet sources may contribute to unintentional plagiarism.
- *Anonymity (on-line completion of exams/tests/assignments/contributions to discussion groups).* It is difficult to control for impersonation or to prevent collaboration where individual work is expected.
- *Online testing (e.g., quizzes) marked by the computer.* With this approach there is no contact by the instructor to detect discrepancies or pick-up on trends that might indicate cheating behaviour.
- *Communication technologies (e.g., pagers, cell phones, programmable calculators, the Internet, electronic mail).* All of these technologies support communication between students for help with tests (sometimes during) and assignments.
- *Hacking.* Students may be able to infiltrate a system to gain access to an exam, another student’s work, change grades, or alter computer code (e.g., introduce a virus). For the latter, this could limit access by other students or crash the system to allow for more time to submit a test or assignment.
- *Copying.* Electronic papers make it easier for students to share their work with one another.
- *Cheating tips and templates (e.g., soft drink and chewing gum labels).* Students have access to materials on which crib notes can be written.

In addition to being influenced by organizational size and the availability of learning technologies, students are also more likely to engage in academic misconduct at institutions that have not successfully established *cultures of academic integrity*; “campus norms and practices,

such as effective honor codes, can make a significant difference in student behaviors, attitudes, and beliefs' (The Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity, 1999, p. 2). In fact, research suggests that campus climate or culture may be *the* most important factor in determining levels of student cheating (McCabe, 1993; McCabe & Trevino, 1996, 1997; McCabe & Pavela, 1998). As a result, fostering a high integrity culture has become a focus at many North American universities. How such a culture can be developed is dealt with in the following section.

Fostering a Culture of Academic Integrity

The literature is rife with suggestions for how universities can foster cultures of academic integrity. The Centre for Academic Integrity at Duke University, which represents a consortium of over 200 colleges and universities, including the University of Guelph, defines academic integrity as “a commitment, even in the face of adversity, to five fundamental values: honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility” (The Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity, 1999, p. 4). The Centre also advocates seven key attributes in support of these values (p. 10):

1. Clear academic integrity statements, policies and procedures.
2. Information and education for the entire university community regarding academic integrity policies and procedures.
3. Reinforcement for these policies and procedures from the top down, and support for those who follow and uphold them.
4. Clear, accessible and equitable system to adjudicate suspected violations of policy.
5. Development of programs to promote academic integrity for all segments of the university community, including discussion about the importance of academic integrity and its connection to broader ethical issues and concerns.
6. Awareness of trends in higher education and technology affecting academic integrity.
7. Regular assessment of the effectiveness of policies and procedures for improvement and rejuvenation.

One type of policy that is becoming increasingly popular, particularly in smaller, religious-based U.S. colleges and universities, is referred to as an “honour code.” Research supports the effectiveness of such codes in reducing academic misconduct. For example, in their 1995 study of more than 4,000 students from 31 campuses, McCabe and Trevino (1996) found that there was a significant difference in the number of students who admitted to “one or more incidents of serious cheating” on campuses that had honour codes (54 percent) compared to those that did not (71 percent). Similarly, students who admitted to “repeated instances of serious cheating” also

compared favourably (7 versus 17 percent respectively). Reportedly, students at institutions with honour codes tend to frame the issue of academic integrity differently than students from institutions that do not have them; establishing a culture of integrity makes it less likely for students to justify or rationalize their cheating (McCabe, Trevino & Butterfield, 1999).

Traditional honour codes typically include written pledges affirming the students' commitment to academic integrity and are often accompanied by a centrally controlled judiciary comprised primarily of students, and some degree of obligation on students to report violations/violators (Melendez, 1985). In some cases, students are also required to write across their examinations and graded class work that they did not break the code in preparing their submitted work. Because universities with honor codes tend to place responsibility for enforcement on the students themselves, this can relieve faculty from unpopular activities such as proctoring exams and gathering evidence against suspected students. Further, having a centrally controlled judiciary tends to lead to more uniform enforcement and practice.

Honour-code schools also place significant emphasis on education and communication. "Honor-code schools differ from their peer institutions in that they actively communicate to students the importance of academic integrity as a core institutional value and the major role students must play in achieving this institutional goal" (McCabe & Pavela, 2000, p. 35). This focus on education is further reinforced through the design of the penalties.

Penalties tend to be comparatively strict, often including some kind of temporary transcript notation, but have an educational rather than punitive emphasis. Students are assumed to be capable of ethical development, and are engaged in substantive discussions about the importance of trust and honesty in academic life, and in the careers they plan to pursue (McCabe and Pavela, 2000, p. 35).

Traditional honour codes tend not to be found in large, urban, public, research-focused institutions as such campuses have unique challenges that make it difficult to create a unifying culture. Part-time students, commuter students, large class sizes, and the ability to remain anonymous in class all contribute to a kind of dissociation from local cultures and community standards. However, such institutions have experienced some success with the implementation of modified or quasi-honour codes (McCabe, Trevino & Butterfield, 1999). Modified honour codes usually include a strong, well-defined role for students in the judicial process and a substantial amount of educational programming for faculty and students, but not unproctored exams, pledges, or written statements of adherence to the code by students. As with full honour codes, research has found a significant relationship between the existence of modified honor codes and lower self-reported levels of academic misconduct (McCabe & Pavela, 2000).

McCabe and Pavela (2000, pp. 36 - 37) suggest the following ten steps in the development and implementation of a modified honour code:

1. Ask students to explain the nature and extent of campus cheating.

2. Give interested students and faculty members a voice in setting campus policy.
3. Allow students to play a major role in the resolution of contested cases.
4. Enforce significant sanctions keyed to an academic integrity seminar. For example, use a “XF” transcript notation to denote failure due to academic misconduct, but remove the designation once the student has successfully completed an academic integrity seminar.
5. Help student leaders educate their peers, particularly first-year students (e.g., a personal letter from a student leader, orientation programs, classroom presentations).
6. Develop fair, prompt, and efficient due process procedures.
7. Give student leaders support and guidance.
8. Keep faculty members and senior administrators informed (counter distorted impressions).
9. Encourage presidential leadership.
10. Evaluate and benchmark.

Policies and Procedures at Canadian and U.S. Universities

In our investigation of strategies for dealing with academic misconduct at other Canadian universities, forty-three web sites were visited during the winter of 2001 (see Appendix 1 for a list of the universities contacted) and searches undertaken for policy statements and regulations on plagiarism, academic integrity, and academic misconduct. We found the following:

- The most common place where policies and regulations are published is university calendars, but searches frequently retrieved college, faculty, departmental, course, writing centre, and library web sites.
- The titles of policies and regulations vary somewhat from one institution to another. The most common terms used in the policy titles are:
 - academic misconduct
 - academic dishonesty
 - academic fraud
 - academic/scholastic offences
- None of the universities appeared to have an honour code, although a number have a code of behaviour or conduct.

- A search of the University of Guelph web site, using a variety of terms, yielded the following results:
 - academic integrity – 29 hits
 - academic misconduct – 306 hits
 - plagiarism – 189 hits

- The term “academic integrity” is not in common usage but there is a small number of Canadian universities that have adopted the term in their policies:
 - Acadia University’s Academic Policy and Regulations includes a statement on academic integrity and sets out procedures concerning infractions of academic integrity (http://www.acadiau.ca/registrar/1999_calendar/intro/acade.htm).
 - Bishop’s University has a Policy on Academic Integrity which was adopted in 1999 (<http://www.ubishops.ca/administration/INTEGRIT.htm>).
 - Although the University of Manitoba’s General Academic Regulations and Policies are couched in terms such as plagiarism and cheating, there have been recent initiatives there focused on academic integrity. In 1997, University Teaching Services, a unit within the Centre for Higher Education Research and Development (CHERD) was one of eleven campus groups that sponsored “Academic Integrity Week” with events for undergraduate students, graduate students, staff, and faculty. The Week included lectures, workshops, and nightly screenings of films related to issues of integrity.
 - McGill University’s engineering department has adopted a code of ethics called the “Blueprint.” It promotes six core values: academic integrity, academic excellence, respect for others, equal rights, fostering community through extracurricular activities, and respect for university property.

From information contained in course calendars, we also undertook a detailed comparison of specific procedures involved in processing cases of academic misconduct at 5 Canadian and 3 U.S. universities. Although all had formal procedures for resolving cases of academic misconduct, there were variations in the use of informal mechanisms for dealing with this issue at a local level between instructor and student. We discovered differences in appeal procedures and in the judicial authorities involved in hearing these cases. As well there were variations in how records of action were kept on incidents of student academic misconduct and whether annual reports were generated citing statistics, nature of incidents and sanctions imposed.

Strategies for Faculty

As previously suggested, faculty can have a significant affect on student attitudes and behaviours. The literature, in particular Gross Davis (1993), Rocklin (1996), Gray (1998), Guernsey (1998), Johnson and Ury (1999), and Harris (2001) suggests many strategies that faculty can use in contributing to a culture of academic integrity. To begin with, faculty should

take the time to *clarify their expectations, educate students about the importance of integrity, and ensure that students are aware of university policies and procedures*. Suggestions for achieving these outcomes include:

- When reviewing the course syllabus or during the first class meeting, take time to review and discuss standards of academic scholarship, intellectual property, and copyright. Refer students to the Undergraduate Calendar.
- Educate students about plagiarism, paraphrasing, and proper referencing. Make an assignment out of it (e.g., provide examples, take them through the process of referencing and putting text in their own words in groups or as a class).
- Teach students how to assess the validity/reliability of electronic resources.
- Incorporate Internet assignments that educate students about the web, while meeting course goals (e.g., developing critical analytical skills by judging the worthiness of a website or web document).
- Ensure students know how they will be evaluated for each assignment or learning activity. Provide specific criteria.
- Acknowledge that you are aware of electronic sources that sell or make research papers available online (become familiar with these sources as they pertain to your own subject area and assignments). Identify term paper websites and use examples from them for critiquing - good and bad papers – focusing on the writing process.
- Make clear to students under what conditions extensions will be granted (if at all) and what excuses/documentation will be required.
- Make students aware that submitting the same work for two courses, or resubmitting previous work as something new in another course is considered fraudulent and subject to penalty.
- Provide students with a diverse selection of study materials that all students can access (e.g., previous exams, past students' work).

Faculty should also take particular care in the *design of assignments and exams*, thus reducing or eliminating situations in which cheating or plagiarism might occur. In designing *written assignments*, potential strategies include:

- Focus on both the writing process and the end product.
- Ensure the assignment is interesting and relevant to course goals/outcomes.
- Require specific formatting guidelines and documenting of research pathways (i.e., how students located electronic sources).
- Change topics and the nature of assignments each year.
- Have students publish their original work on the web to develop pride (and empathy) in individual scholarship – develop a community of scholars within the class.
- Require specific elements to be included in the paper (e.g., 2 books, 1 internet source, 4 primary sources or a specific referencing format).
- Require students to submit a select number of journal articles (or photocopy of first page) identified in their bibliography or to provide an annotated bibliography of an identified number of references.

- Build in intermediate steps for which students have to submit work for comment or grade (e.g., draft outline of a paper).
- Require students to submit rough drafts with their final paper.
- Require students to keep a journal throughout the completion of their assignment.
- Have students exchange rough drafts of their papers during class for comment by their peers – require them to demonstrate how peer feedback has been incorporated in their final version.

Strategies for effective *exam design and testing* include:

- Change exam formats and questions regularly.
- Have two sets of exams that are colour coded and/or with the same questions, but ordered differently (make sure students sitting beside each other have different coloured exams).
- Check student ID cards.
- If space is available, have students sit in every other seat.
- If more than one course is taking an exam in the same room, alternate exams every second seat.
- Ensure exams are appropriately proctored.
- Maintain order as students submit their exams.
- Supply scrap paper for making notes or calculations.
- Clearly indicate to students what they can and cannot bring into a testing setting.
- Provide exact procedures for taking exams.

Faculty can also take advantage of *learning technologies* in the design of their assignments and exams. Such strategies include:

- Password protect websites and electronic materials.
- Employ software (e.g., Adobe Acrobat Distiller), which protects word files from being altered or changed from original text.
- Provide referencing information on web documents.
- Let your students know that you are familiar with term paper sites.
- Provide secure testing sites.
- Use electronic means to generate randomized questions in testing settings.
- Create a virtual community with students to decrease anonymity.

Faculty must also become committed to *detecting* and *consistently following established procedures* for responding to academic misconduct when it does occur. Strategies for doing so include:

- Look for inconsistencies in writing style within and between assignments/papers.
- Watch out for out-of-date references or wrong citation style.
- Watch for papers that don't meet the criteria or specifications of the assignment.
- Look for writing or language that is inconsistent with student ability.
- Use tracking programs or websites that can compare assignments to already published

work.

- Follow policy in responding to all suspected incidents of academic misconduct.

Lastly, faculty should endeavour to create *classroom environments* of caring and support and recognize when students are under pressure or experiencing excessive stress. Providing one on one support to students and making referrals to campus support services as appropriate can be very effective strategies for minimizing academic misconduct by students who feel they have no option but to cheat.

Many of these suggestions are summarized in the American Association of Higher Education's (AAHE Bulletin/December, 1997, p. 12) "Ten Principles of Academic Integrity":

1. Affirm the importance of academic integrity.
2. Foster a love of learning.
3. Treat students as ends in themselves.
4. Foster an environment of trust in the classroom.
5. Encourage student responsibility for academic integrity.
6. Clarify expectations for students.
7. Develop fair and relevant forms of assessment.
8. Reduce opportunities to engage in academic dishonesty.
9. Challenge academic dishonesty when it occurs.
10. Help define and support campus-wide academic integrity standards.

Implications for the University of Guelph

There are several implications from this review for reducing academic misconduct at the University of Guelph. Combining the advice of McCabe and Pavela (2000) and the AAHE, the University of Guelph would be wise to engage in the following:

1. Investigate the nature and extent of academic misconduct on campus (i.e., gather perceptions of students, faculty, and administrators).
2. Investigate current policies and procedures (i.e., gather perceptions of students,

- faculty, and administrators).
3. Recommend and implement changes to campus policy as appropriate.
 4. Encourage both student and faculty responsibility for academic integrity.
 5. Help student leaders educate their peers, particularly first-year students about the importance of academic integrity and forms of academic misconduct (e.g., a personal letter from a student leader, orientation programs, classroom presentations).
 6. Help educate faculty about the importance of supporting a culture of academic integrity, as well as strategies for doing so, including the development of fair and relevant forms of assessment, reducing opportunities for students to engage in academic dishonesty, and challenging academic dishonesty when it does occur.
 7. Investigate tying sanctions to an academic integrity seminar. For example, explore the use of a “XF” transcript notation to denote failure due to academic misconduct, but remove the designation once the student has successfully completed an academic integrity seminar.
 8. Investigate the role that senior administrators can play in supporting a culture of academic integrity.
 9. Develop a mechanism by which the impact of any changes can be measured and assessed (e.g., benchmarks for reducing rates of academic misconduct).

Making progress on the first of these recommendations will be the next steps for the Academic Integrity taskforce.

References

- AAHE Bulletin/December (1997). 50 (4), 12.
- Bowers, W. (1964). *Student dishonesty and its control in college*. New York: Bureau of Allied Social Research, Columbia University.
- Cole, S. & Kiss, E. (2000). What can we do about student cheating? *About Campus*, May/June, 5 – 12.
- Dalton, J.C. (1998). Creating a campus climate for academic integrity. *Academic Integrity Matters*. Monograph 20. NASPA Monograph Series. Eds. Burnett, D., Rudolph, L., Clifford, K. Washington, DC: NASPA. [available: <http://www.naspa.org> 11/21/01].
- Davis, S. (1993). *Cheating in college for a career: Academic dishonesty in the 1990s*. Paper presented at the 39th Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association. Atlanta, Georgia, March 24-27, 1993.
- Gray, S. (1998). Maintaining academic integrity in web-based instruction. *Educational Media International*, 35(3), 186-188.
- Gross Davis (1993). Preventing Academic Dishonesty. In, *Tools for Teaching*. [available: <http://uga.berkeley.edu/sled/bgd/prevent.html> 10/22/01].
- Guernsey, L. (1998). Website will check students' papers against database to detect plagiarism. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. December 11, 1998.
- Harris, R. (2001). Anti-Plagiarism strategies for research papers. <http://www.virtualsalt.com/antiplag.htm> [available: 11/20/01].
- Johnson, C., & Ury, C. (1999). Preventing Internet Plagiarism. *The National Teaching and Learning Forum*, 8 (5), 5-6.
- Maramark, S. & Maline, M.G. (1993). Academic dishonesty among college students. *Issues in Education*. Eric Document, ED36093.
- McCabe, D. (1993). Academic integrity: What the latest research shows. *Synthesis: Law and Policy in Higher Education*, 5, 340 – 343.
- McCabe, D., & Pavela, G. (2000). Some good news about academic integrity. *Change*, September/October, 32-38.

McCabe, D., & Pavela, G. (1998). The effect of institutional policies and procedures on academic integrity. *Academic Integrity Matters*. Monograph 20. NASPA Monograph Series. Eds. Burnett, D., Rudolph, L., Clifford, K., Washington, DC: NASPA. [available: <http://www.naspa.org> 11/20/01].

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

McCabe, D., & Trevino, L. (1996). What we know about cheating in college: Longitudinal trends and recent developments. *Change*, 28 (1), 28-33.

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

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

Meade, J. (1992). Cheating: Is academic dishonesty par for the course? *Prism*, 1 (7), 30 – 32.

Melendez, B. (1985). *Honor code study*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

Mullens, A. (2000). Cheating to Win. *University Affairs*, 41 (10), 22-28.

Myers, S. (1998). Questioning author(ity): ESL/EFL, science, and teaching about plagiarism. *TESL-EJ (Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language)*. 3 (2), March [available: <http://www.kyoto-su.ac.jp/information/tesl-ej/ej10/a2.html> 10/21/99].

Pavela, G. (1997). Applying the power of association on campus: A model code of academic integrity. *Journal of College and University Law*, 24 (1), Summer, 97-118.

Pecorari, D. (2000). Plagiarism in academic writing. Conference presentation at *Navigating the New Millennium*, 34th annual TESOL conference, March 14 – 18, Vancouver, BC.

Pennycook, A. (1996). Borrowing others' words: Text, ownership, memory, and plagiarism. *TESOL Quarterly*. 30 (20), Summer, 201 – 230.

Rocklin, T. (1996). Downloadable Term Papers. What's a Prof. to do? Iowa City: Center for Teaching, University of Iowa. [available: <http://www.uiowa.edu/%7Ecenteach/resources/ideas/term-paper-download.html> 11/21/01].

Schneider, A. (1999). Why Professors Don't Do More to Stop Students Who Cheat. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. [available: <http://chronicle.com/> 02/06/01].

Scollon R. (1995). Plagiarism and ideology: Identity in intercultural discourse. *Language in Society*. 24 (1), 1 – 28.

Silva, T. (1993). Toward an understanding of the distinct nature of L2 writing: The ESL research and its implications. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27 (4), 657 – 677.

The Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity (1999). The Center for Academic Integrity, Duke University, October.

Undergraduate Calendar 2001-2002. *Undergraduate Program Services, University of Guelph*. Ed. Goody, A.H. Guelph, Ontario.

Van Hartesveldt, F.R. (1998). The undergraduate research paper and electronic resources: A cautionary tale. *Teaching History: A Journal of Methods*, 23 (2), 51-59.

Other Resources:

Writing Services, The Learning Commons, University of Guelph
<http://www.learningcommons.uoguelph.ca/writing/resources.htm> [available: 11/20/01]
(see links section for information on plagiarism, style guides, writing in general; see fastfax or resources on writing)

Learning Services, The Learning Commons, University of Guelph
<http://www.learningcommons.uoguelph.ca/learning/resources.htm> [available: 11/20/01]

Styles Manuals, Library Services, University of Guelph
<http://tug.lib.uoguelph.ca/referencetools/stylemanuals.htm> [available: 11/20/01]
(provides information and links on a number of style guides)

University of Guelph Copyright Guidelines
http://www.lib.uoguelph.ca/LibEd/newfacultygrad/New_Faculty/copyright.htm [available: 11/20/01]

Cut-and-Past Plagiarism: Preventing, Detecting and Tracking Online Plagiarism
By: Lisa Hinchliffe (1998)
<http://alexia.lis.uiuc.edu/%7Ejanicke/plagiary.htm> [available: 11/21/01]

Term Papers Mills/Papers for Sale:

Essay World – <http://www.essayworld.com> [available: 10/24/01]
Papers123 - <http://www.papers123.com> [available: 10/24/01]

Junglepage – <http://www.junglepage.com> [available: 10/24/01]
BigNerds – <http://www.BigNerds.com> [available: 10/24/01]
Paperwriters – <http://www.paperwriters.com> [available: 10/24/01]
School Sucks – <http://www.schoolsucks.com> [available: 10/24/01]

Appendix 1

List of Canadian University Web Sites Searched

Acadia University
University of Alberta
Athabasca University
Augustana University College
Bishop's University
Brandon University
University of British Columbia
Brock University
University of Calgary
University College of Cape Breton
University College of the Cariboo
Carleton University
Concordia University
Dalhousie University
University of Guelph
Lakehead University
Laurentian University
University of Lethbridge
University of Manitoba
McGill University
McMaster University
Memorial University of Newfoundland
Mount Saint Vincent University
University of New Brunswick
Nipissing University
University of Northern British Columbia
University of Ottawa
Queen's University
University of Regina
Royal Roads University
Ryerson Polytechnic University
St. Francis Xavier University
Saint Mary's University
University of Saskatchewan
Simon Fraser University
University of Toronto
Trent University
University of Victoria
University of Waterloo
University of Western Ontario
Wilfrid Laurier University
University of Windsor
University of Winnipeg
York University