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Academic ethics and integrity are necessary elements of a quality education. The need for academic integrity education on campuses has been well documented (Bertram Gallant, 2008, 2016; Bertram Gallant & Drinan, 2006; Liebler, 2009; McCabe, Butterfield, & Trevino, 2004). Academic integrity is a cornerstone of the learning process (Bretag et al., 2014; Harp & Taietz, 1966). Higher education institutions have the opportunity to promote academic integrity and prevent academic misconduct on campus by providing clear guidelines, equitable resolutions, and student and faculty engagement. While researchers have examined four-year institutions approaches to academic integrity education, differences exist that are unique to the community college. Specifically, increased diversity, more part-time populations of faculty and staff, higher numbers of students enrolled in online education and an institutional commitment to workforce orientation (Tull, Kuk, & Dalpes, 2015) affect the methods used to promote academic integrity and prevent academic dishonesty. Literature on these concepts in the community college setting is extremely limited.

To address this gap in the literature, a single bounded case study using a partially mixed, concurrent, dominant status design (Johnson, Onwuegbuzie, & Turner, 2007) examined the components of academic integrity education within one Mid-Western community college, as perceived by faculty and staff.
The study included a review of 28 documents and academic misconduct violation data from 2002-2015, a modified survey instrument, the *Academic Integrity Survey* \((N=57)\), and semi structured interviews with 10 institutional stakeholders including faculty, staff, and senior administrators. The resulting case reveals a change in academic integrity education over the last five years. The institution made policy revisions to promote faculty autonomy in decision-making. While study participants understood the issue of academic integrity and recognized its occurrence within the institution, the formal data collected on academic misconduct was limited. Responses to academic misconduct varied greatly among administrators, staff, and full and part-time faculty, including refusal to participate in a formal academic misconduct reporting process. Despite this, most study participants indicate a personal willingness to prevent academic misconduct and to promote academic integrity. This willingness spans academic department, faculty rank, and gender within the institution.

The findings indicate the most influential individuals on academic integrity on campus were faculty. Faculty classroom management and curriculum development emerged as important tools in setting expectations of integrity. The choices that faculty made in addressing academic misconduct were based on individual norms of academic discipline, personal, and professional experiences. The study participants found that limited resources of time, money, and priority were a challenge in providing institutionalized opportunities for academic integrity education. Recommendations for higher education leaders in community colleges included increased student engagement, increased opportunities for part-time faculty to share and disseminate ideas, demonstrated student learning, a focus on the integrity policies of workforce oriented certification.
programs, and a clear policy and shared mission. This study adds to the body of knowledge of academic integrity research, namely the promotion of academic integrity and prevention of academic misconduct in the community college setting.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To my study site and participants, thank you for taking on the brave task to assess academic integrity. I am inspired having met such student centered individuals. Thank you to ICAI for the professional space and support to explore such an important discipline. To the ELRT faculty, especially Dr. Bierlein Palmer, Dr. Beach, Dr. Poppink, Dr. Lewis, and Dr. Hadley: Thank you for helping me to stay focused, and helping me to think through difficult questions. We are lucky to have you at WMU. To my amazing committee, Dr. Nagel and Dr. Garza Mitchell: I am forever grateful that you see something in me I have not always seen in myself. Thank you for the thoughtful edits the open doors, the tea, and the words of advice. I have gained such wonderful mentors, and you are truly role models for me. To my chair, Dr. Talbot, thank you for your wisdom, for the process, and for your encouragement. It has not been easy, but it has been my honor and pleasure to learn from you.

To my village of friends and colleagues: your support means the world to me. It has been quite the adventure! Thanks for the late nights and early mornings. To my family: my parents, Larry and Rosetta Pearson, you keep me going. To Miss Trina, G.G., and TiTi Rita, thank you for being there. I love you all. To Leila and Maya: You are wonderful girls who can grow up to be anything you want to be. Thank you for helping Mommy reach her goals. To my husband Tony…it takes an incredible person to support me in all of the ways you have. I love you and I am forever grateful.

Ceceilia Parnther
TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ........................................................................................................ ii

LIST OF TABLES ..................................................................................................................... ix

LIST OF FIGURES .................................................................................................................. x

CHAPTER I .................................................................................................................................. 1

Background ............................................................................................................................. 2

Problem Statement ................................................................................................................ 6

Purpose of Study and Research Questions ........................................................................... 11

Theoretical Framework ......................................................................................................... 12

   Social Learning Theory ...................................................................................................... 12

   Student Development Theory .......................................................................................... 13

   Hofstede’s Cultural Dimension’s Theory ......................................................................... 14

   Social Control Theory ...................................................................................................... 16

Conceptual Framework ........................................................................................................ 18

Significance ............................................................................................................................. 22

Methodology Overview ......................................................................................................... 23

Chapter I Summary ............................................................................................................... 24

CHAPTER II ............................................................................................................................ 25

Academic Dishonesty: Definitions and Faculty Student Disconnects ................................ 25
Table of Contents—Continued

Prevalence ..................................................................................................................................................32

The Academically Dishonest Student ........................................................................................................33
Reasons for Student Academic Misconduct ............................................................................................37

Historical Underpinnings of Policy and Educational Development ......................................................40

The Responsibility of Academic Honesty ..................................................................................................42

The Management of Policy and Process ....................................................................................................43
Institutional and Faculty Responses to Academic Misconduct ...............................................................49
Modern Issues in Academic Integrity Education .......................................................................................56

Academic Integrity in the Community College .........................................................................................61

Chapter II Summary ..................................................................................................................................64

CHAPTER III ..............................................................................................................................................66

Purpose and Research Questions ...............................................................................................................66

Methodology Overview and Rationale .......................................................................................................68

Case Study ..................................................................................................................................................69

Parameters of the Study ..............................................................................................................................71

Setting .......................................................................................................................................................75

Recruitment and Consent Procedures .......................................................................................................76

Participants ...............................................................................................................................................78

Instrumentation and Data Collection ........................................................................................................79
Table of Contents—Continued

Survey Data and Analysis ................................................................. 85
Qualitative Responses and Analysis ............................................... 87
Trustworthiness ........................................................................... 92
Delimitations and Limitations of the Study .................................... 93
The Researcher ............................................................................. 94
Chapter III Summary ................................................................... 95
CHAPTER IV ..................................................................................... 96
Document Analysis ....................................................................... 97
List of Documents ........................................................................ 97
Findings of Document Analysis ................................................... 105
Survey ........................................................................................... 106
  Demographic Information ............................................................ 107
  Academic Environment ............................................................... 108
  Specific Behaviors ..................................................................... 112
  Mid-West Community College Violation Data ............................ 114
Interview and Qualitative Data ..................................................... 115
Description of Interview Participants .......................................... 116
  Dr. Weil ..................................................................................... 117
  Dr. Ferris .................................................................................. 118
  Dr. Cortell ............................................................................... 118
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme one: It’s on us: We are all responsible, personally and</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collectively, for understanding and promoting academic integrity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme two: Faculty set a tone of integrity with classroom management</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and curriculum design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme three: Faculty take personal approaches to academic</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>integrity education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme four: Lean times limit resources for academic integrity</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHAPTER V** .............................................................................................................145

| Description of the Case .........................................................................................| 146  |
| Academic Integrity Policy at Mid-West Community College .........................| 148  |
| Academic Integrity Policy Dissemination and Resources ..................................| 154  |
| Academic Integrity in Practice ...........................................................................| 157  |

| Case Summary .........................................................................................................| 162  |
Table of Contents—Continued

CHAPTER VI ............................................................................................................. 165

Discussion of Findings ............................................................................................ 166

Research Question 1 ............................................................................................... 170

Research Question 2 ............................................................................................... 177

Research Question 3 ............................................................................................... 182

Revised Conceptual Framework ............................................................................. 185

Limitations of the Research ................................................................................... 190

Implications for Future Research ........................................................................... 192

Recommendations for Practice .............................................................................. 196

Future Research ...................................................................................................... 200

Conclusion ................................................................................................................ 202

REFERENCES ......................................................................................................... 205

APPENDICES

A. Email Invitation to Participate in Survey ............................................................ 226

B. Survey Consent ................................................................................................... 228

C. Interview Consent ............................................................................................... 230

D. Interview Questions for Faculty ......................................................................... 233
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E. Interview Questions for Academic Integrity Administrator</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Interview Questions for Staff/Administration</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Permission to use ICAI Faculty Survey</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. ICAI Survey</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Select Syllabi Language</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. HSIRB Approvals</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Emails to Participants</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Academic Integrity Language by Department and/or Division</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Academic Integrity Study Advertisement</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF TABLES

4.1 List of Documents by Type, Primary Audience, and Creator ...........................................98

4.2 Student Handbook Comparison Table ..................................................................................100

4.3 Academic Integrity Survey Respondent Demographics .........................................................107

4.4 Primary Sources of Academic Integrity Policy
   Information ....................................................................................................................................109

4.5 Frequency of Perceived Academic Misconduct .................................................................110

4.6 Frequency of Options Used to Resolve Instances of Perceived
   Academic Misconduct ................................................................................................................111

4.7 Misconduct and Responses to Misconduct .........................................................................113

4.8 Interview Participants ............................................................................................................116

4.9 Breakdown of Themes by Position for Full and Part-Time Faculty ......................................143

4.10 Breakdown of Themes by Position for Department Chairs
    and Academic Integrity Administrators .....................................................................................144
LIST OF FIGURES

1. Components of Academic Integrity Education .......................................................... 18
2. Academic Integrity Education and Social Learning Theory ..................................... 19
3. Strategies and Interventions in Academic Integrity Education ............................... 20
4. Conceptual Framework of the Study ........................................................................ 21
5. Academic Dishonesty Graphic ............................................................................... 26
6. Academic Discipline Process .................................................................................. 151
7. Revised Conceptual Framework ............................................................................ 187
CHAPTER I

Higher education institutions have the opportunity to promote academic integrity and prevent academic misconduct on campus. Academic integrity is a cornerstone of the learning process (Bretag et al., 2014; Harp & Taietz, 1966). Academic misconduct is a breach of ethical conduct, and academically dishonest acts are rampant on college and university campuses. Academic dishonesty refers to a behavior or set of behaviors that lead to the misrepresentation of scholarly work (International Center for Academic Integrity [ICAI], 2015). These behaviors include:

(a) plagiarism, the unattributed use of a source in a situation in which there is a legitimate expectation of authorship (ICAI, 2015, para 3).

(b) unauthorized group collaboration, the inclusion of peer ideas, answers, and knowledge of a mutual project that when combined produces a greater impact than the individual student could produce on their own (ICAI, 2015; Quaye & Paz, 2014).

(c) academic cheating, “the misrepresentation of academic mastery which, includes sharing another’s work, purchasing a term paper or test questions in advance, and/ or paying another to do the work for you” (ICAI, 2015, para 16), and;

(d) forgery, defined as theft or unauthorized reproduction (Pennycook, 1996)

This is not a new problem; Bowers (1964) found that 60% of students were involved in academically dishonest behavior, and over 50 years later, McCabe,
Butterfield, & Trevino (2012) found that 66% of students in a related study admitted to academic misconduct. Threats to academic integrity are clearly a concern for higher education leaders.

**Background**

Attempts to explain why academic misconduct occurs vary. Early studies (Drake, 1941) argued that the competitive nature of college grades were to blame. The literature identifies a variety of issues that affect dishonest behaviors such as self-esteem, time management, anxiety levels, perceived quantity of work, and levels of engagement (Barnett & Dalton, 1981; Maramark & Maline, 1993; McCabe & Trevino, 1997; McCabe et al., 2012; Perry, 2010; Simkin & McLeod, 2010; Stevens & Stevens, 1987; Whitley, 1998).

Despite the many reasons students are academically dishonest, it is clear that the behavior occurs given the necessity, opportunity, and ability to rationalize academic misconduct (King, Guyette, & Piotrowski, 2009; Whitley, 1998). Violations in academic integrity materialize when met with certain internal factors, including perceived values, and an individual’s moral code (Bertram Gallant, 2008; McCabe & Trevino, 1993; Pavela, 1993). Situational factors are also a component in academic integrity (Ford & Richardson, 1994), including the presence or absence of academic integrity policies, honor codes (McCabe et al., 2003; McCabe & Pavela, 2004), educational initiatives, intentional programming, and perception of campus culture (Bertram Gallant, 2008, 2016; Whitley, 1998).

Cultural factors can also affect academic integrity in significant ways. The globalization of education brings many international students to the U.S., and Pennycook
(1996, 2012) suggested that U.S. and European ways of learning are the exception rather than the norm. Increases in globalization, are therefore, challenging Western norms of demonstrating learning and maintaining integrity. Some countries and cultures experience learning in ways that run counter to domestic expectations, and as a result, international students can experience a cultural dissonance that leads to stress, affecting academic performance (Haynes & Introna, 2005; Ladd & Ruby, 1999; Park, 2003). For example, Haynes and Introna (2005) found that students who come from cultures that rely on memorization without critique were more likely to condone unattributed sources in papers. In their study, non-native speakers referred to the act of “borrowing words” in order to translate coherent documents. The researchers implored the importance of academic integrity education, noting:

the need for Western academics not only to develop a broader understanding of how overseas students were taught and assessed but also to communicate their expectations and explain how they differ from those in the students’ own country, and to provide resources for students to meet these expectations. (p. 229)

Technology has also provided a growing opportunity for students to both engage in academic misconduct and be caught doing so (McCabe, 2005c). Papp and Wertz (2009) contend that technology has provided increasingly creative outlets for students to engage in dishonest behavior. McCabe (2005c) found that many students consider the Internet an open forum, and as such did not feel obligated to cite material found online. For example, a survey on academic misconduct found that both students and faculty alike believe that it is easier to cheat in an online course than in a traditional face-to-face lecture course (Mastin, Peszka, & Lily, 2009). Likewise, a study assessing the
motivation for student cheating behaviors in the online environment found that online cheating behaviors related to perceived anonymity, lack of connection, or limited face-to-face accountability in the course, issues not traditionally associated with cheating in face-to-face courses (Black, Greaser, & Dawson, 2014).

Beyond online courses, Internet research provides access to information faster than ever before (Manly, Leonard, & Riemenschneider, 2015). Instant access to information alters historical concepts of the faculty as expert, student as novice relationship (Thelin, 2011). Technology has also added to the methods of academic dishonesty including unauthorized representation, purchasing written papers, using unattributed secondary sources, and cut and paste plagiarism (Manly et al., 2015).

The consequences of academic dishonesty are far reaching. For example, in 2014, the University of North Carolina (UNC) at Chapel Hill discovered widespread academic dishonesty and fraud. The allegations included student enrollment in nonexistent courses, students who used tutors to complete academic work, and faculty who were complicit in these practices. These allegations affected up to 3,100 students, over the course of 18 years. The prosecutorial report suggested that the reach was likely far greater. The report alleged an elaborate system of creating fake courses, and that faculty, advisors, counselors, coaches, and students accepted the system for over a decade before an initial whistleblower came forward (Ganim, 2014). The results of this report tarnished the athletic program at UNC, academic programs, and countless professional reputations, and ultimately resulted in the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges imposing yearlong accreditation probation for the institution (Korn, 2015).
Other examples include Rockland Community College’s finding that one third of all nursing students who took a medical surgery exam had cheated (Milburn, 2012), and Kapioloni Community College’s finding that students in its radiological technology program used a photographed copy of a test and its answer key (Associated Press, 2014). In 2012, a scandal at Harvard University led to the dismissal of an estimated 70 students found to have violated rules of academic misconduct including unauthorized collaboration and cheating (Pérez-Peña, 2013).

Overall, the literature provides a glimpse into some of the systemic issues plaguing academic integrity education and policy. Faculty are reticent to follow university academic integrity procedures (Aaron, 1992; Kiviniemi, 2015); students are often not active partners in enforcing a culture of academic integrity (McCabe et al., 2012), and colleges do not regularly provide or assess academic integrity education (Bleeker, 2007; Bertram Gallant & Drinan, 2008). Few colleges have an office or department dedicated to academic honesty (Bleeker, 2007; Bertram Gallant & Drinan, 2006). To demonstrate the value of academic integrity on an institutional level, a coordinated, multidimensional effort to create and sustain an environment that values academic honor (Bertram Gallant, 2016; Bertram Gallant & Drinan, 2008; Morris, 2016) is necessary.

While traditional research strongly informs the policy and process of academic integrity within the four-year institutions, the nature of the community college requires additional examination. Research on academic integrity in the community college is sparse and rarely done as an exclusive study (Bleeker, 2007; Gerdeman, 2000; Moeck, 2002; Smyth & Davis, 2003; Wotring, 2007). There are several reasons for this. The
emergence of large, empirical research studies in academic integrity occurred in the 1960’s, at the same time as the development of a large number of community colleges. As a result, community colleges were an addition to, rather than a part of, traditional research in the field. Literature on preventing academic misconduct overwhelmingly focuses on honor codes, which experience effectiveness in the traditional, private college setting. Community college students represent a diverse and often transient faculty and student community whose needs are more varied (Tull, et.al, 2015). Therefore, academic integrity in the community college may require different methods of engagement.

**Problem Statement**

Academic ethics and integrity are necessary elements of a quality education, and the need for academic integrity education on campuses has been well documented (Bertram Gallant, 2008; Bertram Gallant & Drinan, 2006; Liebler, 2009; McCabe, Butterfield, & Trevino, 2004). The standards of an academically honest community represent the best of what student development aims to fulfill, the moral and ethical development of individuals who will carry these values into the workplace (Nonis & Swift, 2001; Singh & Bennington, 2012).

Academic dishonesty is damaging to institutional reputation, the quality and legitimacy of academic programs, and to the moral development of students (Aaron, 1992; Coren, 2011; Liebler, 2009; McCabe & Pavela, 2004). Postsecondary education represents an opportunity for students to refine what it means to be honest, prior to formally entering their career of choice. Failure to capitalize on this is dangerous, particularly for community colleges, which tend to have a workforce mission (Cohen,
Brawer, & Kisker, 2014). Dishonest students are more likely to become dishonest employees (Nonis & Swift, 2001; Singh & Bennington, 2012).

Academic dishonesty is usually resolved on campuses largely as a misconduct issue, and colleges and universities have polices stating they resolve violations of these behaviors through a formal process (Bertram Gallant & Drinan, 2006). Yet, the reality is that many instances of academic misconduct go unaddressed or unreported, and these behaviors validate the erroneous perception that this behavior is acceptable (Bertram Gallant, 2008).

Research on academic integrity education offers interventions that can assist administrators in cultivating communities that discourage academic misconduct and promote integrity. The most successful positions on academic integrity combine the use of student development, cultural awareness, technological aptitude, and social persuasion (Kibler, 1993; Volpe, Davidson, & Bell, 2008). Institutional actions in dealing with academic dishonesty vary widely. Literature on programming for academic honor is vast, covering a variety of programs housed in various academic and student affairs departments (Bertram Gallant, 2008). The bulk of these interventions are classified in one of the following categories: honor code and modified honor code policies (McCabe & Pavela, 2004; McCabe et al., 2005; McCabe et al., 2012), administrative processes (Robinson Zañartu et al., 2005), student lead initiatives (Bourassa & Kruger, 2001; McCabe & Pavela, 2000; Turner & Beemsterboer, 2003), technological processes (Olt, 2002; Trenholm, 2006), culturally responsive education (McCabe, Feghali, & Abdallah, 2008; Olshen 2013; Shaw, Moore, & Ghandisan, 2007), contracted services (Hoshiar, Dunlap, Li, & Friedel, 2014), and faculty responses (Aaron, 1992; Roig, 2001; Singh &
Bennington, 2012). These responses can have both punitive and developmental effects and include ethical development and values courses, faculty-training programs, failing and/or grade notations, honor councils, integrity campaigns, and academic integrity training for international students (Boehm, Justice, & Weeks, 2009). More recently, intentional programs include specializing on content issues for online students.

Despite such changes in institutional perspective, the number of students in violation of academic integrity policy demonstrates a lack of mutual understanding of academic integrity issues. Beyond punitive consequences, there are also institutional consequences associated with violations of academic integrity. In addition to scrutiny, the time and additional staff to investigate these cases takes away from the academic life of the institution. Those students acting honestly are also negatively impacted. The grade inflation of dishonest students can affect the grading curve of a course, disproportionately affecting students who did not cheat. The perception of academic dishonesty also devalues degrees and academic programs. Examples such as these are the result of varying levels of institutional support, for, and participation in academic integrity education (Volpe et al., 2008). The research illustrates the need for coordinated and multifaceted educational efforts; apathy and a lack of involvement are a threat to academic integrity.

As campuses become both increasingly diverse and more technologically advanced, opportunities to provide academic integrity education transcend established norms. Nowhere is the shift in postsecondary education more prevalent than in the community college. More students take online courses in the community college setting than any other institution. The community college is the largest and most diverse
postsecondary institutional type (American Association of Community Colleges [AACC], 2015; National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2015). While community colleges commonly encounter issues of academic integrity, they are compounded by higher numbers of enrolled students (Smyth & Davis, 2003), higher levels of part-time faculty and students, and more students who choose distance education options (NCES, 2016). Community colleges educate nearly half of all undergraduate students in the United States. Students attending community college are more diverse than four-year institutions. The majority of Black and Hispanic students choose to attend community colleges (Cohen, Brawer, & Kisker, 2014). Women make up over half of the community college population, and the majority of nontraditional students choose to attend community colleges (Cohen et al., 2014). The trend in globalization extends to the community college setting, with 14% of the international students in the United States choosing to attend a community college (Cohen et al., 2014). When considering technology, students are more likely to take an online course at a community college than a four-year institution. Community colleges are also highly workforce oriented, with post-secondary certifications becoming one of the fastest growing credentials today (AACC, 2015). The diversity and flexibility of education in the community college presents challenges for these institutions as they create programs that meet the varied needs of their student populations. This is evident as community colleges are less likely to provide residential education, are more likely to have nontraditional students, and have higher percentages of part-time faculty (Cohen et al., 2014). Community colleges are also less likely to have academic integrity offices (Tull et al., 2015). In summary, community colleges address academic misconduct while
managing increased diversity, technological gains, and, while preparing a rapidly
developing workforce (AACC, 2015). These components speak to the value of continued
academic integrity research in the community college.

Most research on academic integrity began as many community colleges were
established, limiting the impact of this perspective in the seminal literature (Bleeker,
2007). Studies that do specifically address the community college and academic integrity
reveal that community colleges are less likely to have an academic integrity policy
(Aaron, 1992; Bleeker, 2007) than four-year institutions. Community colleges are
significantly less likely than four-year institutions to have educational policies that are
separate from the formalized student conduct process (Aaron, 1992; Bleeker, 2007). The
study found that the main forms of disseminating information about the policy were in
orientation offices and within the student handbook (Bleeker, 2007). Community
colleges are also more likely to lead to certification programs, which place students in the
workforce after the first two years of college (AACC, 2015). Academic integrity
research finds that students in the first and second year of college are more likely to
commit cheating behaviors (McCabe, 2005b; Whitley, 1998). Therefore, a focus on
preventing academic misconduct and promoting academic integrity within the first two
years is of great importance to the community college.

Overall, a review of the literature provides information on students who commit
acts of academic dishonesty, why and how they engage in dishonest behaviors, and
prevention strategies to promote academic honesty. Such research finds that the majority
of students have participated in or witnessed violations of academic integrity. Prevention
includes academic integrity initiatives focused on education and community building.
Yet, these studies almost exclusively focus on students at four-year colleges (Moeck, 2002; Smyth & Davis, 2003), leaving a void in the literature for institutional types, including community colleges. Such research is critical to the community college sector given the lack of specific literature in this area; namely in the highly diverse, nontraditional student environment, and as innovators in the use of asynchronous online education.

**Purpose of Study and Research Questions**

The purpose of this study is to address the gap in community college academic integrity research by examining the components of academic integrity education within one Mid-Western community college, as perceived by faculty and staff. This study will provide an in-depth examination of community college policy on academic integrity, identify cultural and technological shifts to academic integrity education policy, address faculty and student engagement in academic integrity initiatives, and identity priorities in preventing academic misconduct and promoting academic integrity. To do so, a case study using both qualitative and quantitative methods is used.

To meet the purpose of the study, specific research questions include:

1. What are the strategies used in one community college to equip their faculty with institutional programs and policies to promote academic integrity and reduce academic dishonesty, and how have these strategies changed over the past five years?
2. How does a community college encourage students to participate in promoting academic integrity and reducing academic dishonesty?
3. What are the initiatives perceived to be most effective in promoting academic integrity and reducing academic dishonesty?

**Theoretical Framework**

Four theoretical perspectives frame much of the research in academic integrity education:

1. Bandura’s (1977) social learning theory,
2. Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory,
3. a student development framework (Evans, Forney, Guido, Patton & Renn 2009; Kibler 1992, 1993a, 1993b) and,
4. Hofstede’s (2001) cultural dimensions theory.

In reviewing the literature, it became obvious that to implement the practices of social learning theory (Bandura, 1977), the study must also be further grounded in Kibler’s (1993a, 1993b) student development framework, Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory, and Hofstede’s cultural dimensions theory (2001). Academic integrity education is dependent on social learning constructs, while the framing of strategy and intervention occurs using the latter theories.

**Social Learning Theory**

Bandura’s (1977) social learning theory posits that students learn both indirectly and interactively. In this theory, learning occurs as a combination of personal factors, environment, and behavior. As a result, there are many opportunities to engage in the learning process for students through face-to-face, indirect, and online educational efforts, including role modeling, observation and imitation. The theory describes both the learner and act of learning as active concepts. Opportunities to achieve learning
present themselves through observation, consequence (both observed and experienced),
decision-making, and reinforcement (through instruction and through self-reinforcement).
Bandura also noted that while gains in knowledge occur, motivation is necessary on the
part of the learner to act on learned behavior. Social learning theory identifies peer
modeling as key in helping individuals make choices on learned behavior. Support for
this theory is plentiful as an educational framework in academic integrity research (Finn
& Frone, 2004; Grijalva, 2006; McCabe, 1992; McCabe & Trevino, 1997; McCabe et al.,
2006).

**Student Development Theory**

Student development theory strongly relates to the tenets of social learning theory.
Student development theory, a set of theoretical concepts largely taken from educational
psychology (Evans et al., 2009), identifies psychosocial and cognitive or morality based
theories. Psychosocial theories include those focused on identity development. These
designations include age, gender and sexuality, race and ethnicity, spirituality, and
relationship building. Student development relies on a variety of cognitive and
psychosocial theories that affect decisions students make (Evans et al., 2009). Cognitive
theories include those related to epistemology, including ethics, values, judgment, and
reflection. My research focuses on elements of moral and ethical development. In
student development, moral and ethical development are theories that relate to the
developmental process that occur intellectually and are dependent on the values, morals,
and maturity of a student (Evans et al., 2009). These theories refer to the changes that
occur in traditionally college aged students. In student affairs administration, these
theories assist students and inform professionals as they transition through college.
Linking student development theory to academic integrity, Kibler (1993a, 1993b) developed a national study addressing the need for a student development perspective in academic integrity cases. In this work, Kibler (1993a) outlined the need for educational activities outside of the punitive act of failing students for violations in order to support a student development perspective. Kibler’s research outlined several tools including clearly written policies, equity in decision-making, and discussion around academic honesty. Kibler’s resulting student development framework provides three clear goals supported by the findings of the study: training of administrators responsible for academic integrity, faculty resources and support for promoting academic integrity, and the promotion of academic integrity through honor codes, policy, and programming.

**Hofstede’s Cultural Dimension’s Theory**

Moral and ethical theory in student development addresses many of the challenges within academic integrity education (Stephens, Young, & Calabrese, 2007; Whitley, 1998). However, the globalization of U.S. higher education requires that we identify student characteristics more broadly than ever. Issues of value judgment, such as academic misconduct require a cultural lens inclusive of cultural differences in a more globally minded way. Hofstede (2001) studied individuals from 40 countries to understand differences how they worked individually and in groups. While Hofstede’s work focused on values-based decision making in the workplace, the parallels to higher education are evident. Synthesis of the findings of these empirical studies begin in Hofstede’s dimension 1, Power distance, or the manner in which individuals lacking power accept their status and ultimately inequality.
In dimension 1, the differences in power distance affect a variety of issues, namely how students interact with instructors and what expectations of the student faculty relationship are. It is important to consider the factors of this dimension in context as it speaks to the experiences of many students, ultimately affecting the way they engage both in the classroom and online.

Many of the ideas around academic integrity align with Dimension 2 of Hofstede’s (2001) work focused on collectivist vs. individualist societies. Individualists are defined by Hofstede as “societies in which the ties between individuals are loose: everyone is expected to look after himself or herself and his or her immediate family” (p. 76). Conversely, a collective society is one where individuals “from birth onward are integrated into strong and cohesive groups, which throughout people’s lifetimes continue to protect them in exchange for unquestioning loyalty” (p. 76). Hofstede identified large power distance countries as generally more collectivist, with small power distance countries as more individualist.

Dimension 3 focuses on feminine vs. masculine societies. It is important to identify this definition, which is challenging for U.S. higher education. Dimension 4 identifies uncertainty avoidance, or the willingness to participate in situations that are different from the norm. An understanding of this dimension speaks to a student’s ability to shift cultural norms and expectations upon entering an institution of higher education. Dimension 5 relates to long term and short-term orientation. In this dimension, long-term orientation occurs largely in Eastern cultures of the world and includes characteristics such as persistence, respect and deference based on hierarchy, and shame. Conversely, constructs of short-term orientation include self-preservation, protecting self-image,
respect of traditions, and reciprocating gifts. This dimension in particular can arguably link a fast-paced culture and self-promotion to dishonest behaviors such as academic cheating or plagiarism.

Hofstede’s work illuminates the need for student led academic integrity interventions that value cultural needs for collectivity while also cultivating independent work as required by Western educational standards.

Social Control Theory

Rooted in criminology, social control theory proposes that adherence to social norms is dependent on our social associations. Hirschi (1969) suggested that individuals are born with a propensity to act in dishonest, delinquent, and self-serving ways. The research contends that the phenomena lie with those who choose to abstain from these behaviors. His work proposes that our willingness to behave in socially appropriate and honest ways is dependent on the pro social experiences we develop throughout the years. These pro social elements include value systems, our environmental experiences, and relationships with friends and colleagues. Four bonds or subgroups frame this theory.

The attachment bond refers to the amount of closeness and respect one individual has for another. Individuals with high levels of closeness and respect for another will value the opinions and feelings of that relationship when making decisions. Those individuals with little attachment to others are free to act in ways that negatively influence others. Hirschi (1969) defined this lack of bond, stating,

To violate a norm, is therefore, to act contrary to the wishes and expectations of other people. If a person does not care about the wishes and expectations of other
people - that is he is insensitive to the expectations of others, then he is to that extent not bound by the norms. He is free to deviate. (p. 18)

Hirschi’s (1969) commitment bond speaks to the agreements individuals create to others. Hirschi cites marriage, employment, parent child relationships, and teacher student relationship as example. Here an individual adheres to socially accepted behavior in order to maintain the commitment and to avoid facing the end of a committed relationship. Hirschi’s involvement bond refers to the amount of time an individual spends engaged in a morally appropriate set of activities. The main idea is that busy individuals are less likely to commit dishonest acts, due to a lack of time. Finally, Hirschi’s belief bond refers to the level of value placed on prosocial or legal constructs. Hirschi proposes that individuals who value legal behaviors over illegal behaviors are less likely to break the law.

Hirschi (1969) explained that despite separate definitions of the bonds, the combination or interrelatedness of the bonds is what sustains socially appropriate behavior over time. Rather than a focus on the current bond, the strength and creation of the bonds that has occurred over time, providing a barometer of socially appropriate behavior is most influential. Individuals who have cultivated strong pro social bonds are less likely to behave in a manner outside of socially accepted practice. While there is no way to predict who will engage in socially inappropriate acts, this theory provides a framework to understand how individuals make sense of social norms. In academic integrity education, honor codes, honor boards, ethics statements and pledges are all examples of social control measures using this theory. The combined history and effects of these interventions create prosocial bonds leading to a culture of integrity.
These theories frame prevailing policies existing in postsecondary education, and will serve as a lens for my research on academic integrity education within a community college setting.

**Conceptual Framework**

The conceptual framework for the study offers a visual representation of the elements of a comprehensive academic integrity education program, and the theories that influence the development and implementation of such a program. To review, the diagram first illustrates the components of academic integrity education. The diagram includes the examination of educational activities that include punitive and developmental responses, culturally focused activities, and efforts to address online education.

*Figure 1. Components of Academic Integrity Education*

Social learning theory informs each of these components. Here, the research will identify how, and to what extent, the components address faculty, staff, and student needs, reinforcement of academic integrity, role modeling behavior, and identification with peers.
Figure 2. Academic Integrity Education and Social Learning Theory

Understanding how the components are both informed by, and how the individually inform social learning on campus helps the reader to also understand how the remaining theories are presented as they relate to academic integrity within the institution. Using the components of the project coupled with the elements of social learning theory help to frame each component within the best practice strategies and interventions of academic integrity education described within relevant literature in academic integrity research. Figure 3 illustrates these practices.
Figure 3. Strategies and Interventions in Academic Integrity Education

When combined, there is a fluid link to the components of academic integrity education, the social effects of promoting academic integrity, and the relationship to moral development, culturally normative behavior, and social control. The combined elements present an image of the concept in the figure below.
Figure 4. Conceptual Framework of the Study.

The conceptual framework illustrates best practice efforts to address academic integrity in college. Such components should have a reciprocal impact on the learning environment, as depicted in the social learning theory image, changing the environment and response to academic integrity. Using social learning theory, the institutional actions highlight the ways these components influence faculty and staff. From this, strategies and interventions that make meaning of these educational opportunities outline the theories that guide practices in misconduct prevention and integrity promotion.
Significance

Little research exists that identifies the characteristics of academic integrity policy and initiative in community colleges. This research aims to expand the scope of the current literature in three ways:

1. to provide an in-depth examination of the typical academic integrity policy of a Mid-West community college,
2. to identify cultural and technological changes to academic integrity education policy in the last five years, and,
3. to identify the level of priority, and engagement, for faculty and staff when considering prevention of academic misconduct and integrity promotion.

Understanding what colleges and universities are doing to educate and prevent academic dishonesty is necessary for effective program development. This research should promote a “much needed global approach, rather than a student-centered approach, towards reducing academic dishonesty in higher education” (Volpe et al., 2008, p. 170). Educational approaches are most explicit when facilitated through offices responsible for coordinating the response and education to academic integrity on campus. In the community college setting, these offices are the exception rather than the norm (Bleeker, 2007).

There are several differences warranting the study of academic integrity initiatives in community colleges. Two-year institutions educate 46% of undergraduate students in post-secondary education in the United States (AACC, 2015), and they continue to grow thanks in part to federal initiatives for students to attend college. Community colleges, known for universal access, educate a wide range of students from varied backgrounds.
(Bleeker, 2007). This diversity offers the opportunity to engage in conversations that universally educate students on the value of academic honor. For some students, this will prepare them to enter 4-year institutions; for others, these lessons will follow directly into the workforce. With certification and technical positions emerging as leading employment options for recent graduates, education that challenges students to make honest decisions under pressure can only provide value in everyday life. Academic integrity initiatives that address the online environment are necessary as students continue to pursue this option (Bleeker, 2007). This uniquely affects community colleges. For over 150 years, community colleges have been the leading nonprofit provider of distance education options (AACC, 2015).

**Methodology Overview**

A case study approach addresses the research questions, which comprehensively examined the components of academic integrity education at one Mid-West community college. To gain an in-depth understanding of academic integrity at this institution, a variety of qualitative and quantitative data was collected. To discuss the case, a faculty survey will provide baseline information on current practices at the institution. Semi-structured interviews of selected faculty and staff will provide insights into engagement and practice of academic integrity initiatives. Document analysis provided additional insight into information disseminated to faculty and staff. Data analysis will link current practice and perceptions to the theoretical constructs of social learning (Bandura, 1977), cultural dimension (Hofstede, 2001) moral and ethical student development (Kibler, 1993a, 1993b), and social control interventions (Hirschi, 2002) in order to describe academic integrity education in the community college setting. In doing so, this study
will illustrate the guiding theories and practice addressing academic dishonesty in one community college.

**Chapter I Summary**

This research project sought to understand the current state of academic integrity education in a community college setting. To do so, the chapter included an introduction, including a statement of the problem and research agenda. Chapter I presented an overview of the dissertation proposal describing the problem, defining the purpose of this research, and providing questions that guide the study. The chapter conceptualizes the idea of academic integrity education through a conceptual lens of preventing academic misconduct and promoting academic integrity, using theoretical frameworks guiding academic integrity practice today. Following this framing of the study, a brief overview of the methods concludes the section. Chapter II contains relevant information from my review of the literature.
CHAPTER II

Chapter I served as an overview of the study describing the problem, defining the purpose of this research, and providing questions that guide the study. The chapter conceptualized the idea of academic integrity education through a lens of academic misconduct prevention and academic integrity promotion, using theoretical frameworks guiding academic integrity practice today.

Chapter II aims to synthesize the current literature on academic dishonesty and policies to prevent dishonesty and promote student integrity. As such, the following sections organize the chapter: trends and definitions of academic dishonesty, the prevalence of academic misconduct on campus, a history of policy and practice, modern policy and practice, modern issues affecting academic honor, and academic integrity in the community college context. There is little research on academic integrity policies in the community college setting. As a result, this review will rely on academic integrity literature often focused in the four-year college and university setting to provide a framework for my research.

Academic Dishonesty: Definitions and Faculty Student Disconnects

Academic dishonesty refers to a behavior or set of behaviors that lead to the misrepresentation of scholarly work (International Center for Academic Integrity [ICAI], 2015). These behaviors include plagiarism, fabrication, deception, cheating, bribery and paid services, sabotage, and/ or impersonation.

As expectations of academic honesty vary, the language and definition of the behaviors do as well. Academic misconduct or academic dishonesty covers a wide range of dishonest actions. Often the terms academic misconduct, academic dishonesty, and
*academic cheating* are sometimes interchangeable in academic integrity research. This is for several reasons. Literature in academic integrity relies on the interpretation of the researcher, as a result, the assessment of academic honesty requires a variety of definitions and interpretations, both literal and symbolic (Johnson, 2003). In addition, research on academic cheating predates research on academic misconduct and academic integrity. In addition, some researchers specifically use the term *cheating* rather than academic misconduct, leaving participants to define the behavior according to their own moral and ethical guidelines (Morris, 2012). Therefore, the term *cheating* often describes a variety of behaviors also defined as *academic misconduct*. For purposes of this study, separate definitions provide greater understanding of the differences between *academic misconduct* and *cheating* behaviors. When necessary, a clarifying statement is included for the appropriate definition of the term *cheating*. The following graphic explains the definition guiding the study.

![Academic Dishonesty Graphic](image)

*Figure 5: Academic Dishonesty Graphic*
Historically, academic dishonesty was a form of rebellion. In one of the earliest published research studies on the topic of academic misconduct, Drake (1941) found that student cheating was a reaction to difficult coursework and extreme competitiveness, and a way for students to express displeasure and ambivalence. In his study, 30 of 126 students attending an all-women’s college cheated at least once, by altering answers on an exam. Yet, Drake found that of all students, those who earned an A did not participate in these behaviors. Drake contended that for as long as the perceived adversarial nature of the student teacher relationship existed, cheating would be impossible to eliminate.

Bowers’ (1964) Academic Dishonesty and its Effect in College offered another early line of inquiry with a national study of 99 schools including over 5,000 students. This study used the term cheating to define a series of academically dishonest behaviors. The author found that 66% of students admitted to dishonest behaviors, meaning that academic dishonesty had become a norm within the surveyed population. This study provided a clear disconnect between how students deal with academic stress when compared to faculty expectations. Bowers also found that students in career-focused fields were more likely to behave dishonestly than in liberal arts disciplines. This is significant in providing both historical context for academic misconduct data, but also the linkage to career and technical education, often found in the community college setting, and a higher propensity for academic misconduct by students in those fields.

Barnett and Dalton (1981) conducted a study of faculty and staff that highlighted differences in what faculty and students consider cheating behaviors. Here, as with the Bowers (1964) study, the term cheating described a spectrum of academically dishonest behaviors. This study showed that only 45% of students identified copying unattributed
sentences to a paper as dishonest, compared to 73% of faculty. In another example, 63% of students identified getting the answers to an exam as cheating, while 78% of faculty felt this way. Issues on collaboration were not in alignment. Barnett and Dalton (1981) found that less than half of the students considered unauthorized collaboration a violation of academic integrity.

These issues have not changed with the times. Using a definition of cheating behaviors that includes a variety of academically dishonest behaviors, McCabe et al. (2012) found a high rate of academic misconduct. In their overview of 20 years of research on student academic misconduct, the researchers found that 82% of students admitted to cheating behaviors or watching other students engage in cheating behaviors. In terms of student perspective, the researchers found that 38% of students felt unauthorized collaboration on a take home exam was moderate to severe cheating, while 85% faculty felt this way. This finding illuminates the differences between instructor expectations and student understanding. A longitudinal review of academic dishonesty in the work of Bowers (1964), McCabe and Trevino (1997, 2002), and McCabe et al. (2003, 2012) suggests that not only do many students engage in academic misconduct, but over 50% of all students in each of these five studies found such behaviors to be acceptable. These studies provide a framework for the bulk of research on academic integrity today, defining 13 behaviors with the most prevalent being cheating, unauthorized collaboration, and plagiarism.

The most researched type of academic misconduct is plagiarism, the unattributed use of a source in a situation in which there is a legitimate expectation of authorship (ICAI, 2015). The concept of plagiarism emerged worldwide with the advent of
authorship, leading to ideas of copyright and intellectual property (Pennycook, 1996). Plagiarism occurs in a variety of ways including copying, paraphrasing, incorrect citations, and passing off ideas as one’s own without proper attribution (Handa, 2008; Wicker, 2007). These actions may occur with or without intent (Handa, 2008); as a result, academic integrity policies differ in handling plagiarism based on perceived intent (ICAI, 2015).

Academic integrity policies often differentiate between forgery and plagiarism. The definition of forgery, theft or “reproduction” while plagiarism takes reproduction a step further, robbing the original author of the creative process and synthesis of his own ideas without attribution (Pennycook, 1996). Pennycook (1996) suggested that the process of academic writing could blur the lines of appropriate attribution, quickly lending itself to plagiarism if authors immerse themselves in the work. Pennycook (2007) later arrived at a similar conclusion in a global context, noting that for international students, the process of learning language may include borrowing words to express ideas, blurring the lines of appropriate attribution and creating difficulties in composition. Those who find writing difficult often look to the technical aspects of the writing rather than the specific ideas. The resulting process of paraphrasing, cutting and pasting can easily turn into plagiarism (Wicker, 2007). In this instance, cultural differences in higher education affect academic integrity education.

Another frequent behavior is unauthorized collaboration, the inclusion of peer ideas, answers, and knowledge of a mutual project that when combined produces a greater impact than the individual student could produce on their own (ICAI, 2015; Quaye & Paz, 2014). In their qualitative study, Quaye and Paz identified the perspectives
of students when considering the act of unauthorized collaboration. In this study, the researchers found that students consider unauthorized collaboration to be only a minor offense, and that students were unclear on what appropriate collaboration meant. The authors proposed transparent policy guidelines for collaborative behavior. In practice, the transparency should include the use of appropriate technological tools such as Google docs or collaboration detection software (Evering & Moorman, 2012), in order to demonstrate collaboration.

For example, Harvard University experienced the consequences of unauthorized collaboration when the institution reported allegations for 125 students accused of cheating on a take home exam. Perez-Pena (2013) reported that the students were unclear on the parameters of the assignment, reporting that they as students often collaborated, that the test was more difficult than anticipated which prompted additional collaboration, and the sharing of notes. Pérez-Peña suggested that a culture of unauthorized collaboration in their particular class, coupled with the syllabus language attributed to the cheating behaviors that occurred in this instance.

Overall, academic cheating is defined as “the misrepresentation of academic mastery which, includes sharing another's work, purchasing a term paper or test questions in advance, and/ or paying another to do the work for you” (ICAI, 2015, para 16). This definition is not inclusive of all types of academic misconduct. ICAI contends that academic cheating is on the rise. Barnett and Dalton (1981) found that students admitted to cheating on examinations more frequently than other dishonest behaviors, likewise, Bowers (1964) found that 59% of reported incidents were of students cheating on exams.
In their study of 681 undergraduate students, Eve and Bromley (1981) reported that 43% of students either provided answers to other students, or copied answers during an exam.

In 2006, Klein, Levenberg, McKendall, and Mothersell (2006) conducted a study of 268 students in Business, Criminal Justice, Engineering, Biomedical Sciences, Nursing, and Social Work at a Mid-West institution. Here, 63% of the participants admitted to allowing someone else to copy their homework. More than half of the students (51%) admitted to copying someone else’s homework. Beyond this, 45% of students admitted to telling another student what was on the exam. Students also admit bringing notes into the classroom. Of the participants, 29% admitted to programming information into a cell phone or calculator to use during an exam, and 5% admitted using an unauthorized cheat sheet. More recently, in 2016, McCabe suggests that behaviors defined here as academic cheating such as copying on tests, have decreased. His study of over 7,000 students from 2011-13, indicates that 9% of students admit to cheating on exams.

Academic misconduct in the online environment can occur in tandem with all of the academically dishonest behaviors defined in this chapter. There was no assessment of online academic misconduct in the most recent national study (McCabe, 2016); though the rise in distance education has produced similar studies, suggesting that academic dishonesty in the online environment also occurs. For example, Watson and Sottile (2010) conducted a study of 635 university students who self-reported that they would be 42% more likely to cheat in an online course, and believe their peers would be 61% more likely to cheat in an online course. These findings suggest that technological shifts also affect academic misconduct prevention and academic integrity promotion. A study of
1817 undergraduate students at a private institution found an increase in misconduct using information technology, with self-reported instances of academic misconduct rising from 34% of students in 2009 to 44% of students in 2013 (McCabe, 2016).

**Prevalence**

The previous section revealed differences between the views of academic misconduct between students and faculty. It also showed that these issues have been in existence for some time. Whether or not academic misconduct has gotten worse or not is still unclear, but what is apparent is that student academic misconduct is prevalent on college campuses. Whitley’s (1998) meta-analysis reviewed the findings of 19 studies for academic misconduct. While this study uses the term *cheating*, it more easily understood within the larger umbrella of academic misconduct. 36 for exam misconduct, 12 for academic misconduct on homework, nine for plagiarism, and 40 estimates from McCabe’s longitudinal survey examples between 1970 and 1996. In doing so, Whitley found a mean of 70.4% of students who admitted to dishonest behaviors, with a range of findings as high as 95% and as low at 4%. In a similar fashion, exam cheating ranged from 4% to 82% of students, with a mean of 43.1%; cheating on homework from 3% to 83%, with a mean of 40.9%; and plagiarism from 3% to 98% of students, with a mean of 47%. In 2005, McCabe’s study of over 16,000 students found a range of academically dishonest behaviors from 47% to 71%. Self-reported cheating is prevalent, and has been generally consistent over the past 50 years (Bowers, 1964; Bertram Gallant, 2008; Bertram Gallant & Drinan, 2006; McCabe et al., 2003, 2012).

In perhaps the historically most prolific work on academic integrity, Bowers (1964) surveyed over 5,000 students at 99 institutions to understand academic
misconduct. Again, in this study, the term cheating is used as an umbrella term more encompassing modern definitions of academic misconduct. In this study, he found that over 75% of students admitted to one of 13 cheating behaviors. Of these, 39% admitting to test cheating, and 65% admitted to plagiarism. Thirty years later, McCabe, Butterfield, and Trevino (2003) studied some of the same institutions, reaching 6,000 students at 33 small to medium four-year institutions. The researchers found students more willing to self-report dishonest behaviors, and found a notable increase in unauthorized collaboration; their results found 66% of all students engaged in cheating behavior, with 64% engaging in test cheating and 65% engaging in plagiarism. This research set the framework for popular literature on academic misconduct, academic integrity, and integrity education (Bertram Gallant, 2008). A closer look at these data will examine what is known about who cheats and why.

The Academically Dishonest Student

It is difficult to describe a demographic of students who are academically dishonest; research has stated that anywhere from 40% (McCabe, 2005b) to 70% (ICAI, 2015) of students admitted to participating in or knowing about academically dishonest behaviors on campus. Whitley’s (1998) meta-analysis presented a complex profile of those who engage in cheating behaviors. This study defines cheating in a manner consistent with the broader definition of academic dishonesty. The analysis included those with moderate expectations of success, individuals who have cheated in the past, those with poor study skills, students who party more frequently, those who hold favorable attitudes toward cheating, those who perceive cheating as an appropriate social
norm, students who see themselves as less honest, and those who anticipate greater rewards for success. A look at demographic variables provides some context.

Studies on academically dishonest behaviors report mixed results when considering gender as a factor. Whitley (1998) found that although males have been identified as more likely to cheat than females, this finding is based on one’s willingness to self-report; therefore, while males may be more likely to self-report these behaviors, that is not indicative of being more likely to engage in academically dishonest behavior. Crown and Spiller (1998) reviewed 18 studies on gender, noting that of these, ten studies reported no significant findings related to gender, and six studies found men were more likely to engage in cheating behaviors. Again, Crown and Spiller use a broad definition of cheating, more aligned with that of academic dishonesty within the meta-analysis. The remaining two studies reviewed by Crown and Spiller (1998) suggested that females are more likely to engage in academic dishonesty than males. Another example is a 1975 study by Barnes, which focused on opportunities that junior and senior labor economics students had to cheat on an exam. In this instance, students more likely to cheat were male, in a required course, nearing graduation, and non-major students. Bowers (1964) also found male students committed 54% of academically dishonest. Athanasou and Olasehinde (2002) compiled a literature review that similarly summarized the gender differences in self-reported cheating behaviors of 32 studies using a definition more aligned with academic dishonesty, and found no statistically significant differences. The imbalances of gender represented in certain fields may affect the frequency of reported academic misconduct. Bertram Gallant, Binkin, and Donohue (2015) argued that the influx of women in male dominated majors might change findings as they relate to
academic dishonesty and gender. This is important to note because research in traditionally gender dominated fields may yield higher averages of academic misconduct simply based on the lack of another gender. In a study of academic misconduct violation risk factors, Bertram Gallant et al. (2015) used self and other reported violation data to find that male students were more likely to be at risk for academic misconduct.

As with gender, the literature addressing age also presents a complex profile of academic dishonesty. Newstead and Franklin Stokes (1996) studied 121 university students, finding that younger students were more likely to engage in behavior defined as cheating. In a faculty and student cheating survey, Smith, Nolan, and Dai (1998) found that traditionally aged students were more likely to admit to cheating behaviors than other students, specifically in submitting papers to more than one class, and looking at someone else’s exam. The researchers suggested that changes in motivation, and moral and ethical development might explain this finding. Research including secondary education has yielded similar results. Miller, Murdoch, Anderman, and Poindexter’s (2007) analysis of the literature on age notes that year in school, rather than age of student are better predictors of academic misconduct. There have been significant findings that point to the first two years of college as when academic misconduct most often occurs (McCabe, 2005b; Whitley, 1998). Bertram Gallant et al. (2015) contended that neither age nor year in school is predictive of academic misconduct, but that lower levels of maturity have a greater impact. Given that community colleges often educate students in the first two years of study, understanding this population in the community college setting is important (Smyth & Davis, 2003).
Other student characteristics are also important when considering academic misconduct prevention and integrity promotion. Several studies note that students with lower GPA’s are more likely to commit academic dishonesty than those with higher GPA’s (McCabe & Pavela, 2000; McCabe & Trevino, 1997). Of academic majors, research suggests business and pharmacy majors are more likely to engage in academic misconduct, while majors such as law are less likely to do so (Baird, 1980; McCabe, 2005b). Bertram Gallant, Van Den Einde, Ouellette, and Lee (2014) also found that computer science, engineering, and economics students were more likely to have formal violations of academic misconduct in her study, a single institution analysis. Academic integrity has a great impact on every field, including those directly linked to honesty, harm reduction, and moral behavior as in allied health and social science fields (McCabe et al., 2012). Health and human service fields in particular present a unique challenge when considering the impact academic dishonesty can have on health and safety (Fontana, 2009). In a qualitative study, Fontana described the personal, professional, and patient risks that make academic honesty extremely important. These included the risk to patients, a duty of care, and the dual role of nurse educator as practitioner and educator.

While demographic identity provides some information on risk factors for cheating behavior, it is not definitive. Overall, building off the work of Bowers (1964), there have been several studies (McCabe & Trevino, 1997; McCabe et al. (2001a, 2003, 2012) identifying contextual factors as more influential than demographic factors. Contextual factors relate to the environment created by the institution, organization, and/or peer group that affect student behaviors.
For example, Foster (2016) uses grade data from over 230 institutions to identify grade inflation over the past 30 years. The author suggests that artificial grade inflation is a threat to academic integrity. Specifically, environmental trends of grade inflation create unreasonable expectations for students, and pressure for faculty to give unearned credit for coursework. Kezar and Bernstein (2016) suggest that environmental factors related to the commercialization, or more capitalist methods of delivering higher education also play a role in academic misconduct. Through a literature review, the researchers identify increases in contingent faculty, corporate sponsorships, and commercialization of college admissions practices ad behaviors that communicate ideals at odds with academic integrity. McCabe and Trevino (1997) studied nine colleges and universities and found that contextual influences including fraternity and sorority membership, peer behavior, and peer disapproval had significant impacts on academic honesty.

Academic misconduct affects students regardless of age, gender, or GPA. While individuals and contextual influences play a significant role, understanding why students choose to cheat provides even greater guidance when considering promoting academic integrity and preventing academic misconduct.

**Reasons for Student Academic Misconduct**

There are many reasons why students cheat (Perry, 2010). In early work on academic integrity, Drake (1941) argued that competitiveness negatively affected student honesty. He suggested an overhaul of the grading system, allowing students who did not want to learn the opportunity to receive a letter grade without participating in learning, making space for those committed to the honest process of learning. Newstead, Franklyn-Stokes and Armstead (1996) found that students admitted to cheating in order
to get better grades. A similar finding was also seen in the work of McCabe et al., whose 2004, 2012, and 2015 studies found that high performing students are more likely to succumb to the pressure to cheat in an attempt to earn higher grades. Murdock and Anderman (2006) synthesized literature on academic dishonesty, framed by questions on purpose, ability, and risk. The researchers identified these students as those who can justify academic misconduct through negative perceptions of instruction and placing blame on others. Grade issues and social standing remain important variables affecting academic honor. In addition, perceived consequences, faculty response, and social ramifications ranked at least as high as individual factors such as grade point average, demographic status, and type of institution (McCabe, Trevino, & Butterfield; 2001b; McCabe et al., 2012; McCabe, 2016). As with individual and contextual factors, these studies included cheating behaviors, using a broad definition of the term including sharing information, omitting citations, cutting and pasting, recycling papers for assignments, and gaining access to answer keys or previous copies of tests (McCabe et al., 2001b).

Peer influence also has a significant impact on why students choose to be academically dishonest. Some studies indicate that policies are only as good as the students who aid in enforcing them. Academic misconduct is more likely to increase when students perceive that others are involved in academic dishonesty (Brown & Howell, 2001; Genereux & McLeod, 1995; McCabe, 2004, 2016; McCabe & Trevino, 1993; Stone, Jawahar, & Kisamore, 2009). For example, in a survey assessing student behavior at a small liberal arts university, researchers found that “more than three-quarters of the students would probably not report an incident of cheating if they
witnessed it and more than 80% would not report a close friend” (Papp & Wertz, 2009, p. 4). This supports earlier data that suggests students will not report unethical behavior in the spirit of solidarity (Oblinger, 2003). Stone et al. (2009) argued that peer behavior contributed to cognitive dissonance. In this study of 271 students, the researchers found to overlook this concern as long as their peers did the same. This type of influence has both positive and negative influences. From a positive perspective, the influence of honor codes, as presented in McCabe’s longitudinal studies (McCabe, 2016; McCabe & Trevino, 1993; McCabe et al., 2003, 2012), here, research identifies the importance of student promotion of academic honor in order to be successful. This concept requires the effective use of social bonds in order to promote integrity and prevent academic misconduct (Hirschi, 2002).

Some literature indicates that international students are more likely to commit plagiarism when compared to U.S. students. Park (2003) found that these students both self-report academic dishonesty at higher rates, and, the perception that other students engage in academic dishonesty is more likely for these students. Bertram Gallant et al. (2015) described the challenges international students may face with academic integrity, noting that the “international student population is particularly vulnerable because they may be unfamiliar with behavioral standards in Western educational institutions and given their previous educational experiences, may not share the same fear of punishment as our domestic students” (p. 226).

Studies indicate a lack of understanding of academic misconduct by all students. A misconduct survey identifying the role of student behavioral perception suggested a misunderstanding between student understanding and university expectation (Bisping,
Patron, & Roskelley, 2008). That study identified differences in student knowledge of plagiarism and the expectation of faculty members holding academic integrity in high regard (Bisping et al., 2008).

Perhaps even more concerning is the manner in which students dismiss the severity of academically dishonest behaviors, suggesting that the behavior is harmless and does not affect others (Murdock, Miller, & Goetzinger, 2007, Stone et al., 2009). Generational norms of teamwork and protecting others (Papp & Wertz, 2009) attribute to the lackadaisical attitude toward peer academic dishonesty. As students see members of the academic community benefit from participating in academic misconduct, they are learning that these actions have a benefit (McCabe & Trevino, 1993, 1997; McCabe et al., 2012). Oblinger (2003) suggested that students who commit academic would be less likely that they would report the behavior of others.

**Historical Underpinnings of Policy and Educational Development**

While the numbers of students engaging in academic dishonesty may have remained high overtime, the process by which institutions develop policies around academic integrity has shifted over time. As far back as 1833, McGuffey’s readers were school textbooks, designed to promote morality and character for children, wherein the lessons described acts of dishonesty as immoral, and therefore, un-American (Traiger, 1995). While these books evolved to cover a variety of topics, and still exist as teaching tools today, honesty and morality were overarching lessons. These lessons evolved into policies on academic integrity, first emerging with academic honor codes. *Academic honor codes*, defined as a system of policies that prevent academic misconduct through carefully defined peer enforcement and integrity promotion requirements, emerged from
this work. These codes emerged from “gentleman’s agreements of morality” in education, most prevalent before the Civil War (Bertram Gallant, 2008). McCabe et al. (2003) outlined four core components of an honor code environment: a written pledge of academic honesty, student involvement in formal hearings to address academic misconduct, unproctored exams, and, the requirement that all students report issues of academic dishonesty. McCabe et al. (2003) replicated the contextual influence of an honor code study, and found the policies to have a statistically significant effect on academic dishonesty. The study also included students who were a part of a modified honor code environment, defined by McCabe and Pavela (2004), as honor codes with less stringent demands than the traditional honor code. A description of a modified honor codes is broad, but includes the absence of two honor code attributes such as a pledge, or student responsibility for reporting violations of academic integrity. In McCabe’s study, students under modified honor codes were less likely to report academic misconduct.

One of the oldest honor codes began in 1842 at the University of Virginia in response to a murder (University of Virginia, 2015). The students pledged a commitment to both behavioral and academic honor, and this honor code remains in place today. Historically, institutions of higher education took on the role of parents, commonly known as the Latin in loco parentis (Thelin, 2011); in this realm, faculty were all knowing “parents;” students, like “children” were to listen, and the codes codified this relationship.

The continued emergence of academic honor as an agreement between adults grew in great numbers in the late 1960’s to early 1970’s (Kibler, 1993a; 1993b), due in large part to changes in the faculty/student relationship. During this time, a shift in
ideology from parental supervision to student autonomy took hold validating the emergence of identity development literature (Kibler, 1993a, 1993b; Thelin, 2011). Colleges and universities changed, providing a framework of student development aimed at supporting students as emerging adults. This perspective changed the way academic misconduct was addressed, whereby what would have been a punitive response evolved to focus more on education and support (Kibler, 1993a, 1993b).

A rise of academic honor codes occurred in the mid 1980’s until the early 2000’s, (McCabe, 1992). Student supports had grown to address our current era of increased diversity and technological shrewdness, including libraries, international student offices, student and academic affairs, and information technology (Bleeker, 2007). This increase has moved student services to the forefront, which made student development initiatives the purview of student affairs divisions. Student affairs professionals soon became the individuals to address academic integrity. Aaron’s (1992) study found senior student affairs officers led academic integrity issues at 35.7% of all institutions at that time, with that percentage rising to 76.2% in the community college setting. This finding suggests that student affairs professionals are largely responsible for academic misconduct prevention and academic integrity promotion on campus.

The Responsibility of Academic Honesty

As a part of the student development shift, responsibility for academic integrity has shifted from faculty to the students (Bertram Gallant, 2008); students are responsible for knowing how to avoid academic misconduct with little to no instruction. As a result, most literature focuses on student, not faculty, actions. This limits the understanding of faculty and institutional responsibility to teach academic integrity in college. The focus
on student responsibility also places a value judgment on student actions prior to evaluating educational initiatives (Bertram Gallant, 2008). To provide background information, it is important to consider the current management of academic integrity on campus.

The Management of Policy and Process

McCabe and Pavela used decades of research to create a model code of academic integrity for institutions to consider when designing academic integrity policy. The base characteristics of a model code as outlined by McCabe and Pavela (2004) are also the framework for modified honor code (Pavela, 2000). Model codes hold students responsible for maintaining a culture of honor, particularly in the roles of reporting incidents. They also require the inclusion of student judicial board members when adjudicating cases using a university hearing panel. While many institutions have processes that include elements such as an academic integrity board, training, development, and engagement varies widely, dependent on the individuals and departments charged with the management of academic integrity (Bleeker, 2007).

Academic affairs or student affairs maintains the ownership of the academic integrity process and policy. The most challenging issue with these designations is that for many institutions, those who facilitate process procedures, such as senior administrators are not experiencing the policies in practice, as are faculty and staff (Volpe et al., 2008). Many institutions limit the purview of faculty to integrity within the classroom, and limit the staff role, to maintaining records and explaining policy language (Volpe et al., 2008). Institutions generally fall into one of five categories: those with faculty managed academic integrity policies (Bertram Gallant, 2008; Park, 2003, 2004),
student affairs managed policies (Kibler, 1993a, 1993b), honor code policies (McCabe, Butterfield, & Trevino, 2003), student-led policies, and third party policies (McCabe, 2005a). More often than not, a response to academic integrity will include an overlap, or some combination of these policies. From these, program dissemination, and education and policy with a cultural or technological focus augment the academic integrity program (Bleeker, 2007).

Although the management or administration of the policy may differ, faculty often own the policies and processes of academic integrity in many cases. These policies, voted on through appointed board members, seek to define the issue of academic honor, creating common language for discussion, syllabi, and expectations, and to withstand scrutiny in the face of potential legal ramifications (Park, 2003). These practices must be overly broad including all academic majors, type of assignments, and level of student understanding. While the benefits to central ownership of the policy are clear, there are risks involved in the interpretation of the policy (Park, 2003).

Faculty managed policies (Bertram Gallant, 2008; Park, 2003, 2004) are generally voted for by a faculty senate and are designed to maintain the integrity and honor the faculty position espouses. Historically, this was the model that was created as research institutions became commonplace (Bertram Gallant, 2008). Faculty held the knowledge that students came to seek (Thelin, 2011). Ideas of deference to expertise and the apprenticeship model prevailed in the pursuit of knowledge. Students, often young, were treated as adolescents, with faculty and administrative response to academic misconduct being as that of a parent (Kibler, 1993). Social movements altered the landscape of higher education, creating the need for student development, educating students beyond
punishment (Thelin, 2011). As faculty-run policies, faculty rely on peer-to-peer contact to both define issues of academic misconduct and to hold students responsible for said misconduct (Aaron, 1992; Volpe et al., 2008). While peer feedback is commonplace in the professoriate, the idea of defending academic choices is not clear-cut. The very idea of challenges to academic freedom by policy and formal academic integrity systems is problematic. Some systems require a faculty member to prove the methods they use in the classroom to teach academic integrity and prevent academic misconduct (Aaron, 1992; Gerdeman, 2000; Volpe et al., 2008). These often-legalistic hearings take time away from faculty life in order to prepare for investigations (Volpe et al., 2008). As a result, significant portions of faculty avoid participation in institution wide academic integrity processes (Coren, 2011). The issues and time costs inherent in managing hearings and providing students supplemental education on academic misconduct is often left to student affairs professionals.

Moral and ethical development emerge as best practice policies in addressing academic misconduct. Studies have argued that academic integrity professionals charged with providing that type of education educate outside of the classroom, namely in student affairs settings (Kibler, 1993a; Sandeen, 2004). Kibler’s 1993 national study of student affairs administrators managing academic integrity programs suggested that education around value building, goal setting, and exploring moral and ethical issues are all examples of how student affairs administrators support institutional goals of academic integrity. Sandeen (2004) noted the growing importance of student affairs administrators as academic partners in the out of classroom experience. Kibler’s line of research, coupled with the expansion of student services outside of the classroom, has led to a shift...
in handling academic misconduct. In addition to the developmental aspect of the work, the management of academic misconduct in student affairs is administrative. Student affairs administrators keep track of misconduct issues over the course of a student’s academic career, conducting follow up, and informing faculty on the limitations of further institutional actions (Tull et al., 2015). These staff members are often the gatekeepers of the formal academic misconduct process, offering due process, access to records and appeals, and serving as an impartial resource for questions and concerns (Tull et al., 2015). In the absence of an academic integrity office, student affairs generalists usually provide training and development for student, faculty, and staff hearing panels. Where available, honor code offices are often housed in student affairs divisions.

Research suggests that Honor Codes provide students an opportunity to become moral leaders within their own academic community. To this end, honor codes focus on the quality of moral behavior, with the responsibility of reporting left to students. In this model, exams are rarely proctored, a decision based on a relationship of trust in the academic community. In addition, students undertake a large portion of responsibility both in reporting violations of their peers, and in serving on judicial boards for cases of academic dishonesty. McCabe and Pavela (2000) contended that the creation and sustainment of honor codes create a strong sense of community around academic honor. For this reason, it is easier to implement honor codes in smaller residential campus settings with traditional populations. These codes are often institutional culture shifts, and require years of implementation and consistency to achieve transformative results.

The use of academic honor codes is reliant on student leadership. To this end, institutions have worked with students to promote integrity while preventing academic
dishonesty, even in the absence of a formal honor code. Components of student-led policies often include the use of student leaders as peer educators, chairs of student conduct boards around academic integrity, student clubs and organizations, and student opportunities for professional development. ICAI offers students the opportunity to serve as active participants in the academic integrity community, recognizing the importance of peer leadership in this area. Here students present best practices to an international audience.

Sweeney, Imboden, and Hannah (2015) offered a review of moral and ethical student development in their work to link moral responsibility to student actions. The authors suggested that student leadership in promoting integrity and preventing academic dishonesty provides role-modeling opportunities, and offers a pathway to change. The authors highlighted the importance of moral aspiration, providing students and student leaders with a goal to measure honor and integrity, rather than the prevention of bad behavior. Specifically, the research finds that initiations, recognition, and reflection are helpful in developing student-led systems. Buruss, Jones, Sackley, and Walker (2013) also argued that students take a lead role in preventing academic dishonesty. This study analyzed the response of 330 students at a four-year institution to determine the level of importance students placed on preventing academic misconduct. The results indicate that the fear peer reporting was a greater deterrent than clear policy and procedure, or the perception of a vigilant faculty. This study also suggested that peer influence might have a greater impact than honor codes. Student led policies are dependent on formal expectations that are easily taught and understood. Ease of use is a core component of success in reporting academic misconduct; as a result, technology offers additional
options for academic misconduct prevention and academic integrity promotion, including the use of third party prevention and enforcement.

More recently, it has become popular to review academic integrity work through a third party. In addition to regular search engine investigation, institutions and faculty alike may choose to use online services such as turnitin.com, grammerly, ithenticate.com, and plagchecker.com. These companies maintain databases of scholarly work and report a likelihood of student plagiarism by assigning percentage points based on the number of identical phrases, organizational themes, and word choice. The programs also provide the user with links to the source material when available. Many institutions use these programs as the first line of enforcement, doing so in part because the software is objective and does not take into account personal relationships or intent, factors known to affect the handling of academic honesty issues. These companies have recently come under fire (Rivard, 2013; Turner, 2014) for two reasons. Opponents of the software argue that the software labels students as plagiarists before the faculty begin the grading process. In addition, turnitin.com in particular saves copies of submitted papers, including them in its database. This practice has led to litigation regarding student copyright throughout the US that is currently unresolved (Foster, 2002; Rivard, 2013).

Other third party products serve as educational tools to promote academic honesty. Literature supporting these programs provides serves as marketing tools for eager institutions (McCabe, 2005a; Vilic & Cini, 2006). Vendors in the field such as integrityseminar.com and epigeum.com, provide institutions with best practice modeling solutions and sanctions as a supplement to university policies (McCabe, 2005a; Vilic & Cini, 2006). For example, students with one violation may be subject to complete a
number of modules focused on plagiarism should an instance occur. Completion of the module serves as the educational outcome for the student necessary in order to return to positive academic standing (academicintegrity.org, 2015).

Outsourcing misconduct detection is another method for some institutions. For example, Walden University has a policy that an integrity office grades all exams; investigations of alleged academic dishonesty undergo a review by the academic fraud office or designee (Walden University Student Handbook, 2014).

Hoshiar, Dunlap, Li, and Friedel (2014) noted the effectiveness of academic authenticity procedures. In their study of 100 California community colleges, the researchers found that faculty teaching online are aware of the importance of student authenticity in online education. The study showed that faculty perceived a higher potential for academically dishonest behavior in the online environment. The researchers noted a relationship between faculty professional development and awareness of authenticity issues. Faculty with strong professional development opportunities had a greater awareness of authenticity issues. To a lesser, but still significant extent, faculty practicing in an institution with clearly written and disseminated policies also have a greater awareness of authenticity in online learning. Literature on the institutional response to academic misconduct provides insight into how faculty respond to incidents of academic dishonesty.

Institutional and Faculty Responses to Academic Misconduct

When considering addressing academic dishonesty, research indicates that faculty members prefer to handle student issues independently, rather than going through administrative policies (Coren, 2011; McCabe & Pavela, 2004; Robinson-Zañartu et al.,
In a study of 2,500 faculty members, McCabe and Pavela (2004) found that less than two thirds of faculty members include statements of academic integrity in their syllabi. Keith-Spiegel, Tabachnick, Whitley, and Washburn (1998) contended that faculty do not pursue academic integrity violations due to time constraints and insufficient evidence. Coren (2011) studied faculty who choose to ignore violations of academic integrity, and found 40.3% of faculty admitted to ignoring academic dishonesty at least once. Reasons for ignoring academic dishonesty included a perceived lack of time and/ or evidence. According to a study of 270-psychology faculty by Robinson-Zañartu et al. (2005), only 31% would choose a formal conduct process to handle a clear-cut case of plagiarism.

Judgments on intent, defining plagiarism, and perceived consequences seemed to have an effect on the decision to pursue a formal conduct process. Despite the ability of researchers to ascertain what a clear cut case of plagiarism might be, there is a perception that less significant cases might receive sanctions that were too severe resulted in faculty refusing to bring forward cases at all (Behrendt, Bennett, & Boothby, 2010; Cook-Morales & Peña, 2005; McCabe & Pavela, 2004; Robinson-Zañartu et al., 2005; Singh & Bennington, 2012 ). One example of this disconnect is in defining dishonest behavior. Roig (1997) found that faculty responses to academic misconduct are varied and dependent on individual faculty member discretion. In his study of university faculty Roig (1997) identified discrepancies of plagiarized material between faculty participants who reviewed the same passage of rewritten material from a psychology journal. The inability to find equity in sanctioning is also a factor in faculty refusal to participate in a formal, documented process (Behrendt et al., 2010). In this instructor study, Behrendt et
al. found that instructors agreed that failing to attribute sources was plagiarism; however, instructors disagreed on whether or not the recycling of papers was academically dishonest. In addressing these issues, instructors were also disparate in choosing to hold students responsible for academic misconduct. In short, faculty often value academic freedom in decision making more than they value a consistent approach to addressing issues of academic integrity (Ritter, 1993).

Faculty who do address issues do so in a variety of ways including one-on-one conversations with students, grade changes, opportunity for resubmittal, and the formal code of conduct process (McCabe, Trevino, and Butterfield, 2001). These responses are largely personal, dependent on individual faculty member’s definitions of plagiarism, assumptions of intent, reaction to confrontation (perceived or actual) and individual ideas of justice (Ritter, 1993; Singh & Bennington, 2012).

Bretag (2016) summarized the complexity of academic integrity. Her overview identified the differences of discipline based academic integrity perspectives given the wide range of priorities and skill sets needed in academic departments. Understanding common strategies between these competing ideals provides a starting place for understanding responses to preventing academic misconduct and promoting academic integrity.

Ritter (1993) described five strategies in addressing academic misconduct: prevention, detection, investigation, confrontation, and outcomes. Serviss (2016) used literature on academic integrity to make the case that faculty development is necessary to promote academic integrity, namely when dealing with issues of plagiarism. Serviss (2016) synthesized the literatures into three categories, a conceptualization of academic
misconduct, best practices to prevent academic misconduct, and a holistic approach to address academic misconduct. Serviss (2016) found that a holistic approach, combining curriculum design, research driven data, and student engagement is the most positive strategy for faculty in addressing student academic misconduct.

Studies focused on preventing and limiting academic dishonesty indicate that students, faculty, and institutions are responsible for efforts to prevent academic dishonesty. Researchers have suggested that an institutional focus on moral and ethical development would have a greater impact on student’s decision-making than punitive measures (Kibler, 1993; Tittle & Rowe, 1974). Kibler (1993) surveyed senior academic and student affairs officers to gain perspective on the extent of student development as a preventative strategy in academic misconduct. Kibler’s work finds educational opportunities in academic misconduct prevention and academic integrity promotion. Hollinger and Lanza Kaduce (2009) identified prevention strategies such as rotating test questions, smaller courses, and using multiple proctors. This study of students in 27 different classes at a Southeastern university sought to compare the perceived effectiveness of countermeasures between students admitting to academic misconduct and those who did not. Here, peer influence provided the greatest opportunity to deter dishonest actions. Peer behavior, institutional culture, and perceived consequence affect student and faculty response to academic integrity. While methods to prevent cheating and promote academic integrity can vary, a review of the literature on trends in the formal adjudication of academic misconduct can provide a framework for decision making around this topic.
Hamlin, Barczyk, Powell, and Frost (2013) conducted a study of ten universities to isolate and define what formal actions to address academic misconduct on campus. This study described the administrative efforts in detail, ranking the predominance of methods. The authors found that websites are the leading method of sharing information on academic integrity policy. In order of frequency, the authors found student handbook literature, academic integrity hearing boards, honor pledges, faculty managed policies, and general administrative procedures, are additional ways the institutions handled academic misconduct. The use of educational websites had the lowest frequency in actions addressing academic dishonesty in the study. The predominate form of addressing academic misconduct on campus is punitive (Boehm et al., 2009).

Sanctions holding students responsible for academic dishonesty violations come in a variety of forms. While most schools have some focus on education, the realities of time and resolution often prevail, leaving punitive responses as the most common way to address violations. Bertram Gallant (2008) identified the manner in which institutions resolve academic dishonesty issues, separating the resolutions into two categories, rule compliance and academic integrity education.

Bertram Gallant (2008) defines punitive or rule-compliance measures as responses that demonstrate the severity of the violation through punishment. These resolutions include special notations on transcripts identifying academic dishonesty, formal notations on student records, failure in coursework or reduced grade, dismissal from course, suspension, and expulsion. While written broadly, the ramifications for students vary in significant ways. For example, the effect of an academic integrity violation for a student dependent on a scholarship in way that differs for those who are
not. Likewise, an international student whose residency is determined by credit hours may face the end of their academic career in the U.S. as the result of a course dismissal or expulsion. The idea of fairness in the face of increased globalization and access makes subjective fairness a challenging scale to use when considering punitive judgments. As a result, boards are often unduly harsh or light to compensate for factors they assume, but may not know. Teaching students academic honesty requires an educational component in handling cases.

Educational methods, or academic integrity education are also used to address academic misconduct. Bertram Gallant (2008) identified these as measures that focus on the learning and prevention of academic misconduct by providing opportunities for the student to understand what academic responsibilities are. These practices are often time consuming and require a collaborative effort by many institutional stakeholders (Bertram Gallant, 2008; Morris, 2016; Volpe et al., 2008). Students are provided coursework or curriculum which allows them to practice academically honest behaviors, there are assessments of understanding, the ability to see other role model behaviors of integrity, and opportunities for resolution both within the classroom and within the institution as a whole (Bertram Gallant, 2008). These responses require collaboration with academic and student affairs offices, the participation of other students, and program faculty. These practices require additional time from faculty who have already gone through the process of investigation. Time, morale, and equity are additional barriers to educational outcomes (Volpe et al., 2008).

Bertram Gallant (2008, 2015) has conducted focused research on educational opportunities for students that promote academic integrity on campus. Her work
provides an alternative perspective to increasing punitive responses to academic dishonesty. Specifically, Bertram Gallant suggested that faculty role model integrity for students. This includes citing sources, showing up prepared and on time, and focusing on five fundamental values: honesty, respect, responsibility, fairness, and trustworthiness.

McDougal and Moore (2012) identified nine research universities to compare aspects of integrity education, and found most of the schools researched had an office dedicated to integrity initiatives and all of them housed this office in a division of student affairs of student services. Additional characteristics included specialized programming for international students, student engagement and leadership to meet the goals of the integrity office, campus wide initiatives that are well publicized and disseminated in a variety of formats, faculty education on academic integrity concerns, and an early introduction to issues of integrity, some as early as campus visit programs.

Some studies address integrity education through course mastery. In an Australian study focused on mastery, Curtis, Gouldthorp, Thomas, O’Brien, and Corriea (2013) identified modules on academic integrity as a valuable tool in educating students and promoting a culture of honesty. In this study, students completing academic integrity modules reported greater understanding of plagiarism, and believed that plagiarism was a serious violation that those who did not completed the module. Owens and White (2013) compared outcomes for psychology students who had the benefit of an educational program versus those that did not. The researchers found that students who completed the mastery modules had significantly reduced amounts of reported academic misconduct. When considering the use of mastery modules in response to a growing technological environment, it is important to understand the changing landscape of
academic misconduct in online education. Modern issues are not limited to the online environment; there is a need for academic integrity education designed for international students, and for those for whom English is a second language (Olshen, 2013; Pennycook, 2012; Pecorari, 2016; Shaw, Moore, & Gadhidisan; 2007).

Next, a closer look at the modern issues of increased globalization and online education is necessary.

Modern Issues in Academic Integrity Education

There are limited studies on academic integrity education related to culturally mindful approaches to academic integrity education. Heuser, Martindale, and Lazo (2016) described the increased internationalization of higher education and the challenges and opportunities as they relate to academic integrity. The authors noted increased globalization, creating more marketable students, increased opportunities for international research, and intercultural influences on curriculum as perceived benefits in the higher education sector (Heuser et al., 2016). Given these opportunities, understanding what opportunities exist for academic integrity education that crosses cultural difference is important.

Shaw et al. (2007) analyzed the benefits of an academic integrity program for graduate students in a public health program. In this study, an intervention based in task-based pedagogy taught students Western concepts of academic integrity. The public health program found success using writing exercises and integrity concepts such as appropriate citations, referencing and use of source material. Olshen’s (2013) qualitative study on academic success identified some of the challenges for international students, and specifically described issues such as faculty staff collaboration, shared messaging,
pressure to succeed, and intentional education as needed interventions. Students in the study were able to articulate that academic misconduct could lead to dismissal, but did not have a consistent definition of what the act of plagiarism was (Olshen, 2013).

Academic integrity education for international students presents cultural challenges that are important to address. There have been several studies that address the differences in student cultural perspectives. These studies are important for several reasons, as access to higher education increases, U.S. institutions have not only welcomed more international students, but have built campuses in other countries, bringing together culture and expectations at an unprecedented speed.

For example, Lupton, Chapman and Weiss (2000) found differences in cheating, using a definition encompassing a wide range of academically dishonest behaviors of Polish and U.S. business students. Findings note that in scenarios where students were to identify academic misconduct, 44% of Polish students identified behaviors as cheating, compared to 9% of U.S. students; likewise, 55% of U.S. students in the sample reported cheating themselves, while 85% of Polish students did the same. Notable findings included differences in what students considered cheating. In this study, U.S. students did not find the act of distributing previous exams as cheating, while Polish students did (Lupton et al., 2000). Yet, the majority of Polish students in the study did not feel it was bad to cheat on an exam. In addition Polish students believed it was the expectation of the faculty member to prevent students from cheating, while U.S. students reported a belief that it was up to the students themselves to prevent cheating behaviors (Lupton et al., 2000). Chapman and Lupton (2004) continued this line of inquiry, next looking at differences between U.S. undergraduate business students and students from Hong Kong.
In this study, and using the same broad definition, Chapman and Lupton reported that in China, Hong Kong, Korea, and Taiwan was pervasive; in this study, one third of students from Hong Kong reported cheating behaviors compared to 50% of U.S. students. While this appears to suggest that students from Hong Kong are less likely to cheat, the researchers noted that this finding is only applicable to a student’s willingness to self-report. Therefore, students from Hong Kong are less likely to consider certain behaviors cheating, and even less likely to self-report cheating behaviors themselves. Students from Hong Kong were more likely to believe that their peers were cheating on out-of-class assignments. In both sets of literature, the authors (Lupton & Chapman, 2004; Lupton et al., 2000) noted that differences in reported cheating behaviors do not signify less cheating, in some instances in may mean more. The most significant takeaway is that there are clear cultural differences around what academic misconduct is, who is responsible for the prevention the behavior, and understanding what academic misconduct is.

In other research, McCabe, Feghali, and Abdallah (2008) conceptualized factors affecting academic honesty in Middle Eastern students, using U.S. based research as a framework. Their study, which compared three institutions in Lebanon to U.S. institutions, found that Lebanese students self-reported higher levels of cheating behaviors and lower levels of importance placed on consequences. The authors suggested that factors of peer influence, defined as “coordination effect” coupled with a collective society, might hold greater weight in decision making than perceived punishment. In other words, if the environment is one accepting of academic dishonesty,
academic misconduct behaviors become normal. This study highlighted other important factors including culture (individual vs. collective), and the educational system.

These studies provide a few examples of how an ethical culture affects the perception of what it means to be academically honest. Understanding the cultural components of teaching academic integrity education provides resources to all students, and can serve as a tool for faculty and students navigating what academic integrity means on campus. In addition to methods pertinent to a changing global student population, an increase in online course taking and technology warrants a closer look at academic integrity in the online environment.

Opportunities for education and prevention of academic misconduct in the online environment are significant. Over 6.7 million students, or 32% of students in postsecondary education have enrolled in online courses since 2012, and the number continues to climb (Sheehy, 2013).

With institutions becoming increasingly friendly to asynchronous coursework, the potential for student to obtain course credit or even an entire degree without a face-to-face interaction is increasing (Trenholm, 2006); 2.6 million students were enrolled in fully online programs in 2014 (NCES, 2016). Growth in online education is rapid and promoted within higher education (Symonds, 2003). Research suggests limited differences in quality between courses delivered online and those facilitated face–to–face. There are several factors to consider in the online environment. First, current research shows an increased workload for faculty developing course content online. Academic integrity literature acknowledges the need for meaningful connections between students and faculty in creating communities of academic honesty. The question of what,
if any resources are provided to faculty to create relationships with trust and integrity in mind is a concern. Trenholm (2006) noted that while instructional designers find reward in efforts to modernize course content to include new technologies, “in this competitive environment administrators backed by many working in instructional design appear in no rush to examine issues of quality assurance and academic integrity” (p. 287).

It is necessary to engage students in education around academic integrity in ways that are both unique to the online environment and in ways that echo on campus initiatives. The majority of college and university students will use online platforms for coursework, or engage in the online proliferation of research. An up-to-date, technologically perceptive response is necessary to engage students in this way. Olt (2002) identified four strategies for online instructors to use as tools in preventing academic misconduct: identify limitations for the student instructor and include relationships; design effective, mastery based online assessments; curriculum rotation; and providing students with a written academic dishonesty policy.

Technology presents a unique opportunity to prevent academic misconduct and promote integrity. While many studies on technology and academic integrity focus on four-year institutions, the community college has emerged as a notable provider of online education. Online courses have become one of the greatest sources on enrollment growth in the community college sector (Cejda, 2010). Few studies address academic integrity in the community college; however, a closer look at academic integrity research focused on community colleges provides a better understanding of the issues.
Academic Integrity in the Community College

As noted previously, much of the previous research on academic integrity in higher education has focused on four-year institutions. Some research on academic integrity in the community college does exist and broadly covers topics related to the management, perception, and frequency of academic misconduct. A review of literature specific to community colleges provides additional context. Aaron (1992) obtained data from 157 senior student affairs officers, on how they address academic integrity. In this study, 4-year institutions were overwhelmingly more likely to have a separate and specific set of guidelines for addressing academic misconduct, with 70% of 4-year public and 72.4% of 4-year private colleges providing specific policy guidance. In contrast, only 20.9% of community colleges maintained specific guidelines for handling academic misconduct. In the same study, methods of sharing information on academic honesty relied on the student handbook and orientation. Only 9.1% of community colleges surveyed provided a stand-alone document addressing academic integrity (Aaron, 1992). Despite relying on senior student affairs officers to resolve issues of academic misconduct, only 4.7% of institutions held programs promoting academic integrity as it relates to student development (Aaron, 1992). In terms of researching the prevalence of academic integrity on the community college campus, only 4.7% of community colleges participated in assessment efforts on academic integrity (Aaron, 1992).

Burke’s (1997) study of community college faculty also sheds some light on how faculty address academic integrity. Specifically, faculty most often use informal processes to address the issue with students. In this study, faculty did not believe that academic misconduct was an important concern in the institution. The study also
suggested that faculty do not pursue formal institutional action due to time, adversarial processes, and a lack of support. Aaron and Georgia (1994) validated these findings. Their study found that 60% of community colleges believed that faculty handled their own academic misconduct issues independent of a formal process. Despite this, 20% of community colleges did not disseminate any information on academic honesty to faculty (Aaron & Georgia, 1994).

A Canadian study of 365 community college students identified self-reported estimates that 35% or students were frequent cheaters and 50.1% of students would consider themselves occasional cheaters (Genereux & McLeod, 1995). Using a broad definition of cheating more aligned with academic dishonesty, this study also found that 85% of males and 95% of females admitted to cheating behaviors in the community college. In a later study, Smyth and Davis (2003) conducted a study on academic dishonesty in the community college. The researchers surveyed 265 students to understand academic integrity. The study found that they witnessed fewer academically dishonest behaviors in college than in high school; however, 82% of students report witnessing cheating in college; 45.6% of students have admitted to academic misconduct. The authors also found many students ask other student to cheat for them, with 66% of students reporting this request. Forty-five percent of students considered cheating socially acceptable. In this study, males were more likely to cheat than females. There were no significant differences between freshman and sophomore students. Given the limited research in community colleges on academic integrity education, this study serves as a baseline comparison for future studies.
Gerdeman (2000) reviewed studies on academic honesty from the perspective of literature from 2- and 4-year institutions. In his review, he recommended clear communication of policies, encouraging faculty to promote academic integrity and prevent academic misconduct in the classroom, and provide fair and equitable resolutions to academic dishonesty. Boehm et al. (2009) find similar results in a national mixed methods study inclusive of community college academic integrity perceptions. This study sought to identify best practices that contribute to academic integrity while preventing academic dishonesty. In this study, 64% of community colleges noted moderate amounts of academic dishonesty, compared to 57% of private colleges and universities who note low levels of academic dishonesty. Senior academic officers at community colleges were found to have statistically significant rankings on four best practices in academic integrity education, including: (1) Faculty training on topics such as classroom management and academic misconduct prevention; (2) Support in classroom management techniques such as small class sizes; and prohibiting electronic devices; (3) Clear expectations for students and faculty on academic integrity code violations; (4) Placing a notation on a transcript to indicate an academic integrity violation. This research suggests that senior academic officers in community colleges may have specific ideas on policy and practice that may or may not currently match the perceptions of the greater institution. An example of opportunities to review best practices are found in Hensley’s (2013) To cheat or not to cheat: A review with implications for practice summarized the research on academic dishonesty in the community college and identified best practices for academic misconduct prevention and academic integrity promotion. Using a broad definition of cheating including a broad
spectrum of dishonest behaviors, this research found certain implications for community college policy and practice important to the study of academic integrity education. Students who may have low levels of academic confidence may be more likely to cheat (Hensley, 2013). The number of developmental courses in the community college environment suggests that a lower measure of academic self-efficacy may exist (Hensley, 2013). Another risk factor academic dishonesty is a lack of engagement. In the community college setting, this can be especially concerning as the majority of the population is nonresidential. Institution wide efforts to promote character and integrity are important to preventing academic misconduct and promoting integrity (Boehm et al., 2009; Hensley, 2013). For online learners, virtual tutoring and dedicated study spaces are suggested actions in research in promoting an academically honest environment (Hensley, 2013).

**Chapter II Summary**

A review of the literature provides information on what academic integrity is, who violates academic misconduct, why and how they are dishonest, policy norms, limitations, and prevention strategies to promote academic honesty. These studies almost exclusively focus on students at four-year colleges (Moeck, 2002; Smyth & Davis, 2003). They find that the majority of students have violated academic integrity or witnessed academic dishonesty. Prevention includes academic integrity initiatives focused on education and community building.

As campuses become both increasingly diverse and more technologically advanced, opportunities to provide academic integrity education transcend established norms. As organizations, colleges and universities have the opportunity to promote
ethical principles in innovative ways in order to affect a culture of academic honor on campus.

The reviewed literature describes the evolution of academic integrity at the organizational level. It goes on to identify common practices of adjudicating behavior and opportunities for educating students and faculty on academic integrity. The historical frameworks demonstrate the ways in which academic integrity has evolved to be more inclusive of modern issues in academic integrity.

Throughout the literature, opportunities for academic integrity education are clear. The first are resources for those who maintain ownership of the process. In most universities, this means faculty members. Support for students in preventing academic dishonesty, creating an expectation of academic honor, and a role-modeling expectation is necessary. A modern approach that includes explicit opportunities to engage in online dissemination of education and specific content suitable for the online environment is valuable. Lastly, a system of academic integrity education that honors the globalization of U.S. higher education, providing a space for dialogue around expectations, differences in cultural norms, and promoting standards of academic honor is a component of environments that value academic integrity. Chapter III details the methods for my study on academic integrity issues within a community college setting.
CHAPTER III

Chapter I serves as an overview of the study describing the problem, defining the purpose of this research, and providing questions that guide the study. The chapter conceptualizes the idea of academic integrity education through a conceptual lens of academic misconduct prevention and academic integrity promotion, using theoretical frameworks guiding academic integrity practice today.

Chapter II synthesized the current literature on academic dishonesty and policies to prevent academic misconduct and promote student integrity. The chapter included trends and definitions of academic dishonesty, the prevalence of academic misconduct on campus, a history of policy and practice, modern policy and practice, modern issues affecting academic honor, and academic integrity in the community college context. The previous chapters provided an overview of academic integrity issues through a conceptual framework of student and faculty roles in academic integrity education. To do this, both a view of policy and practice through theories supporting researched efforts in academic integrity education, and as revealed via document analysis of key policies and procedures. These theories, including social learning, moral and ethical student development, social bonds, and cultural dimension, can inform academic honesty programming, prevention, and integrity promotion. This chapter describes the methodology, focus, perspective, and methods for my research involving the in-depth, single case study of academic integrity education at a community college.

Purpose and Research Questions

The purpose of my study is to help fill a gap in academic integrity research by examining the components of academic integrity education at one Mid-West community
college as perceived by faculty and staff. This study used the following research questions:

1. What are the strategies used in one community college to equip their faculty with institutional programs and policies to promote academic integrity and reduce academic dishonesty, and how have these strategies changed over the past five years?

2. How does a community college encourage students to participate in promoting academic integrity and reducing academic dishonesty?

3. What are the initiatives perceived to be most effective in promoting academic integrity and reducing academic dishonesty?

Academic integrity research identifies factors such as environment, institutional culture, consequences, student concern, and faculty response as key indicators of preventing academic misconduct and promoting academic honesty (Bleeker, 2007; Boehm et al., 2009; Bertram Gallant, 2008; McCabe, 2016; McCabe et al., 2003; McCabe & Pavela, 2004; Stone et al., 2009). The literature suggests a direct relationship between promoting academic integrity and the frequency of academic misconduct (Coren, 2011; McCabe, 2005b; Volpe et al., 2008); however, there is limited literature describing academic integrity in the community college setting. To better understand this issue, a detailed exploration of policy in practice is necessary. I used a case study approach to examine academic integrity education on a community college campus, via the experiences of faculty and administrators working to prevent academic misconduct and promote academic integrity.
Methodology Overview and Rationale

The methodology used to explore the research questions uses multiple methods, yet is qualitatively driven. This method is as a partially mixed, concurrent, dominant status design (Johnson, Onwuegbuzie, & Turner, 2007). This method incorporated:

1. Qualitative content analysis,
2. Quantitative survey data, and
3. Qualitative interview data.

While the study began with the survey, interviews occurred concurrently during survey data collection. During this time, an analysis of documents collected from the host institution was also taking place. This study relies more heavily on the qualitative elements of the research; specifically semi structured interviewing, and the coding of open-ended survey questions, and document analysis. The quantitative elements included 13 years of institutional data points and a survey instrument. These provided background information on the recorded cases of academic misconduct, summarized demographic information, gauged academic environment, and summarized specific behaviors of academic honesty as standardized by the instrument. Given the descriptive nature of the data, limited statistical analysis occurred. This was the most appropriate choice due to the speculated and actual number of survey participants, the limited amount of data available on academic misconduct violations at the institution, and the high quality of the qualitative data available to the researcher. The quantitative and qualitative analysis was separate. Triangulation occurred following the initial findings.

To execute this research design, I used in-depth, single bounded case study (Creswell, 2013). Case study research was suitable for this line of inquiry since such
research is ideal for research conducted in a natural setting (Marshall & Rossman, 2014). An environmental context helps to create greater understanding of policy and practice, which, in my study, involved immersion in a typical Mid-Western community college and through the disseminated literature of the college. This methodological overview and rationale outlines the importance of this method to my project.

**Case Study**

Case study research requires “complex reasoning through inductive and deductive logic, participant meaning, emergent design, reflexivity and a holistic account of a case” (Creswell, 2013, pp. 46-47). A case study allows the researcher to gain an in-depth knowledge of a process. In addition to exploring how academic integrity education is implemented, this project will “explore where and why policy and local knowledge and practice are at odds” (Marshall & Rossman, 2014, p. 91). Creswell (2013) defined case study research as “a qualitative approach in which the investigator explores a real life, contemporary bounded system…over time, through detailed, in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of data” (p. 97). Collecting detailed experiences of faculty and staff while also reviewing the policies they choose to follow allowed me to understand the implementation of policy and process simultaneously. Understanding this process also adds to research on community college academic integrity education and process in a realistic, campus bound context.

A case study was the appropriate methodology for this research for several reasons. First, this study of academic integrity education is a phenomenon. Yin (2009) describes the observation and naming without manipulation of contemporary events, such as changes in academic integrity education, and participant behaviors. Specifically, the
single case study technique is appropriately suited for my research, as Yin (2009) described elements of the case study as a methodology:

The case study inquiry copes with the technically distinctive situation in which there were many more variables of interest than data points; …relies on multiple sources of evidence, with data needing to converge in a triangulating fashion; and …benefits from the prior development of theoretical propositions to guide data collection and analysis. (pp. 13-14)

There are limited studies on academic integrity initiatives in the community college. As a result, it is usually in comparison to four-year institutions, a comparison that does not account for the unique characteristics of the community college setting. The complex nature of the community college presents multiple viewpoints including community college administration, faculty, department, certification body, and so on. To honor the different perspectives present in the case, it was necessary to turn my attention to a single institution. Focusing on one institution allows for the type of in depth analysis that might be lost when attempting to compare multiple institutions. The goal of the design was to gather as much data as available on the subject. A single case study allowed me to do that, using qualitative and quantitative elements in a tightly bound design. Yin (2009) specifically describes the necessity of single case designs, noting that a single case offers an in-depth examination into policies, procedure, engagement, and perception, in the absence of a cross case analysis. This type of focus allows for the consideration of a wide variety of data to in a narrow context.

Academic integrity education has layers of institutional complexity and theoretical backing described in depth in Chapters 1 and 2. Yin (2009) contends that a
case study is the most appropriate method when the understanding the case requires framing the context of the phenomenon. Here, understanding academic integrity education through multiple contexts is necessary to describe the phenomenon of academic integrity policy and practice in the community college. In order to understand the policy and perception of this institution, a case study provides the flexibility to include multiple streams of data within a bounded population. Here, the units of analysis are the faculty, staff, and institutional policies. The case was bound to the confines of one community college, from the perspective of individuals directly responsible for educating and administering academic integrity education on campus. Single case studies are not generalizations, but serve as nuanced examples that can inform opportunities for research of a similar size, scope, and intention.

**Parameters of the Study**

This study is a single bounded case study examining academic integrity education in the community college setting. Case study research often involves multiple methods, and Yin (2009) identified the need for data triangulation in case study research to provide a balanced and comprehensive view of the phenomenon. In order to answer the research questions, this study took a three-pronged approach. First, I used a faculty survey in order to gather baseline information on the attitudes, knowledge, and experience faculty members had regarding academic integrity. Next, I held semi structured interviews to gain a more nuanced understanding of faculty and staff experiences with academic integrity. Then, I reviewed all documents that were accessible, permitted, and available regarding academic integrity at the institution. Using a three-pronged approach allowed me to build up and triangulate the data. The combination of a faculty survey, faculty and
staff interviews, and document analysis provided rich data on academic integrity policies and practice within the community college. My study incorporates these elements to create a detailed understanding of educational process and practices in academic integrity.

My study identifies the characteristics of academic misconduct prevention and academic integrity promotion for faculty, staff, and administrators of the academic integrity process using surveys, interviews, and document analysis. Four theoretical viewpoints: social learning theory, moral and ethical student development, social control theory, and cultural dimension theory frame the phenomenon of academic integrity education as promoted at the host institution. The perspectives, faculty, staff, and academic integrity administrators explain the theoretical connections.

It was my intention to select a mid-sized community college in the mid-west that, as an institution, was interested in learning more about the use of academic integrity policy and practice on campus. I began the study by researching community colleges in general, choosing to focus in the mid-west. I chose the selected community college for its size, class size, academic integrity policy, and course offerings. I first gathered information about the policy through informal conversations with administrative staff, and by gaining access to policy language that has existed over the last decade.

Mid-West Community College is a rurally located institution of approximately 5800 students. There are between 315- 410 faculty in full – time and part – time roles. The majority (75%) of the faculty are part-time. The faculty work in four locations, including a military installation in a Mid-West state.
Conversations with the Senior Academic Affairs officers, Senior Student Affairs officer, Dean of Students, and Director of HSIRB occurred over the course of three months to propose and agree upon documents that would be available. I first generated a list of potential documents guided by:

1. literature that addresses academic integrity education (Löfström et al., 2012),
2. the conceptual framework defining the study,
3. the research questions guiding the study, and
4. my professional experience in educating and resolving issues of academic integrity.

Over the course of the study, it became apparent that the bulk of the documents I requested did not exist at the institution. This was not surprising. It is common for institutions to have a limited amount of campus wide resources on academic integrity (Bertram Gallant, 2008; Löfström et al., 2012). As the researcher, I assumed that I would find policy documents related to academic misconduct conduct boards, case summaries, newspaper articles, and training documents. No newspaper articles, student group information, posters, or orientation guides contained information regarding academic integrity. I also assumed that I would find educational resources for specific populations, namely for international and online students. When considering international students, as identified in the research questions, no printed information on academic integrity is specific to international students at Mid-West Community College.

While many of the items I requested were not available, I had not anticipated some documents. Unexpected finds included resource guides. One example is the library website. The website contains in depth resource video modules on proper writing
and citations. The second resource that was a surprise to me was *The Pocket Prof*, a guide that addresses proper writing skills. This handbook specifically references the academic integrity policy in a section on avoiding plagiarism. In addition to receiving policy and process documents from the institution, I asked for and received a spreadsheet of resolved academic integrity matters. This spreadsheet included information on the infraction, the resolution, the semester, and the course where the incident occurred.

A document analysis of print and electronic materials provided context on the state of academic integrity programming, dissemination of information, and opportunity for engagement in the selected institution. The violation data provided an account of formal reports of academic misconduct. Following these items, I launched a survey.

Survey data in case study research as a valuable method for measuring baseline information. The baseline information collected include demographic information, perception of the academic environment, and addressing academic misconduct. The survey provided a contextual description using measures of frequency for issues of academic integrity. An email to complete the instrument, the *Academic Integrity Survey* went to all current, full and part-time faculty at a community college in the mid-west. The institution also provided 13 years of academic misconduct violation data. Semi structured interviews and open-ended qualitative data round out the data points. To understand the perspectives of academic integrity, I conducted interviews of faculty, staff, and academic integrity administrators. This data provided insight into the experiences of campus colleagues’ understanding of and ability to navigate academic honor on campus. I also reviewed qualitative open-ended survey responses with the interview data.
Setting

The institution selected for my study is Carnegie classified as a medium sized, rural serving community college that has international admissions. This setting satisfies many of the characteristics of the majority of US community colleges. National data on community colleges provided a guide to make comparisons. Two-thirds of community colleges have enrollments of 6,000 students or less (Cohen et al., 2014), and per the institution’s website, the selected institution serves approximately 5,800 students on its main campus. The institution offers over 30 associate’s degrees, a university transfer program, and career and technical education programs and certifications for students. While course offerings in community colleges vary, these offerings are typical of those offered nationwide (AACC, 2015). The institution is approximately 66% female and 34% male, which is similar to the national average of 57% women and 43% male enrolled students in community colleges (AACC, 2015). Online courses are available at the institution, which supports national data finding that 27% of students enroll in online courses. There is no number of international students listed on the institutional website; however, international students enroll as both first time and transfer students according to the institution’s website. Regardless of citizenship status, the institution also supports students with limited English proficiency. These characteristics all relate to my study in that they represent the reality for the majority of community colleges within the US. In addition, the host institution provides a current case that helps us to understand change. The institutional characteristics meet the needs of my line of inquiry, a community college adapting to policy change with influences, such as increased globalization and technology, which are key issues in academic integrity education. The institution has an
academic integrity policy updated within the last five years, and an academic discipline procedure. This speaks both to the nature of case study methodology as a contemporary phenomenon, and to the nature or change in a modern context.

**Recruitment and Consent Procedures**

To gather participants, I first sent a list of prospective administrators, based on title, to the senior student services and academic affairs staff. There was some confusion on my part as to how the recruitment would occur. I believed that the endorsement of the project would come from senior leadership and focused on networking in that way. Instead, the chair of the HSIRB via email listserv provided all information on the project. Despite the support of senior leaders at the institution, as an outsider, it was difficult to develop trust. I expected that my early relationship building would help to develop trust and enthusiasm for the project. I overestimated my this position, and as a result began with very little survey participation. I held three meetings with senior leadership over the course of two weeks to strategize the best methods of earning participation. Eventually, I learned that immersing more intentionally within the institution would be necessary. I reserved table space through student services over the course of a month in the most heavily trafficked common area of the institution.

During this time, I passed out flyers, business cards, and spent time discussing the survey and interviews. I spoke with faculty and staff in the halls, introducing myself and sharing the premise of my project. The hall where I was located is a shared common space. Individuals choose to advertise there because they have the greatest chance of visibility by the campus community. The design of the institution connects all of the buildings with a walkway system. Sitting in the most centrally located part of this system
allowed me to visit with many individuals as they went to grab food, consult with colleagues, or head to and from their classroom. I learned about their roles on campus as they considered participating in my study. Several individuals were willing to share my information with colleagues. By the time I had completed my visits, I had cordial relationships with several faculty and staff that wished me well and agreed to share information with colleagues.

Ultimately, I posted flyers in every academic department office, emails went to all current full-time and part-time faculty members, and the HSIRB director sent additional emails to department Chairs and division leaders encouraging participation. The division leaders then forwarded the emails to the faculty. Follow-ups with prospective participants for both the survey and interviews occurred via email, office visits, and phone calls. In discussing my study with prospective participants, I learned that several individuals identifying as faculty also had administrative responsibilities. This was important because the interviews included perspectives of faculty, administration, and staff designations. This required me to be more flexible in my requests for participation, allowing individuals to define roles for themselves, rather than placing my perception on them.

Prior to each interview, participants read and reviewed the consent document describing the process in detail. Each participant received an email confirming the time and date of the interview, along with a copy of the interview questions, and informed consent. Upon agreeing to participate, the interview participants signed a consent document permitting the session to be audio taped and transcribed verbatim for data analysis. In two cases, I held interviews by phone after receiving permission from my
advisor and the HSIRB of both institutions. In these cases, the participants also received
the informed consent ahead of time, and agreed to audiotaping and transcription. As the
researcher, I honored all details of the informed consent. All interview participants
received a copy of the transcript and a copy of a summary of our interview for comments
and member checking.

Survey participants received consent information (See Appendix B) via the
introductory page of the online survey instrument. Participants acknowledged
understanding of the informed consent by choosing to start the survey.

Participants

The study used a purposeful sample of participants generated from faculty and
staff at the community college. Creswell (2013) described this method as valuable,
noting that the sampling technique can “purposefully inform an understanding of the
research problem and central phenomenon in the study” (p. 125).

To gather baseline information on policy and practice of academic integrity, I
intended to offer all full and part-time faculty the opportunity to participate in a survey.
This decision was made because full and part-time faculty members are largely
responsible for addressing issues of academic integrity (Volpe et al., 2008), and as such
can offer valuable perspectives to the study. Typically, faculty members can have the
biggest impact on academic misconduct prevention and academic integrity promotion,
given their direct interactions with the students. Ultimately, the HSIRB of the host
institution sent emails to 315 faculty registered within their system. Of these, 67 (21%)
began the survey instrument, and 57 (18%) completed the survey.
In addition, I planned to conduct individual faculty interviews with 12-16 faculty and staff. To select faculty, those completing the survey had the chance to share their email addresses via a link that was set to maintain confidentiality of the survey responses while capturing email addresses of those interested in participating in a face-to-face interview. From this group, I intended to select six to ten random faculty and four to six staff, with the ideal criteria being representation from as many of the 10 academic programs at the institution as possible. I planned to solicit suggestions from the Senior Academic Administrator for faculty who I felt played a more defined role in the implementation of academic integrity education of campus. The Senior Academic Administrator deferred to the host institutions’ HSIRB, and removed herself from the recruitment and participation process. In all, six faculty agreed to participate through the survey link, with two declining to participate. Two administrators volunteered to speak with me. One additional administrator participated in the interviews, and three faculty members contacted me after hearing about the study. I interviewed two faculty selected from this pool, and the other faculty member declined participation. Ultimately, I was able to secure 10 interviews with seven faculty, two of them department chairs and three administrators.

**Instrumentation and Data Collection**

As mentioned, this research project consists of survey analysis, in-depth, semi-structured interviewing, and document analysis. I received permission to conduct the study from the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB) of the host institution and my institution.
Conversations with the Senior Academic Affairs officers, Senior Student Affairs officer, Dean of Students, and Director of HSIRB occurred over the course of three months to propose and agree upon documents for the study. As mentioned previously, I first generated a list of potential documents guided by: (a.) literature that addresses academic integrity education (Löfström et al., 2012), (b.) the conceptual framework defining the study, (c.) the research questions guiding the study, and, (d.) my professional experience in educating and resolving issues of academic integrity.

The bulk of the documents I requested were not available. According to the literature, it is common for institutions to have a limited amount of campus wide resources on academic integrity (Bertram Gallant, 2008; Löfström et al., 2012). As the researcher, I assumed that I would find policy documents related to academic misconduct. I also assumed that educational resources for international and online students would be available. There was no evidence of printed information on academic integrity for international students at Mid-West Community College. It was also challenging to gain access to some departmental documents, such as student handbooks. All documents that were publically available, and those supplied by the institution were included in the analysis. I was surprised to gather several resources I had not anticipated, including a writing resource guide with a reference to the academic integrity statement and tips to avoid plagiarism. Links to resource guides from the library were also available.

After gaining approval and supplying a final list, the Director of HSIRB at Mid-West Community College provided information regarding violations and resolutions for alleged academic misconduct over the past 13 years. In addition, the Director sent out an
email requesting syllabus language from department chairs. Several departments sent copies of academic integrity policy language. After receiving these, I followed up with multiple Internet searches using Google search. I used the search terms “Mid-West Community College 2015 syllabus.” The Senior Student Affairs officer sent the student and faculty handbooks to me. I found the library reference page during a keyword search on the Mid West Community College website using the terms “academic integrity.” The course catalog and a resource handbook known as The Pocket Prof were in a public display in the college’s student life office. The director of the HSIRB at Mid-West Community College gave me forwards of all of the emails sent by department chairs and academic deans. The primary audience was determined by specific language within the document, or inference (i.e., syllabi are created primarily for students). The creator of the document was determined through interviews and conversations with the senior administration team at Mid-West Community College.

Following the document organization, I read each document thoroughly. I compared each document to the 2015-2016 student handbook for similarities and differences. For each, I took notes on the following items:

1. if the policy was outlined completely or referenced;
2. if the language matched the language in the student handbook 2015-16, and if not, how the language differed;
3. if the language was specific to a group or academic major (i.e. Faculty, Nursing students), and;
4. if the items provided examples or tutorials of appropriate (or inappropriate) academic behavior.
After this, I took each item, read the policy language again, and determined whether the information regarding academic integrity provided evidence to support or answer one or more research questions. I then reviewed the documents again to determine if my original perceptions remained the same, or, if there were other nuances that I noticed during the additional review.

**Academic Integrity Survey**

Another instrument used in my study was a self-administered Internet survey. This is the preferred method of survey distribution, and is cost effective (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2014). After securing permission to use the instrument from the International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI), the instrument was adapted based on the needs of the host institution. Following this, I uploaded the instrument to *Qualtrics*, an online survey hosting software. The host institution on behalf of the researcher to all full and part-time faculty, summarizing the purpose of the research, and including the survey link, sent an email invitation. The survey was open for a total of eight weeks.

Mid-West Community College distributed the survey through their campus email list to increase response rates. I anticipated two follow-up emails over a three-week period, sent at the beginning of weeks two and three. Early low response rates required an extension of the study. Ultimately, I requested two extensions granted by the HSIRB of both my institution and the host institution.

**Survey Instrumentation**

I used data collected from the ICAI faculty survey instrument, the *Academic Integrity Survey*. Participants provided information on (a) types of interventions conducted by the institution, (b) the prevalence of academic misconduct, (c) prevention
of academic misconduct, and (d) integrity promotion. Given the small sample size and survey questions providing a contextual framework, statistical data is almost solely limited to descriptive data. Using SPSS version 22, descriptive statistics including mean, mode, median, and standard deviation, skewness, and kurtosis present a picture of the institution and the perceptions of faculty addressing academic misconduct. Analyzing the frequency distribution of the academic integrity policy characteristics provide descriptive information on academic integrity. To analyze returned surveys, first, I reviewed the descriptive data, then, the reviewed the data by faculty status (full vs. part-time), the frequency of academic misconduct by academic department, and responses to academic misconduct. Qualitative data, including open-ended survey questions combine for a comprehensive qualitative analysis.

The survey portion of my study used the tailored design method of survey methodology (Dillman et al., 2014). The tailored design method refers to a series of actions in developing surveys that limit cost, increase benefits, and promote trust (Dillman et al., 2014). In doing so, I considered the best practices of social design theory, incorporating a variety of tools to promote participation. This method assumes that the benefits to the participants outweigh the costs of participation (Dillman et al., 2014). In this instance, data collection does not exist specifically for this community college, presenting an opportunity for the institution to understand the characteristics of their academic integrity education issues. In addition, I earned trust through collaborating with senior leadership at the institution, attaining permission to use the survey instrument from the International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI), limiting the inclusion of personal
information, assuring confidentiality where possible, creating a visually interesting instrument, and providing the institution with a research report following data collection.

The survey instrument itself is the *Academic Integrity Survey* (Appendix H). The late Dr. Don McCabe of Rutgers University developed the instrument for the International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI) to assess perceptions of academic integrity issues. While psychometric measures addressing reliability and validity were not readily available, this survey instrument has been used over the last 15 years at more than 200 schools, with over 250,000 student and faculty responses (ICAI, 2015). An expert review panel representing 12 higher education institutions established content validity for the instrument. The instrument assesses faculty views of academic integrity, how they perceive the climate of academic dishonesty, the prevalence of academic dishonesty, and addressing specific violations of academic integrity (ICAI, 2015).

This survey provided baseline information including perceived frequency, faculty response, and institutional support on academic misconduct prevention and academic integrity promotion in the community college from the faculty perspective. The survey contained 28 questions. While I did not obtain permission to include specific survey questions within the dissertation, the subject matter of the questions include the perceived severity of campus policies, knowledge of policies, perceived misconduct, frequency of actual misconduct, and willingness to address academic misconduct.

Mid-West Community College provided violation data including violations and resolutions for alleged academic misconduct over the past 13 years. Academic misconduct type, resolution, and date, frequency and academic program type summarizes the data.
The survey gathered baseline information on the attitudes, knowledge, and experiences faculty members had regarding academic integrity. Gathering baseline information is an important step in establishing an understanding of general perceptions and feelings of a phenomenon. The baseline information collected included, demographic information, perception of the academic environment, and, if and how faculty address academic misconduct. The survey findings provided a contextual description of academic integrity at the host institution using frequency data.

The survey was adapted based on the structure and organization of the host institution. This included changing the descriptions of faculty status, and adding the specific colleges found at the host institution. Following this adaptation, I received approval by the HSIRB of both the researcher’s and the host institutions.

**Survey Data and Analysis**

As a part of the survey, participants provided information on (a) types of interventions conducted by the institution, (b) the perception and prevalence of academic misconduct, (c) prevention of academic misconduct, and (d) integrity promotion. The number of respondents in the study made descriptive data especially important. I downloaded the data from Qualtrics to SPSS version 22. The data set was cleaned to remove identifying information such as IP addresses. I also compiled multiple responses to single questions into one variable where appropriate, and gave yes/no responses numerical values.

Following cleaning of the data set, I calculated descriptive statistics including mean, mode, median, and standard deviation, skewness, and kurtosis to present a picture of the institution and the perceptions of faculty addressing academic misconduct. I then
reviewed frequency data for every survey question. Frequency responses describe the bulk of survey questions. The survey consists of three sections, *Demographic Information, Academic Environment*, and *Specific Behaviors*.

**Demographic Information.** The survey included questions related to demographic information. This included gender, referred to as “sex” in the survey as male and female but renamed “gender” hereafter, academic rank, referred to as full and part-time faculty, and department, which referred to the academic departments that exist at Mid-West Community College.

There is a full representation of participation across academic departments, academic rank, and gender. On some level, there is respondent data from every sector of the faculty at Mid-West Community College. Faculty data on gender indicates higher numbers of female (59.3%) then male (40.7%) participants. More part – time faculty (67.9%) responded to the survey than full – time faculty (32.1%). All academic departments at the institution are represented, with health (21.2%) having the highest representation. Additional details on the table are in Chapter IV.

**Qualitative Responses and Analysis**

In all, 22 individual qualitative responses were captured related to what faculty felt could assist in integrity promotion and the prevention of academic dishonesty. The open-ended responses are with the remaining qualitative data analysis, semi-structured interviews.

After selecting interview questions that would align with my research questions, I reviewed interview questions using feedback from two faculty and two administrators. Prior to conducting the interviews, I researched and created interview questions using the
best practices of ICAI review documents and previous studies on academic integrity education. This pilot refined the interview process, to strengthen my role as the instrument, and to ensure a process that was as smooth as possible.

**Interview Questions.** There are three sets of interview questions, one for faculty, one for staff, and one for administrators. Questions focusing on faculty experiences with the current academic integrity policy of full and part-time faculty (Appendix D) were included in the interviews. The interview questions explore the type of engagement faculty have with preventing academic misconduct and promoting integrity. The interviews closed by asking participants the most important techniques to promote integrity and prevent academic misconduct on campus. I asked questions to identify role and understanding of the academic integrity policy, to examine engagement in academic misconduct prevention and academic integrity promotion, to offer a critique of the current policies, and to discuss perceptions of effective technique to educate students. I ended the interviews by asking participants the most important techniques to promote academic integrity and to prevent academic misconduct.

The second set of questions is for staff who work directly with academic integrity policy (Appendix E). This includes individuals who are involved with the management of the academic integrity process. This interview protocol includes questions about the academic integrity policy, the level of engagement for faculty and staff, and current issues in preventing academic misconduct and promoting integrity. These address the current state of the academic integrity policies and changes made in the last five years. The questions address academic misconduct and the opportunities available for campus
partners to participate in preventing academic misconduct and promoting integrity, and the questions address perceptions of effective techniques to educate students.

The third set of questions is for staff that work indirectly with academic integrity, but work directly with students in some capacity (Appendix F). These individuals have the opportunity to impact generally available opportunities and awareness of academic misconduct prevention and academic integrity promotion, but are not directly responsible for established outcomes. This list of questions aims to identify knowledge about the academic integrity policy, perception of opportunities to engage in academic misconduct prevention/integrity promotion initiatives, and the technique this group of staff believes is most useful in academic integrity education. Here, questions identify role and understanding of the academic integrity policy, questions examined engagement in academic misconduct prevention and academic integrity promotion, questions address the extent of personal responsibility staff feel to participate in the process, questions offered a critique of the current policies, and questions addressed perceptions of effective technique in educating students.

**Interview Data Collection.** Recordings and transcription captured the data. I, as the researcher, served as the sole interviewer. I conducted face – to - face interviews in one of two centrally located rooms in the Student Success Center at Mid-West Community College. Each room was equipped with a door capable of closing; blinds on the windows of each room provided some privacy. I excluded personal information from the interviews, and participants received pseudonyms using a web based auto name generator. These pseudonyms replaced any identifying information. I used a digital voice recorder to record interviews and computer software to manage the data files.
After transcribing three interviews, I used a professional transcription service to translate the remaining voice files into text documents. The transcripts are stored in a secure, locked file cabinet in an office owned and maintained by the researcher. I destroyed the audio transcripts after collecting the transcripts, reviewing them for accuracy, and confirming this review with each interview participant. Upon conclusion of the study, the data was stored on a Universal Serial Bus (USB) and transported from the host institution to WMU via the researcher. After erasing the USB, I placed the data on a secure server.

Saldaña (2012) suggested the use of analytic memos to organize and qualify thoughts on the emerging data. This reflective exercise captured my assumptions, surprises, challenges, and feelings throughout the process. This type of memoing provided added accountability in the form of a real time document, which summarizes my process from a personal and critical thinking perspective. This memo also serves as a place to outline concepts and definitions, which ultimately emerged into categories. During this time, similarities developed which assisted in the early organization of the interview data. These developments allowed me to organize the interview questions into categories. The categories were refined, and coded, ultimately organizing the data in Chapter IV.

**Qualitative Data Analysis.** I used a cyclical coding approach (Saldaña, 2012) for the qualitative data. Cyclical coding refers to repeated identification of patterns and categories. Examining the academic integrity program through the experiences of faculty and staff followed the epistemological tradition. In doing so, the research uncovered perception and practice. Saldaña identified several first round coding methods as
appropriate for this type of inquiry, including initial emergent coding (Saldaña, 2012). I used initial emergent coding in order to document initial impressions of the data as a response to the information presented. Following the review of interview notes, I wrote the first initial emergent coding by hand. Specifically after noting initial codes in a text document, I printed the transcripts and highlighted the codes in text as a visual aid. I organized the data by separating it into pieces by separating and organizing the highlighted text into categories. During this process of reading and rereading these pieces of text, I added and deleted codes. I rearranged and organized the text. Following several cycles of the initial coding, I used the research questions and literature review framing the study. This method, supported by Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw (1995) refers to the use of research questions to frame the collected data. Next, I searched for patterns, and contrasts based on the codes I had created. Yin (2009) describes this method as explanation building, by checking the data for its dissimilarity to existing research. I chose to use the research questions and literature review framework to provide boundaries given the complex perspectives and differing information I received. Doing so allowed me as the researcher to remove my preconceived notions as much as possible in order to focus of the perspectives and experiences of the participants. As I intended, I used the initial emergent data to begin framing a loose interpretation in a chronological, open coding process. Secondary coding confirmed the legitimacy of these categories, and the process continued until I reached a pattern of repetition. In line with guidance on coding methods, the analysis was complete when the results reflect an adequate representation of the institution and the faculty and staff within in it (Yin, 2009). This
coding, in conjunction with the analytic memos, provided a thorough picture of the interview data.

It was important to be sure that the representation of participants are accurate. Participants received a copy of their transcript for review, so that they could add or revise areas that they believed were not clear. This is referred to as member checking, which helps ensure the researcher has captured their perceptions in the manner they intended (Marshall & Rossman, 2014). This review helped to ensure that the interpretation of the transcripts reflect the intent, tone, and meaning of each participant. There were omissions that occurred because of this review. I edited the transcripts as necessary before proceeding.

**Themes.** Four themes emerged from the cyclical coding process. The first, *It’s on us: We are all responsible, personally and collectively, for understanding and promoting academic integrity.* This theme, represented as a sense of responsibility for faculty, staff, and students, individually and collaboratively, for academic integrity. The second theme, *Faculty set a tone of integrity with classroom management and curriculum design,* is defined by the sense of importance faculty, staff, and administrators place on the planning and cultivation of relationships between faculty and their students within the interviews. The third theme, *Faculty take personal approaches to academic integrity education,* emerged by the many individualized responses, driven by both discipline and prior experiences in preventing misconduct and promoting integrity present within the data. The fourth and final theme, *Lean times limit resources for academic integrity education,* is defined by a perceived loss of opportunity as budgets
decrease and responsibilities increase. A detailed discussion of the themes is included in Chapter IV.

Trustworthiness

To ensure trustworthiness, I focused on multiple methods to confirm study results. Lincoln and Guba (1985) identified four constructs necessary for a sound study: (a) credibility, (b) transferability, (c) dependability, and (d) confirmability. Credibility refers to the use of methodologies proven effective in related research. Survey research is the primary methodology for academic integrity research. The survey used in this study is a verified and replicated instrument used hundreds of times over a 25-year period (McCabe et al., 2012). Creation of the three sets of interview questions was completed following a review of the ICAI’s academic integrity assessment program, as well a significant review of literature spanning 50 years. In addition, my experience as a student conduct administrator, a review of the ICAI academic integrity assessment, and conversations with academic integrity administrators influence organization of the document analysis elements. Other techniques included member checking, which entailed reviewing the results of the interview with each participant to verify accuracy (Marshall & Rossman, 2014; Yin, 2009). Steps taken to provide credibility also included a thorough review of the literature, and a pilot study to refine interview questions. A thick, rich description of the phenomena through the description of the case aids in the credibility of the analysis (Creswell, 2013)

Transferability refers to the extent in which the study may provide insight for related research (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). My study is applicable within the parameters of the sample because the sample was purposeful with a specific subset in mind, the
faculty and staff of a typical Midwest community college. My study is only transferable if used as a guide to generate conversation rather than a prescribed experience of all community colleges. The results are comparative baseline information for institutions of similar size, type, structure, and policy.

The detailed overview of the methodology, links to literature, and specific research questions (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), provide dependability to the study. I followed a specific process with protocols for each element of the study. An in-depth description of the process as the study occurs, coupled with a clear reflection of the process will serve to ensure dependability.

Confirmability relates to a researcher’s ability to acknowledge inherent bias, beliefs, and assumptions (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Understanding my role as the researcher, as well as acknowledging my inherent feelings on academic integrity is necessary in order to move forward. As such, a reflection on my role as the researcher, and a breakdown of my experience in the field has been included. In addition, the data triangulation that will occur as a part of the case study will provide support or detraction from any identified themes, thus reducing research bias.

**Delimitations and Limitations of the Study**

My study is delimited to the experiences of the selected institution included in the study and cannot be generalized to other institutions. Variances in university policies, honor code systems, and university mission are examples of those factors that are uncontrollable in this study, making it impossible to draw broad conclusions. This study provides an introductory step from which other studies may offer additional site-specific
insights. Despite this, case study research describing a phenomenon through predominately-qualitative methods is not generalizable.

In reference to interviews, despite a desire to allow the research subjects to be as comfortable as possible, addressing dishonesty in the classroom and institution can be controversial, and may be perceived as judgmental. Marshall and Rossman (2014) argued that inherently, “interviewing has limitations dependent on trust” (p. 145). Several factors make trust challenging in this project. First, my role as researcher created a divide given my background and bias toward coordinated efforts to address academic honor. Secondly, as a student and former administrator not directly affiliated with the institution, I am not a peer or colleague, which may alter the answers to questions. As a result, interviewees may not answer as candidly as they might with someone they have had a long-standing relationship. These factors may have affected levels of comfort and the ability to be completely forthright (Marshall & Rossman, 2014).

The Researcher

As the researcher, I recognize my role as an instrument of data collection (Marshall & Rossman, 2014). Professionally, I have worked in the area of student conduct administration for six years. My experience also includes serving as an instructor for undergraduate and graduate students on a part-time basis. My experience working with faculty on issues of academic misconduct has led me to this area of research. Confronted by the realities of difficult process, time restraints, and the emotion of conflict, I have served as mediator and organizer for many proceedings. This perspective helped me to understand the complexities inherent in describing a process that many people are responsible for upholding. I believe that it is my role as an educator
to provide timely and appropriate resolutions to cases of academic dishonesty. This also informs my research in that standards for what is timely and appropriate are important for institutions to consider. In addition, in my roles in student conduct I was responsible for educating new faculty, staff, and students when appropriate. I believe that coordinated responses to academic misconduct serve to create a culture of honesty and integrity. I also believe that faculty do and should lead the expectation of academic honesty on campus.

I have a professional investment in educating students, faculty, and staff on best practices in academic integrity education. In order to create a case study that speaks to the realities of the community college rather than my own perspective, I have intentionally approached the study using a design bound by literature and research questions.

**Chapter III Summary**

This chapter provided an overview of the methodology used in this study, a partially mixed, concurrent, dominant status design (Johnson et al., 2007) which is conducted through an in-depth, single bounded case study (Creswell, 2013). Data included a survey distributed to all faculty, semi structured interviews, and document analysis. Methodological details include sampling, subjects, and access, instrumentation, data collection and data analysis procedures. In addition, reflections of research identity and a summary of limitations and delimitations conclude the chapter.
CHAPTER IV

Chapter I serves as an overview of the study describing the problem, defining the purpose of this research, and providing questions that guide the study. The chapter conceptualizes the idea of academic integrity education through a conceptual lens of academic misconduct prevention and academic integrity promotion, using theoretical frameworks guiding academic integrity practice today.

Chapter II synthesized the current literature on academic dishonesty and policies to prevent academic misconduct and promote student integrity. The chapter included trends and definitions of academic dishonesty, the prevalence of academic misconduct on campus, a history of policy and practice, modern policy and practice, modern issues affecting academic honor, and academic integrity in the community college context.

Chapter III provided an overview of the methodology used in this study, a partially mixed, concurrent, dominant status design (Johnson et al., 2007) which is conducted through an in-depth, single bounded case study (Creswell, 2013). Data for the study includes a survey distributed to all faculty, semi structured interviews, and document analysis. Methodological details include sampling, subjects, and access, instrumentation, data collection and data analysis procedures. In addition, reflections of research identity and a summary of limitations and delimitations conclude the chapter.

Chapter IV provides a review of the findings present in the case. An in-depth study into the perceptions of academic dishonesty by faculty and staff was beneficial to understanding academic integrity education as it relates to the policies and practices.
occurring within the institution. To do so, I conducted interviews with six faculty and four staff at a public community college, using an open-ended, semi-structured interview process. The type of data collected organizes the chapter by document analysis, survey data, and interview and qualitative data.

**Document Analysis**

In all, 28 documents were analyzed. The categories for analysis were document type, who the document is for, and who created the document. The type of document was either on the document itself, or in emails identifying the language or document. The director of the HSIRB at Mid-West Community College forwarded all email responses to me. The emails were responses to a direct request for handbook and policy materials. Only documents provided by the institution and/or those available via web search were included in the analysis. The primary audience was determined by specific language within the document, or inference (i.e., syllabi are created primarily for students). The creator of the document was determined through interviews and conversations with the senior administration team at Mid-West Community College.

**List of Documents**

Once the collection of the documents occurred, through online searches, electronic copies, and hard copies, I organized them by document type as illustrated in Table 4.1. This is to compare the document in context accurately. For example, a course syllabus for a major specific course addresses a different audience than a faculty handbook disseminated at orientation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Primary Audience</th>
<th>Creator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Integrity Policy (host institutions) (committee)</td>
<td>Students, Faculty</td>
<td>faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic integrity policy (transfer institutions) (committee)</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medical Services Handbook</td>
<td>Students, Faculty</td>
<td>EMS faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course syllabi (15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Technical Manufacturing Center</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Technology</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic Design</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Design</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Appreciation</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art-2 dimensional Design</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macroeconomics</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pocket Prof</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>faculty committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Catalog 09-10</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Catalog 10-11</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Catalog 11-12</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Catalog 12-13</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Catalog 13-14</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Catalog 14-15</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Catalog 15-16</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website Search words “Academic integrity”</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library website</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Handbook</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>faculty committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Handbook 10-11</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>faculty committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Handbook 15-16</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>faculty committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Course Catalog and Handbook Language.** There were several findings as a part of this analysis. First, I reviewed course catalogs from 2009-10, 2010-11, 2012-2013, 2013-14, and 2015-16. The *Academic Discipline Policy* is how matters of academic dishonesty resolved. A description of the policy is in the course catalog. The language for all course catalogs included the following:
Procedures in cases of academic integrity infractions will begin with the individual instructor who has reason to believe an incident has occurred. The instructor must first review the information and determine whether there is sufficient reason to proceed with the charge of academic integrity violation. If the instructor determines to proceed, the instructor must communicate, in writing, the charge to the student with a copy to the instructor’s chair or director. (*Mid-West Community College Course Catalogs, 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012, 2012-2013, 2013-2014, 2014-2015, 2015-2016*).

This language written above is the same in the faculty handbook. In 2009-10, the language went on to specifically outline the steps faculty and administrators should take, stating,

Penalties imposed by the instructor fall with-in the confines of the course, i.e., failure of the assignment, requirement of an alternate assignment, or failure of the course. Dismissal from the program or suspension from the College are actions outside of the instructor’s purview and must be dealt with by the appropriate department chair or director. (*Mid-West Community College Course Catalog, 2009*)

The language changed in the 2010-11 course catalog to eliminate specific language on the role of faculty in determining penalties. Instead, the course catalogs refer to the student handbook for additional information.

From 2009-10 to 2012-2013, the catalog language also included language using the terms *guilt* and *innocence as follows:*
If the student admits his or her guilt and accepts and completes the penalty prescribed by the instructor, the matter is resolved, and a copy of the incident report detailing the allegations, the student’s response, and the penalty must be sent to and filed with the appropriate chair or director and the Vice President for Student Services office…If the student maintains his or her innocence, the instructor will apply the penalty and refer the student to the appropriate chair or director who shall process the matter.

The 2013-14 to 2015-16 catalogs did not include this language. All course catalogs refer to a corresponding student handbook, which provides detailed information on the Academic Integrity Policy at the institution.

Student handbooks from 2011-12 and 2015-16 were available and permitted for me to use. Student handbooks from spring 2012 to spring 2014 were not available after several requests. As a result, there are only comparisons of the two handbooks.

Table 4.2  
Student Handbook Comparison Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Handbook Date</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Handbook language title</td>
<td>Policy on Academic Integrity, Academic Discipline Procedure</td>
<td>Academic Integrity Policy, Academic discipline procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitions</td>
<td>Cheating, Denying Access, Fabrication, Facilitating academic dishonesty, Plagiarism</td>
<td>Cheating, Denying Access, Fabrication, Facilitating academic dishonesty, Plagiarism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization and language</td>
<td>(2009-10) Course catalog language addressing responsibility</td>
<td>Bulleted list organized by student acceptance/denial of responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are academic integrity issues resolved?</td>
<td>Paragraph suggesting administrative actions by department chair or academic dean</td>
<td>Bulleted list with example Institutional resolutions and course resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are appeals resolved?</td>
<td>Appeal process conducted by the president with bulleted requirements for appeal</td>
<td>No “appeal” language present, instead “If the issue is not resolved.” Student may elect to meet with Academic Dean, if not resolved, the student may petition for a formal judicial board hearing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are clear differences in the language and organization of the two handbooks that were available to review. As outlined in Table 4.2, some of the differences included: (a) the use of bullets instead of paragraphs to outline academic integrity policy options, and, (b) changing language to focus on student behaviors rather than faculty action. The changes also include the elimination of appeal language, instead focusing on resolution language including the terms “resolved” and “not resolved.” The largest change appears with (c), the elimination of the President as an appeals officer. Instead, the final option is a judicial board hearing.

The text in the student handbooks provided insight into expectations of how issues of academic misconduct should be resolved. These include institutional sanctions of warnings, probation, suspension, and dismissal. Faculty receive suggested sanctions including “failure of the assignment, requirement of an alternate assignment, or failure of the course” (*Mid-West Community College Student Handbook*, 2016).

**Syllabus Language.** While reviewing academic integrity policy at Mid-West Community college, I found several documents outlining additional policy and position language. Several 4-year institutions have created agreements with Mid-West Community College to offer degree programs on site. These students take a blend of classes satisfying requirements from each institution’s course catalog. As a result, some of the courses from the other institutions offer additional policy statements on academic integrity. For example, one institution defines academic dishonesty: “Academic dishonesty is unethical behavior which in any way violates the standards of scholarly conduct…students are not excused from adherence to the policy even if they have not read it” (*Misty Creek University at Mid-West Community College*, 2016).
Another example includes the statement above, but adds on the following statement:

Willowbend University at Mid-West Community College expects its students to use resources with consideration for ethical concerns and legal restrictions. The principles of truth and honesty are recognized qualities of a scholar and of a competent, purposeful, and ethical individual… (Academic integrity) refers to the representation of one’s self and ones work honestly while demonstrating respect for the accomplishments and contributions of others. (Willowbend University at Mid-West Community College syllabus, 2016)

Here, you can see that the University’s policy and principles are included, and students enrolled in dual programs must abide by them.

Of the available sample syllabi, every syllabus contained language related to the academic integrity policy in some way. Of those available syllabi, six of the 15 syllabi (40%) used the same language found in the introductory paragraph, which is also in the course catalogs during 2009-2016, and in student handbooks to address academic misconduct. In all of these cases, the language follows a bolded heading including the words Policy Statements.

The remaining nine (60%) altered or added language addressing academic integrity. For example, the nursing department adds specific language regarding additional departmental requirements, such as clinical field experience hours, adding, “In addition, students are asked to obtain signatures and other verifying information to
document field hours and observational visits, etc.” (Mid- West Community College Nursing Program, 2016). The nursing program also outlines falsification of hours as an academic misconduct violation stating, “This includes falsifying observations and field experience hours where applicable” (Mid- West Community College Nursing Program, 2016).

The Social Sciences department also referenced field experience hours, providing a disclaimer that records may be examined for authenticity, noting “The instructor reserves the right to contact sites and parents to verify field experience hours” (Mid- West Community College Social Sciences Program, 2016).

In addition to the standard institutional language addressing academic integrity, the English department specifically addresses plagiarism in its syllabi language noting, “Plagiarism can take many forms including copying and pasting sources found on the Internet such as Wikipedia. Suggestion: whether or not a source has an identified author, credit it” (Mid-West Community College English Program, 2016). The Information and Technology Department also adds specific information on plagiarism stating in the sample syllabus I collected: “it is important, especially because this is a college course, that all thoughts and ideas (intellectual property) that you reference and present in your writings and designs for this course cite the originator(s) of these ideas. Just as you wouldn’t want anyone claiming your great ideas as their own, you shouldn’t do it to another” (Mid-West Community College Department of Information Technology, 2016).

As is evident by the examples, academic disciplines define form of academic integrity based on what is most appropriate for their programs. In another example, a syllabus addressed the copying of images. An Art syllabus included resubmitting a previous
assignment as plagiarism: “Using assignments from previous classes for current course projects is also unacceptable” (Mid-West Community College Art Department, 2016). An online web technologies course lead me to an online syllabus. In it, a faculty member linked the policy to a PDF version of the student handbook. In addition, the faculty member shared their own definition and philosophy, linking the syllabus to a personal website defining plagiarism and explaining expectations in detail.

Five syllabi (33%) outline specific consequences for violating the academic integrity policy including failing assignments, dismissal from the course, and receiving an automatic failing grade for the course. The student handbooks also outlines these consequences as example resolutions to academic misconduct. For example, an engineering technology syllabus described consequences in detail, stating, “Anyone found cheating on a quiz or test will be given a zero for that item they cheated on and a warning will be issued. If anyone is detected cheating a second time, they will be asked to leave the course with no credit” (Mid-West Community College Engineering Technology program, 2016). Beyond syllabus language, resource documents were also available.

**Resource Materials.** A group of faculty including one in information literacy, two in English composition, one in the institution’s technology learning center, and one in history designed a handbook called The Pocket Prof. This handbook focuses on effective writing techniques. Two pages of the handbook include language on academic honesty, specifically on avoiding plagiarism, providing examples of appropriate citations. The handbook also points out the nuance of appropriate paraphrasing through case study examples.
The handbook is available in selected classes, and all students checking out textbooks from the library receive it in the first semester. In addition, the handbook is available in the student services suite, a centrally located set of offices including services such as student life and academic advising. While specific numbers were not available, the assumption that all students in English composition classes and all students who check out books receive the manual suggests a sizable amount of the student population have received the handbook.

Online resources, such as the Mid-West Community College library resource website, provides links to several videos from other institutions describing paraphrasing and plagiarism. A frequently asked questions list is also included. An infographic addressing plagiarism and paraphrasing is included. The 2009-10 academic integrity policy language is included on the site as well. The excerpt of the language on the website has not changed since that time.

**Findings of Document Analysis**

My document analysis uncovered the following elements. Faculty receive sample syllabus language to introduce the policy and procedure. This boilerplate language describes academic integrity as an ethical requirement. In addition, the policy defines academic integrity as submitting work that is wholly one’s own. Syllabi that also reference the student handbook for information to the formal policy is included.

While most faculty use boilerplate language referring to the academic misconduct policy, some define misconduct and consequences for misconduct in specific ways. These policies are in addition to or they elaborate upon policies listed in the student code of conduct. In addition, each academic department has an opportunity to create a
statement inclusive of its needs, specifically concerning additional responsibilities such as reporting, observation, and/or requirements for handling misconduct. Faculty receive suggestions from departmental syllabi and the faculty handbook.

The *Mid-West Community College Faculty Handbook* provides guidance on many aspects of faculty life at the institution. As it relates to academic integrity, the language found in the course catalog is in the faculty handbook. I continued to look for additional information that would inform academic integrity policy at Mid-West Community College. While considering information on how technology is used, I came across a website for online education. The Office of Learning Technologies uses the same language for online students as it does its face-to-face counterparts, and, as a result, no additional information was available from this office.

The documents provided evidence of academic integrity promotion and academic misconduct prevention for faculty, staff, and students. While there are important differences in language and structure, it is also apparent that a shared message of policy language implemented at the institution. The documents reviewed also provide a context for the multiple audiences discussed within the study.

**Survey**

The quantitative *Academic Integrity Survey* item data is organized in three sections, *Demographic information*, defined as selected characteristics of the faculty group, *Academic Environment*, defined as the perceptions of academic misconduct within the institution, and *Specific Behaviors*, which addresses actual instances of academic misconduct. The survey included open-ended response data. I analyzed this data with
the remaining qualitative interview data collected during the study. All responses were anonymous.

**Demographic Information**

The survey included questions related to demographic information. This included gender, referred to as “sex” in the survey as male and female but renamed gender hereafter, academic rank, referred to as full and part-time faculty, and department, which referred to the academic departments that exist at Mid-West Community College. Table 4.3 depicts the Academic Integrity Survey respondent data.

Table 4.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Integrity Survey Respondent Demographics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Rank</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood and Teacher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Trades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math and Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As described in Chapter III, participation across academic departments, academic rank, and gender is present. On some level, there is respondent data from every sector of the faculty at Mid-West Community College. Faculty data represents a similar gender
breakdown of the institution, with female faculty (57%) and male faculty (43%) (Mid-West Community College Self Study, 2015). Faculty data is similar to the full and part-time faculty data where part-time faculty comprise the majority (75%) of faculty on campus. Full-time faculty (25%) make up the rest of the population (Mid-West Community College Self Study, 2015).

**Academic Environment**

The Academic Environment portion of the survey relates to questions about faculty knowledge of academic integrity policy and academic dishonesty at Mid-West Community College. First, I looked at what faculty felt they know about academic misconduct policies.

Descriptive statistics indicate that most faculty perceive the severity of penalties for academic misconduct to be average (51.8%) or high (21.4%). When asked about the average student’s understanding of academic misconduct policies, faculty selected average (35.7%) or low (28.6%). Faculty were most likely to select high (40%) or average (29%) when asked about faculty understanding of academic misconduct policies. In terms of effectiveness, faculty selected average (42.9%) or high (28.6%) most often.

**Campus Policy Knowledge.** Faculty have similar responses regarding the average student's understanding of campus policies concerning academic misconduct. Here, 39.3% of the participants find that students have a *very low or low* understanding of campus policies regarding academic dishonesty. Faculty reported that, overall, faculty have *high* or *very high* knowledge of campus policies regarding academic misconduct. The majority (52.3%) of the participants reported that faculty colleagues have a *high* to *very high* understanding of campus policies concerning academic misconduct. This
suggests that participants feel that they have an understanding of campus policies related to academic misconduct that is *high* or *very high*.

The survey also assessed perceptions of student and faculty support of academic integrity policy. Again, descriptive statistics explain the findings. Participants answered survey items related to the perceived support of policies. The majority (60.7%) of the participants described faculty support of policies as *high* or *very high*. There was no significance difference found when looking at student support of policies. The faculty, irrespective of faculty status or gender, have similar feelings about faculty and student support of the policies. Most faculty (59%) indicated that students maintain an average level of support for academic integrity policy at Mid-West Community College. The survey results also indicated that as a group faculty have *high* to *very high* perceptions of faculty support for academic integrity policies. Participants then identified the way that they received information on the academic integrity policy, referred to as a primary source.

Table 4.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Sources of Academic Integrity Policy Information</th>
<th>Frequency Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty handbook</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other faculty</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty orientation program</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University catalog</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans or other administrators</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus website</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have never really been informed</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicized results of judicial hearings</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The majority of respondents learn about the academic integrity policy using a faculty handbook ($f=32$). The next most common response was that faculty became aware of the academic integrity policy from other faculty ($f=24$). No ($f=0$) faculty reported learning about the policy from students. This indicates that the majority of the faculty identify training materials and/or peers as a primary source of academic integrity policy information.

Next, faculty selected how frequently they believe certain types of academic misconduct occur at Mid-West Community College. The items include plagiarism, group assignments, and cheating on exams. Participants selected from a scale including never, very seldom, seldom/sometimes, often, or very often. Table 4.5 presents the findings.

Table 4.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$f$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plagiarism on written assignments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very seldom</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom/Sometimes</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Often</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group Assignments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very seldom</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom/Sometimes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Often</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cheating on exams</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very seldom</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom/Sometimes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Often</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Over half (56.1%) of the faculty participants report that they think plagiarism occurs seldom or sometimes, with 29.8% of faculty reporting plagiarism as a behavior that occurs often or very often. On group assignments, 48.2% participants believe that academic dishonesty occurs. Of the participants, 37.5% of faculty believe that this misconduct occurs often or very often on campus. In terms of cheating on exams, 45.6% of faculty believe that cheating occurs seldom/sometimes. Here, 42.1% believe that cheating on exams occurs very seldom or never.

**Frequency of Academic Misconduct.** The survey included questions regarding instances of academic dishonesty. Within the survey, faculty could report what they would do in a clear-cut case of academic dishonesty occurred. Faculty participants chose from seven options, and participants could choose all options that applied. Table 4.6 highlights the faculty responses.

Table 4.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolutions</th>
<th>(f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Report student to your Chair, director, or dean</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Fail the student on the test or assignment</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Report student to the disciplinary dean for referral to disciplinary committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Require student to retake test/redo assignment</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Lower the student’s grade</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Fail the student for the course</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty chose *reporting a student to a Chair, director, or dean* most frequently \((f=36)\). Next frequently was the choice to *fail a student on the test or assignment* in
question \((f=33)\). The least likely response was to fail a student for the course \((f=5)\) in the event of academic misconduct.

**Specific Behaviors**

Survey questions addressing issues of specific examples of academic misconduct observed by faculty were included. Of survey participants, 60% of faculty reported they have personally seen academic misconduct at least once, with 41% of the group reported having observed dishonest behaviors more than once. When asked how they have addressed academic misconduct, slightly over half (52.6%) of faculty who have witnessed academic misconduct indicated that they have referred academic misconduct to a dean, a Chair, or someone else on campus. A low percentage 7.7% of faculty observed academic misconduct through online exams.

The survey listed 29 individual academically dishonest behaviors. Faculty selected how often they had witnessed these behaviors in the classroom. The options were never, once, more than once, and not relevant. The top three behaviors faculty reported witnessing in the classroom were paraphrasing or copying a few sentences from a book, magazine, or journal (49.1%), paraphrasing from an electronic source (48.1%), and copying word for word from any written source and turning it as your own work (38.9%).

**Perceived Severity of Behaviors.** Next, faculty marked responses based on perceived severity of the behavior for the same 29 individual academically dishonest behaviors. The response options were not cheating, trivial cheating, moderate cheating and serious cheating. Behaviors that were reported as not cheating included using a drug such as Adderall to enhance his/her ability to study (35.9%), submitting the same
paper in more than one course without permission (17.6%), and using a false or forged excuse to obtain an extension on a due date or delay taking an exam (1.9%). Selected behaviors that were reported as serious cheating were submitting a paper you purchased or obtained from a website and claimed it as your own work (98.1%), turning in work done by someone else (94%), and using electronic crib notes to cheat on a test or exam (92.4%).

How Students are Educated. Following the review of academically dishonest behaviors, faculty participants selected items describing how they educate students on academic integrity. There were four types of misconduct to choose from, and six options to address the behaviors. For this set of questions, participants could to check all that apply.

Table 4.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Misconduct and Responses to Misconduct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of misconduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plagiarism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabrication and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>falsification of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proper citation of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>references</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 4.7, the types of academic misconduct in this question were plagiarism, proper citation of references, permitted and prohibited collaboration, and fabrication and falsification of data. Choices for each behavior were the same for each type of academic misconduct; they were do not discuss, on individual assignments, on course syllabus, start of syllabus, other, and/or not relevant. The sixth option (not relevant), was not included in the analysis in order to focus on the actions of the participants, rather than the perceived relevance. In this section of the survey,
participants selected all educational opportunities that apply, therefore eliminating traditional assumptions regarding descriptive data. Proportions of responses provide an understanding of how faculty participants address academic misconduct. With regard to proportions of the responses regarding plagiarism, the most selected option was that faculty (N=53, f=42, p=.79) address the issue while reviewing the syllabus. For falsifying/fabricating research data (N=35, f=19, p=.34), permitted and prohibited group work (N=52, f=34, p=.65), and proper citation and referencing (N=46, f=28, p=.61). The frequency data indicate faculty are most likely to review expectations on individual assignments. Following a review of the survey data, I turned my attention to data provided by Mid-West Community College on academic misconduct violations.

Mid-West Community College Violation Data

Institutionally, there are formal reports of 177 cases from faculty in the last 13 years, and 119 of these were warnings. Other resolutions included probation, suspension, point deduction, zero/failed grade, required rewrite, removal from the program, and administrative withdrawal. Warnings are a formal administrative recognition that a violation has occurred (Mid-West Community College Student Handbook, 2015-16). In instances where a warning is outcome, there were no other indications of resolution, either educational or punitive in nature. This means that faculty agreed that the institutional response would be sufficient, without further academic resolution.

In conversations with academic integrity staff, reporting and recording has changed significantly over the past 13 years, with 45% of all recorded violations occurring after the 2011-12 academic integrity policy change (Cortell, 2016). The most
frequently selected response to academic integrity violations was *Warning*. No other recorded action is included in the *warning* outcome, either educational or punitive. According to the data, a student was required to resubmit an assignment once in the last 13 years. Of recorded resolutions, 21%, or 38 incidents resulted in a student receiving a zero for the assignment or failure from a course. Plagiarism (52.5%) was the most frequent violation followed by academic cheating (41.2%).

**Interview and Qualitative Data**

To discuss the themes in the context of the interviews and open-ended survey questions, the data is organized by a brief introduction to the participants, and then through the emergent themes. The following table summarizes information on the participants. The information gathered in *Table 4.7* includes data generated by the participants over the course of the interview. Following the initial participant data, the interview profiles and themes follow. The *Academic Integrity Survey* contained additional qualitative data. Participants in the faculty survey provided 22 unique responses to two open-ended survey questions. All responses were anonymous. I reviewed the interviews and open-ended survey questions together. Descriptions of the interview participants are in *Table 4.8* below.
Table 4.8

*Interview Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Pseudonym</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Academic Dept.</th>
<th>Policy experience</th>
<th>Methods of prevention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Abbott</td>
<td>Faculty (PT)</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Institutional policy development</td>
<td>Classroom management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Weil</td>
<td>Faculty/ (FT)</td>
<td>Emergency Medical Services</td>
<td>Departmental Development</td>
<td>Open book exams, group work, labs, licensing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Ferris</td>
<td>Faculty (PT)</td>
<td>Anatomy</td>
<td>K-12, instruction</td>
<td>Multiple copies of exams, boosting self confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Cortell</td>
<td>Senior Administrator</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Institutional policy Developer, Administrator</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Elliott</td>
<td>Institutional stakeholder</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Paul</td>
<td>Support Administrator</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Kipling</td>
<td>Faculty (PT)</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Course design, relationship building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Frair</td>
<td>Faculty (FT)</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Instructor, Resource Developer, Instructor</td>
<td>Online instruction, Collaboration, Course design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Galmacci</td>
<td>Faculty (FT)</td>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Field Standards, enforcement, honor pledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Laning</td>
<td>Faculty (FT)</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Course instruction, curriculum design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Interview Participants**

There were 10 participants interviewed for the study. The breakdown of these participants were two full-time faculty, three part-time faculty, two department chairs, two student services administrators, and one administrative support staff member in academic integrity administration. Seven of the participants have held previous positions at the institution providing additional perspective and depth to the interview data.

Participant information including position, department, and experience is included in the
interview profiles. The participant descriptions follow, using pseudonyms generated for the study.

**Dr. Abbott**

Dr. Abbott is currently serving as part-time faculty in psychology. Dr. Abbott has enjoyed a 25-year career as a member of the faculty at Mid-West Community College. During this time, Dr. Abbott served as a department chair and a full-time faculty member with Mid-West Community College. He is currently serving as part-time faculty in a social science department. Dr. Abbott teaches a discipline that is a core course for most degree-seeking students at Mid-West Community College. Previously, Dr. Abbott has served on a committee to change policy and process of academic integrity at Mid-West Community College.

**Dr. Weil**

Dr. Weil is a teaching department chair and division leader in the Emergency Medical Services department at the institution and has been at Mid-West Community College for over 20 years. He began working at the institution as a part-time faculty in 1988. In addition to his work within the organization, he has served as a practitioner at the state level in his field. As a result, Dr. Weil is in charge of testing and certification for a Mid-West state. This responsibility places a self-defined high level of integrity on him and his program, in the allied health field. Dr. Weil often linked his professional commitments to issues of integrity. Dr. Weil has created and edited a departmental handbook for students addressing issues of academic misconduct.
Dr. Ferris

Dr. Ferris is a part-time instructor in Anatomy. She has previous experience in both K-12 and college settings, and has taught at Mid-West Community College for the past four years at the main and satellite campuses. Dr. Ferris considers academic integrity to be an important part of the learning experience. Dr. Ferris teaches a class required for all students interested in allied health. She also teaches a required lab science offering for general education students. As a part-time instructor, Dr. Ferris was a late addition to the instructional staff for the 2015-16 academic years. Previously, she has taught for three years at the institution. Dr. Ferris participated in a half-day faculty orientation program years ago and became familiar with the academic integrity policy there.

Dr. Cortell

Dr. Cortell is a senior administrator at Mid-West Community College. She manages academic integrity on campus as one of her many roles. She was also instrumental in policy changes occurring in the last five years. Dr. Cortell has been at Mid-West Community College first as a student, then as an administrator. Previously, she worked in enrollment management and as the Dean of Student Services prior to her current appointment. She is a proud, lifelong resident of the area. Dr. Cortell oversees academic integrity reporting, presents at faculty orientation, and adjudicates formal cases of academic misconduct when necessary.

Ms. Eliot

Ms. Eliot is an administrative staff member at Mid-West Community College. Her role involves the administration of the academic integrity process. In her work, she typically receives electronic reports from faculty and department Chairs. From these
reports, she prepares summary letters for students outlining the details of the violation and the resolution. Ms. Eliot, in consult with Dr. Cortell, formally records violations and creates outcome letters based on the number of academic integrity violations a student has.

Ms. Paul

Ms. Paul is an administrator who works with students in the Student Services department. Her title is Dean of Student Services. Previously, Ms. Paul worked at Mid-West Community College in college admissions, student life, and as a director in student life and student advising. Her role currently includes the supervision of five functional areas. Ms. Paul receives reports of academic integrity when they include to behavioral or student concern issue she is managing.

Dr. Kipling

Dr. Kipling is a part-time faculty member in Communications and in Western Civilization, and has does so for 10 years. He teaches in three different topical areas, two of which are core courses for students. In addition, Dr. Kipling teaches a noncredit course in composition. He estimates that he has taught over 1,000 students. Dr. Kipling does not formally report issues of academic misconduct, but addresses them within his own classroom. Dr. Kipling’s previous experience includes part-time faculty positions at private, four-year liberal arts universities. Dr. Kipling often takes on teaching assignments at multiple institutions.

Dr. Frair

Dr. Frair has a full-time faculty appointment in at Mid-West Community College. She has been at the institution for approximately 5 years. The nature of her work often leads to providing information on academic integrity for students and faculty colleagues.
Dr. Frair holds a cross functional academic appointment, meaning her work spans most academic departments on campus. As a librarian, she teaches information literacy in addition to her other duties. Dr. Frair has collaborated with several faculty to promote information literacy and academic integrity through presentations and resource guides.

Dr. Galmacci

Dr. Galmacci is a recently named department chair in Criminal Justice. He has worked at the institution since 2001. First serving as a part-time instructor, Dr. Galmacci then became a full-time faculty member and academy director. During this time, he taught courses while also running a subsection of a larger department. Dr. Galmacci’s experience includes an academic curriculum with an honor code component. His department is maintains legal and ethical guidelines for the completion of coursework and within the workplace. As an administrator, he is aware of issues of academic misconduct within his department.

Dr. Laning

Dr. Laning is a full-time faculty member in Sociology. Dr. Laning has been a faculty member at the institution for five years. She has 18 years of teaching experience. At Mid-West Community College, Dr. Laning began as a part-time faculty member, and has been full-time for one year. She is the only non-tenured faculty member in the social sciences. She teaches courses that are a part of the college core, and her classes consist of first and second year students. Dr. Laning also teaches an upper level elective course, for student pursuing specific majors or interests. Prior to this, Dr. Laning taught at a four year, private institution with an honor code. In addition, Dr. Laning attended an
institution with an honor code during her own academic studies. Dr. Laning has gone through the formal process of reporting a violation of academic misconduct.

Themes

Adhering to the cyclical coding procedure outlined in Chapter III, four overarching themes emerged and follows the description of interview participants. These themes capture the perceptions of academic integrity education and policy at Mid-West Community College for faculty, staff, and administrators.

Description of the Themes

Theme one: It’s on us: We are all responsible, personally and collectively, for understanding and promoting academic integrity.

This theme describes the internalized and shared responsibility that participants demonstrated in addressing issues of academic misconduct, as well as in promoting academic integrity. All of the interview participants indicated that promoting academic integrity was a personal responsibility, and one they felt is common throughout the institution. All of the participants believe they have a role in understanding the policy and process, and in promoting academic integrity on campus.

Responsible for administering the academic integrity process, Dr. Cortell described her role in managing academic integrity violations. She described the trial and error of designing a process for reporting:

One of the things we are doing, we didn't get it in place for this semester, so it'll probably be for fall, is when we first built Retention Alert, we took all of the code of conduct, and each one was a separate type of report that you could do. That totally confuses people. They got tired of reading down through the list, and so (the misconduct report) it says, ‘Animal on campus’ (the first item on the drop
down list). We have shortened the list quite dramatically, and we'll roll that out probably in the next couple of months, making it just easier.

Beyond managing the reporting software, the interview data indicated that administrators feel responsible for teaching faculty about the policy in an effort to promote academic integrity policies on campus. Dr. Cortell described her responsibility in discussing the process with faculty.

You have to break it down by, is this classroom management? What's happening within the classroom? Is the chairperson involved in that? No, I can't just withdraw your student and get them out because you're uncomfortable. Then that's going back to the chairperson with some training.

Dr. Cortell described her experiences with part-time faculty challenged by the academic integrity policy, mentioning, “in particular, if it's an adjunct, sometimes adjuncts don't realize what they're signing on for. They used to believe they were going to come in and embark their knowledge on this group of just eagerly awaiting students.”

Other staff also described their perceived responsibilities sharing information on academic integrity. As Dean of Students, Ms. Paul described her role, as a point of contact for many faculty, and stated, “A faculty member might come to me and say, ‘I don't know what to do with this, help me out.’ I think it's difficult for them to know always where to go for what.” She explained that it was her responsibility to explain the reporting process to faculty as needed. A willingness to assist in reporting academic misconduct violations and preventing misconduct is something she and other participants revealed over the course of our conversations. This sense of responsibility extended to peers, colleagues, and students across the institution.
Ms. Paul described in detail who she felt was responsible for preventing academic dishonesty and promoting academic integrity.

Well, big picture I would say all college employees to some extent or a different extent have responsibility to help prevent it… Ultimately, prevention, while that sounds nice to say…how well do we or do we not do that? My next level would be faculty in the class coupled closely with other students.

While a sense responsibility was evident, the nuance of responsibility was more difficult to ascertain. Full-time faculty noted an expectation that their colleagues are responsible for academic integrity on campus. This was not as apparent in part-time faculty interviews. An overall sense of responsibility, and concern for academic integrity was apparent. Some faculty described the collective standards of academic departments by discipline. For example, Dr. Galmacci stated “the responsibility of managing academic integrity is one that I would say that we probably have a more conservative department. They're probably held to a standard and our instructors are pretty savvy … to make sure that they don't do that.”

Other faculty, such as Dr. Laning, described the importance of student education stating, “I try to understand from the perspective of students the issues of why it is they resort to that (academic misconduct).”

Full-time and part-time faculty indicated that they are solely responsible for managing academic integrity outside of an institutional process. Dr. Laning provided an example of this stating, “I believe it's up to the professor. I've never
been told otherwise.” Supporting this belief, Dr. Kipling described his view of
the formal policy:

(The policy) is meant to scare students, but is broad enough to enforce or not
to enforce. It doesn’t have a specific enforcement link to it. We don’t know
how enforcement works, it doesn’t say that there is a procedure to be
followed, it is just a general statement.

Perhaps due to this perception, some faculty have taken it upon themselves to
develop policies and practices within their own classrooms in order to promote
academic integrity and prevent academic misconduct. Over the course of the
interviews, this became clear on several occasions. Dr. Weil described the policy
he shared with his faculty in addressing issues of academic misconduct:

You educate them and make sure they know it’s not right and then move
on. If it happens again, now it’s a different situation, but right up until that
point, that’s not worthy of throwing them out of the program.

Dr. Weil considered the responsibility and necessity of academic integrity as he identified
the ramifications of academic dishonesty emerging in the workplace, inquiring, “You got
to look at that and say, ‘do I really want this person in people’s homes where they’re
going to have access to things they could really destroy the profession and really destroy
people’s lives’?” He went on to link the importance of academic integrity to the
discipline process in his department:

When we get into discipline for integrity issues, very often in that disciplinary
process, we talk about integrity and how, well, this might seem a very minor thing
to plagiarize, which somebody else wrote, would copy somebody else’s work and
call it your own. It’s very important, because what it says is you lack integrity
and that lack of integrity translates right up the food chain to, can I trust you to
practice? Ultimately, that’s where it comes down to so what you’re writing on is
an extremely important topic even though many would not see it that way.

For many interview participants, personal anecdotes of faculty supported the idea that
the participants felt a sense of responsibility by discipline, by profession, and by a
personal moral code. To exercise this responsibility within the classroom, both faculty
and staff believe that the responsibility lies with faculty in the context of classroom
management and curriculum design.

**Theme two: Faculty set a tone of integrity with classroom management and
 curriculum design**

All interview participants identified faculty as the most influential stakeholders in
preventing academic misconduct and promoting academic integrity. Faculty in particular
spoke confidently about the ways that course design and classroom expectations prevent
academic misconduct. Faculty participants indicated a confidence about classroom and
curricular strategies to share information on academic integrity, and to serve as tools in
academic misconduct prevention. For the faculty participants, early intervention was
important. One professor, Dr. Abbott, described what he does at the beginning of each
semester, stating, “Here is the college catalog, here is the handbook. Be familiar with
student rights and responsibilities.” Other faculty agreed with this method. Dr. Galmacci
shared his confidence in setting expectations in the beginning.

I would discuss that usually within the first two days of class when we'd go
over the syllabus, but I would also explain exactly what it means… all the
students, they know. If I go and talk to the intro class, I tell them. I say,
‘This is what I expect, and if you are going to lie, cheat, plagiarize, and it comes to my attention, don't think that you're going to get away with it. I set the tone in the beginning.’ Not to be a jerk, and I tell them like, ‘Listen, I'm not being a jerk, but I'm letting you know that this is your warning.’

Beyond setting early expectations, some faculty described the ways they prevent academic misconduct while in class. For example, Dr. Ferris has a policy of having students sit with one empty desk next to them. She walks the aisle, describing herself as “walking back and forth, taking notes away, saying, ‘I don’t want to see your cell phone, I don’t want to see your notes’…I barely sit at the desk, I’m up every ten minutes.” In situations where this seating arrangement is not possible, such as a lab, Dr. Ferris gives multiple copies of the same exam. She regularly designs multiple copies of exams to prevent academic dishonesty such as exam cheating. She noted that she purposefully assigns few papers, and believes that plagiarism does not come up due to this. A review of the open-ended survey responses also supported the use of course design and curriculum development in academic misconduct prevention and academic integrity promotion. An anonymous faculty member described a strategy for preventing academic misconduct, writing, “My course does not utilize exams/tests but rather final writing and presentation projects.” Yet another anonymous survey respondent echoed this statement, writing, “in my area, I allow use of the text during tests/quizzes with a time limit. That way, cheating isn't involved.”

Others also described the importance of designing assignments and course content. A department chair, Dr. Weil, described his use of partner work to allow student
to engage in real life scenarios and promote integrity. He described what he expects from the exchange, stating, “If I’m going to work with you, I need to know you have integrity as well. I need to be able to trust you and if I can’t trust you, I can’t work with you.” This response resonated with me. It is important for me to engage students in conversations around moral and ethical expectations is important as a student affairs professional. Faculty described encouraging students to look beyond memorization to engage in higher order learning. These perspectives emerged multiple times in the qualitative data. For example, a faculty survey respondent notes, “If there were better assignments, students wouldn't be able to plagiarize and it would be easier to see it along the way” (Anonymous, 2016). Dr. Laning, who described more specifically her techniques in creating assignments, echoes this:

I've made all of my exams open note, open book, and so that eliminated the cheating pressure from any sort of quiz or short answer in class kind of exam, so I don't really talk about it in terms of … I'm not really worried that students are going to have a cheat sheet in their hand or something, because they can have it out anyway, basically.

Dr. Laning also mentioned the work she does within the classroom, which limits the opportunities for students to choose academic dishonesty.

I do a lot of material in class, and so if you haven't been in my class, if you're just working with a textbook, if you're an outsider, you also won't be able to pass the assignment because you won't be familiar with the material.

Full- time and part – time faculty were confident that they design assignments that limit academic dishonesty. When asked, faculty went to great lengths to describe curriculum
design and classroom management strategies. Dr. Kipling, who was also very confident is his curriculum design, shared his methods in designing a presentation assignment, “Personalization of assignments helps prevent academic dishonesty. We encourage students to choose a topic they are very comfortable with and they know very well, so there is no need to engage in academic dishonesty.”

Some instructors provide open note, or open book testing. When asked for details, Dr. Abbott described her open note exam method, as he explained, “I allow them to use their book. I want them to use their book. It’s like good quality cheating, but usually they have to have read the book before to know where to go to find the answers.” Others choose a more formal route. As Dr. Laning explains, “Online classes, even here, have proctored exams. There is a person who will take their I.D., make sure they don’t have the book.” The testing and assessment center at Mid-West community college manages proctored exams on campus. The office is responsible for standardized tests and requires identification to complete exams, as per federal regulations (Mid-West Community College, 2016). Administrators supported this assertion, also noting the challenges that occur when faculty do not choose to address academic misconduct in these ways. In one example, Dr. Cortell discusses the challenges she faces when issues of academic integrity appear without set expectations:

It can be difficult to educate people that the process is educational in nature, and it's not first intended to be punitive. It's actually never intended to be punitive…(so expectations are important so) that we not merely take the student through a process without a dialog with the student, Those are very hard for me,
and I have to keep my judgment out of it, as well, and just go back in with, ‘What was your conversation with a student?’

The participants perceived numerous challenges; working independently to resolve instances of academic integrity, while relying on one another for full resolution of formal academic integrity violations. While administrators identified the need for faculty to set expectations and manage academic integrity within the classroom before an issue arises, faculty described the methods that work best for them.

Faculty identified specific requirements and techniques that aid in preventing academic misconduct and promoting academic integrity. Specific tailoring of course material to require critical thinking rather than rote memorization emerges as a preferred manner of course design. In addition, creating meaningful relationships with students using consistent classroom management techniques including proctoring exams, responding to perceived stress and disruption, and varying content delivery appear to set a tone, or create a sense of expectation for students within the classroom.

Faculty also identify instances where expectations are not appropriately set, as a result, academic misconduct may be difficult to enforce. In one instance, Dr. Galmacci described resolving a difficult case of academic misconduct after the incident, stating, “There’s a lot of effort into something that, in my opinion, could have been dealt with much better on the front-end.”

In a few instances, full-time faculty and department chairs discussed some frustrations with the way part-time faculty set classroom expectations. Noting the importance of setting expectations through course design, Dr. Laning described her experience using a colleague’s curriculum design:
I think I need to overhaul entirely my online class. Because this is the first time I've done it, I borrowed it from a (part-time) colleague who's taught it before and I'm using a lot of her assignments and stuff. I'm adding some of my own, but the core of it is her approach, and I think that her approach is just very easy to cheat, and I have not even actually pursued the plagiarism question because I'm sure that if I did it would be so rampant.

Dr. Galmacci also described this frustration, “the adjunct, in my opinion, was kind of timid. She wanted something done (about academic misconduct), but she didn't want to do anything.” To conclude, the second theme, Faculty set a tone of integrity with classroom management and curriculum design, emerges from the sense of importance faculty, staff, and administrators place on the planning and cultivation of relationships through course expectations between faculty and their students within the interviews. In interviewing the participants, it became apparent that the choices faculty make are often personal in nature, combining academic, personal preference, and moral perspectives to manage academic integrity within the classroom.

**Theme three: Faculty take personal approaches to academic integrity education**

The interview data revealed the individualized nature of academic integrity education at the institution. Faculty participants described in depth the methods they use to teach expectation of academic honesty in the classroom. A review of the qualitative data indicated that the faculty described the importance of academic integrity in very personal ways. These ways included professional affiliation, prior experience, self-preservation, and moral perspectives.
For many, the discipline with which they affiliate is a large part of how the approach the classroom, as a scholar practitioner. As a result, workplace practices, requirements, and scenarios inform the decisions they make within the classroom. Here, a description of academic integrity was in the context of a job requirement. For some faculty, the discipline they belong to may affect how students perceive them. Dr. Galmacci exemplified this when discussing the straightforward and direct personalities needed for law enforcement work. As a result, he depends on the professional experience of part-time faculty in his area to deal with issues independently.

When people don't like what's going on, our instructors have an ability to address the issue without coming to me all the time for me to deal with it. We are much more apt to do that, where I would say in other disciplines here they're not. They're not as, I'd not say stern, but more lax… I'm sure when Chris comes in (to the classroom) and she's a circuit court judge, and she's looking at him and they go over that, I know that that's a big thing. They know.

Beyond personality, academic disciplines have strict requirements that faculty feel strongly about adhering to. This emerged in several interviews. For example, Dr. Weil discussed the importance of integrity in EMT work:

We’re going into homes, in which things are exposed to us both legal and illegal. We’re going into homes, in which people have money out. They have valuable items. We’re dealing with very sensitive information regarding personal health…As they (students) conduct themselves through the education that’s when we learn more about them, in how they handle things.
Integrity within a profession also extends to integrity within an academic concentration. In reviewing the qualitative data, there were several mentions of the English department and a focus on honest writing emerged. “In my class, students are beginning to understand professional writing. When a sentence is not quoted properly, I bring it to their attention as early as I can so that they can learn what is and what is not plagiarism. They must change how they cite it or paraphrase it” (Anonymous, 2016). Staff supported the perception that English faculty take exception to issues of plagiarism. Dr. Cortell also referenced the violation data, explaining, “The discipline you probably saw in there the most often was English. That's almost offensive to them, the academic integrity side of it, where other areas it's maybe, maybe not.”

Beyond approaches informed by professional affiliations, faculty use their own personal philosophies to reach students enrolled in their course. This stood out in discussions with the faculty. It was clear that they viewed themselves as visible deterrents, motivators, support systems, and change agents when it comes to promoting academic integrity. It became apparent that confidence building was a tool promoting integrity. To do so, Dr. Ferris uses success tips, personal conversation, and motivational talks before exams. Dr. Ferris described an example of this:

One of the things I said to them before that first test was, hey, you've been working hard at this. Show me what great work you've already done. Which is to say, I know you've got greatness. You don't have to stoop to something that isn't so great to prove it. If you let them know that you believe what they're able to do, they're not going to want to slip back in how you perceive them or how they think you perceive them. I think that's a really big piece of it.
In another example, Dr. Abbott discusses his method for preventing cheating “So I’ll say we are going to have a test every week. A 4x6 card, typed. That has information that you want front and back. And you can use that as your cheat sheet.” He went on to describe the types of personal conversations he has with students who may be at risk of academic dishonesty.

You can cheat. (But) There is a price to be paid. (The student might say) ‘Who is going to stop me, a cop? You? Or me?’ ‘But what is the cost to your personal integrity? What does that (cheating) say about me? What does that say about you?’

Two faculty described approaches to prepare to address misconduct, ensuring they have all of the information they need to back up the allegation. Despite the confidence that faculty instill in students, academic misconduct occurs on campus. Personal experience and moral ideals affect faculty approaches to prevention and resolution of academic misconduct. In terms of previous experience, Dr. Weil described an incident where a student took a picture of answers to a state exam, a violation of state law. As a result, he created handbook language to address this issue. Dr. Weil describes the outcome:

I never thought somebody would be stupid enough to do something like that, but we now have that in our handbook and we have it not only for tests, but quizzes and we actually don’t just use the term, take a picture of, but reproduce in any way, shape or form. Now I never had to have that before. The student caused us to do that.

In one example, Dr. Laning described her perspective, as both a sociologist and an instructor in the community college setting:
I sort of wonder, well, what is going on in the larger culture where people have that approach, and when you think about it, people lie and cheat all the time and they get ahead, and particularly like a population at a community college where people (aren't) generally coming from layers of the population that are not getting ahead.

Here, and in other interviews, it is apparent that faculty interpretation of the policy may be at odds with the personal perspective of the faculty. In another instance, a faculty member admits that he would never formally report a student because of the potential impact it could have on his position. Dr. Kipling explained his position: “We are very much at risk, so it is very important that we solve the problem as soon as possible within the classroom.”

The notion that part-time faculty do not have as much influence as full-time faculty was also apparent in the interview data. Faculty mentioned increased “influence” as a full-time faculty member or department chair. As Dr. Galmacci notes, “Obviously I have more pull than any other adjunct on campus as an instructor.” Dr. Abbott described to the faculty union as a potential funding source for professional development on academic integrity. This is a resource not available to part-time faculty. Dr. Kipling elaborated on his perspective as a part-time faculty member more directly:

We have no tenure, we are viewed as independent contractors, and we don’t have relationships with administration. Typically, administrators don’t know if we have been effective instructors, all they know is there is an unhappy student. I don’t want to get administration involved. I won’t escalate these incidents to the administration.
Staff also grapple with the difficult choice to address academic misconduct for varying reasons. For some, balancing student retention and student outcome is challenging. In sympathizing with the student, Dr. Cortell described a response to the decision to suspend a student, stating, “The individual was just so absolutely blown away, they almost didn't come back to the community college. Four year engineering degree, and (as a result of the outcome) almost walked away from us.” The data shows a very personal influence in addressing academic misconduct. While not directly stated, several interviews suggested that faculty discuss issues of academic misconduct with others, but do not formally document them using the *Retention Manager* software. All faculty experienced academic misconduct as instructors in the classroom, but when asked, only two mentioned formally reporting the incident. Dr. Cortell confirmed this perspective, sharing, “a lot of faculty keep the academic integrity conversation within their own classroom, and they don't report it, and then we can't see the entire picture for a student, even within the class or among classes across the institution.”

These approaches also rely on personal perspective of policy. There are differences in the ways faculty perceive potential penalties for academic dishonesty. For example, Dr. Abbott described the penalties for academic misconduct on campus as severe, stating “The way they are laid out I think they are pretty severe. You can end up with a zero on an assignment or even fail a course.” Dr. Laning does not feel that the penalties are severe, based on her previous experience, shared her perspective:

I don't think that Mid-West Community College’s policy is all that rigorous based on that experience, I would say, because other schools I've taught at, well, the student would not be allowed to withdraw. They'd get a failing grade and there
would probably be a disciplinary hearing and they might even be required to withdraw from the college or something.

Of the faculty participants, several disclosed that they were not familiar with the academic integrity policy in a formal sense. As a result, they make independent decisions based on their experiences and opinions. For example, Dr. Abbott noted that despite serving on a committee to review the policy, he “can’t say I have looked at it word to word.” Dr. Laning explained she is not specifically familiar with the policy and process at Mid-West Community College. “I'm familiar with academic integrity overall in an institution, but I have not read word for word Mid-West Community College’s policy, and that has created certain challenges, actually.” Dr. Frair also shared “I know it's online because I have a link to it in my syllabus, but I actually haven't read it.” Students are also dependent on the personal interpretation of academic integrity.

Despite not reading the academic integrity policy, or being familiar with the handbook, in several instances, participants provided specific examples of the ways they interact with students when defining expectations, promoting academic integrity, or addressing alleged instances of academic misconduct. Faculty wanted to discuss the ways they handle academic integrity in the classroom. Some faculty rely on creating personal relationships with students. This includes getting to know the students and building trust from there. Faculty who make these inroads with students feel less likely to experience issues of academic misconduct in the classroom. Dr. Laning explained that she knows there are varieties of reasons why a student may struggle, stating, “I get frustrated with the cheating thing, but then on the other hand I try to be sympathetic.” She goes on to discuss the approach she takes in letting students know she understands:
With my students I usually, at the first class, emphasize that if they're facing a crisis of some sort, rather than do something dishonest, talk to me about what is happening and I might be able to make some sort of (adjustment).

Other faculty do not want to cause severe consequences for the students as well. Dr. Kipling described understanding how hard it is to present in the front of a class. If someone is very, very, nervous, and they stand up and read an article they found online. To a certain extent, I understand their predicament. I don’t have some draconian policy. So they will lose a lot of points, but I think that is enough. I wouldn’t want that to impact the test that they take, or the degree.

Faculty personally decide how serious or lenient approaches to academic misconduct should be without guidance from the policy, or in many cases, from academic departments.

To conclude, theme three, faculty take personal approaches to academic integrity education, defined by the many individualized responses, driven by academic and professional discipline, temperament, and prior experiences in preventing misconduct and promoting integrity present within the data emerged from the qualitative data. The lack of common understanding of policy and process is also apparent within this theme. There appear to be few opportunities to share and disseminate information. A closer review of the qualitative data presented a fourth theme relate to a lack of resources.

Theme four: Lean times limit resources for academic integrity education

The fourth and final theme emerged from a concept of limited resources. Faculty and administrators referred to lowered budgets, dwindling professional development
funds, and the elimination of detection tools. Everyone experiences the impact of budget cuts in some form. For department chairs, this often means that teaching and filling in if numbers of part-time faculty are low is common. Dr. Galmacci discussed this, and said, “If I can’t find somebody to teach something, I may end up teaching it.” Other department chairs echo this sentiment. For Dr. Weil, a lean staff affects classroom regulations, due to ratio requirements of instructors to students. Dr. Weil described the situation:

Just now as I was coming down here, it’s a minor thing, but we had an instructor just now that didn’t show up. They put us under a ratio and so I said, okay, if we’re only over by one student, I said, do the best you can for the next hour when I get back, I’ll jump in.

From the faculty perspective, in addition to increase teaching loads for full-time staff and administrators, curriculum changes in response to budget cuts have occurred as well. Dr. Frair described incorporating academic integrity into a model focused on student career pathways as “a way of restructuring the whole college to make it easy for students to be directed on a pathway instead of exploring whatever you want to do. That's (exploration) not useful anymore with funding the way it is.”

Full-time faculty have limited access to professional development funds. Dr. Abbott described the opportunities for full-time faculty, when he mentioned, “somebody might offer a presentation. The faculty union has monies that are provided by the administration so that faculty can get money for or be reimbursed for workshops like that.” Full-time faculty attend one half day orientation session per semester. These professional development funds are not open to the majority of faculty, who are part-time
at the institution. During this session, staff interviews revealed that less than one hour of presentation time is available to review all behavioral and academic policies for the institution. Staff interviews also indicated that part-time faculty do not attend these sessions and receive an online power point of the training for review. From the staff perspective, there is a sense that academic integrity is not a priority on campus, not because it is not important, but because there are so many competing priorities. Ms. Paul described this, stating, “Academic integrity is not; well we think it's important and we do our best. I think that's where we struggle, getting it to the top of the list.”

Professional development has dwindled due to budget cuts, and faculty feel the impact. For example, Dr. Frair described a working group who created online modules that were shelved due to a loss of funding and low faculty support. Funding cuts include resources for detecting academic misconduct, such as plagiarism detection by the institution. This is a concern for several faculty. Dr. Laning openly discussed the impact of the loss of detection software:

to me seemed to be a sign that it's not taken very seriously, because if it's incumbent upon the professor to be monitoring and then googling stuff, it doesn't relieve the burden … It's already burdensome to deal with a plagiarism incident, and to not have a resource that is readily available that could help at least deal with the basics of discovering a problem seems to me to say you don't have a very serious attitude towards it.

The interviews also revealed that in the absence of detection software, new part-time faculty might not be aware of tools to assist in addressing academic misconduct. An
open-ended survey participant responded, “I am not sure many adjuncts know there are tools and software that can help identify cheating.”

Aside from budget constraints, faculty feel that they take on high numbers of courses and have no time, and no peer or institutional support for additional initiatives. Some faculty shared frustrations that they do not feel supported in their efforts to promote academic misconduct, and have no recourse. Dr. Frair states, “for the most part I feel pretty frustrated that it’s just me doing these things. I feel there are tools that they could have with embedding this (academic integrity education).” This perception was confirmed through open-ended survey data. One respondent described some of the tools that would assist in addressing academic integrity.

We need adequate computers and software to create our exams in a way that questions can be mixed up but still be tracked by statistical analysis for validity. The paper and pencil testing is an outdated methodology and does not prepare our students for how they will take their boards. This method will help minimize cheating too.

In another example, Dr. Frair suggests that staffing and offering a first year experience course could be helpful, stating, “What would be so helpful is a first-year experience class. Tons of research has gone in and shown that that just helps so much with all of these different things, so that would be a way to embed these things (academic integrity) throughout the curriculum.”

Faculty and staff described themselves in positions requiring them to take on additional work when compared to years past. In addition, as funding and accreditation precipitate specialized attention to certain educational competencies, these
responsibilities and priorities do not include academic integrity. The perceived lack or resources extend beyond money and time. Some participants also described dwindling support from faculty colleagues to collaborate on academic integrity initiatives. For example, some full and part-time faculty suggest that there is limited support from the institution and faculty colleagues to look more carefully at issues of academic dishonesty. For example, Dr. Frair shared,

   I had (presented in) a sociology class where the instructor was just like, “Forget responding because they don't care. You shouldn't even bother.” I'm like, “Okay.” (sarcasm) Since I've got all of these students, I'm like, I can write them off, but yeah, so that's been good, but it is so labor intensive that I think I'm going to have to set limits as to how many classes I'm going to be embedded in and how that happens.

From the staff perspective, the consensus is that resources are very limited, and they do the best with what they have. An example of this is the retention management software. Staff interviews revealed that the software documents anything that may have an impact on retention. As Dr. Cortell explains,

   we used it for so many things that the system that it wasn't intended for, because your counseling contacts are in there, you're advising those for on their progress reports for students, and any code of conduct retention alert cases on there. As a result, the system is cumbersome to some staff, who concede that faculty may have trouble navigating the system. Despite the limited resources, the staff feel that they provide information on academic integrity and that everyone should be equipped and aware of policy and procedure. To that end, they feel that some of the resources that are
free go unused by faculty. For example, Ms. Paul noted that policy and process information should be easy to understand for all faculty and staff, stating, “It’s in emails….it's brought up at chairs and directors meetings, different departmental meetings. It's their choice not to take in that information.”

Staff and faculty appear to have differing perspectives on handling academic misconduct in a time of limited financial support.

To conclude, theme four, Lean times limit resources for academic integrity education is defined by the perceived shift in support for initiatives related to academic integrity. Specifically, budget cuts have affected professional development funds and faculty detection resources. Many faculty feel that they have large course loads and volunteering to participate in separate initiatives on academic integrity would be burdensome. Some faculty feel frustration with the reluctance of faculty colleague participation. Part-time faculty appear to receive the fewest resources of all, the experience limited orientation and do not receive professional development opportunities. Staff also perceive limited resources as a concern, but suggest that they have adapted to provide as much policy and procedure information as possible given institutional priorities. Table 4.9 presents all of the themes by faculty group, while Table 4.10 presents all of the themes by administrative group.
Table 4.9: Breakdown of Themes by Position for Full and Part-Time Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Full-time faculty</th>
<th>Part-time faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme one: It’s on us: We are all responsible, personally and collectively, for understanding and promoting academic integrity.</strong></td>
<td>We are responsible for academic integrity in the classroom.</td>
<td>We are responsible for academic integrity in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme two: Faculty set a tone of integrity with classroom management and curriculum design</strong></td>
<td>We prevent misconduct and promote integrity through classroom management and curriculum design.</td>
<td>We prevent misconduct and promote integrity through classroom management and curriculum design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme three: Faculty take personal approaches to academic integrity education</strong></td>
<td>We take personal approaches to addressing academic integrity using professional and personal experiences.</td>
<td>We take personal approaches to addressing academic integrity using professional and personal experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme four: Lean times limit resources for academic integrity education</strong></td>
<td>We have some resources, but they are limited/</td>
<td>We do not have resources to address academic misconduct.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.10: Breakdown of Themes by Position for Department Chairs and Academic Integrity Administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Department Chairs</th>
<th>Academic Integrity Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme one: It’s on us: We are all responsible, personally and collectively, for understanding and promoting academic integrity.</td>
<td>We are responsible in the classroom (when we teach) and for our faculty.</td>
<td>We are responsible for bookkeeping, reporting, and discussing, but faculty are responsible for promoting integrity/preventing dishonesty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme two: Faculty set a tone of integrity with classroom management and curriculum design</td>
<td>Faculty are responsible for setting a tone of integrity. We create guidelines for faculty to follow in the classroom.</td>
<td>Faculty are responsible for setting a tone of integrity and should be setting expectations in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme three: Faculty take personal approaches to academic integrity education</td>
<td>Our perspectives on how academic integrity is handled influence faculty approaches. As instructors, we also bring in our own personal style.</td>
<td>Faculty take personalizes approaches to academic integrity education. This presents challenges in equitable outcomes for violations of academic integrity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme four: Lean times limit resources for academic integrity education</td>
<td>There are few resources available to address academic misconduct.</td>
<td>We attempt to do as much as possible given our limited resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V

Chapter I serves as an overview of the study describing the problem, defining the purpose of this research, and providing questions that guide the study. The purpose of this study is to address the gap in community college academic integrity education within one Mid-Western community college, as perceived by faculty and staff. The chapter conceptualizes the idea of academic integrity education through a conceptual lens of academic misconduct prevention and academic integrity promotion, using theoretical frameworks guiding academic integrity practice today.

Chapter II elaborates and synthesizes the current literature on academic dishonesty and policies to prevent academic integrity and promote student integrity. The chapter included trends and definitions of academic dishonesty, the prevalence of academic misconduct on campus, a history of policy and practice, modern policy and practice, modern issues affecting academic honor, and academic integrity in the community college context.

Chapter III provided an overview of the methodology used in this study, a partially mixed, concurrent, dominant status design (Johnson et al., 2007) which is conducted through an in-depth, single bounded case study (Creswell, 2013). Data for the study includes a document analysis, survey distributed to all faculty, semi structured interviews. Methodological details include sampling, subjects, and access, instrumentation, data collection and data analysis procedures. In addition, reflections of research identity and a summary of limitations and delimitations conclude the chapter.

Chapter IV provided a review of the findings present in the case. An in-depth study into the perceptions of academic dishonesty by faculty and staff was beneficial to
understanding academic integrity education as it relates to the policies and practices occurring within the institution. An open-ended, semi-structured interview process was used to conduct interviews with faculty and staff at a public community college in the Mid-West. The type of data collected, document analysis, survey data, interview data, and open-ended question data organizes the findings for Chapter IV.

Following the findings presented in Chapter IV, Chapter V uses these findings to describe the case, to interpret the findings through the lens of the researcher, ultimately triangulating the data. Doing so provides a thick, rich description of the case, explaining the purpose and outcome of the case informed by the data and experienced by the researcher. A narrative format organizes the description of the data and describing the case. As previously stated, the purpose of this study is to address the gap in community college academic integrity research by examining the components of academic integrity education within one Mid-Western community college, as perceived by faculty and staff. This description provides a summary of the findings in sum using data sets from Chapter IV.

**Description of the Case**

Compiling previous data, Mid-West Community College is a rurally located institution of approximately 5800 students (Mid-West Community College, 2016). There are between 315-410 faculty employees. The majority (75%) of these faculty are full-time (Cortell, 2016). Faculty teach courses in four institutional locations, including a military installation, in a Mid-West state. When compared to literature on Community Colleges, Mid-West Community College is a “typical” community college in size and scope.
The institution is a close-knit, active community. I define close-knit as a collegial community where face-to-face interactions are commonplace. The interviews indicated that many, if not most, faculty and staff know each other. There is a commitment to workforce development as seen by the partnership with exists with local industry. These signage within the institution displays these partnerships. Course catalogs and the institutions website also list these partnerships. These characteristics often represent the mission of the community college at stated in the literature.

Mid-West Community College is an institution similar to many all over the United States, committed to the community, while growing and changing to increase enrollment. This institution educates professionals that live and work as neighbors, desiring a thriving and prosperous community. Students hope to receive degrees and certificates that help to enrich and support the areas where they live and raise families. An embedded culture of trust exists throughout the case. Mid-West Community College is a place where individuals come and stay. The majority of individuals I interviewed had worked at the institution for at least five years, with several having been there for over 15 years. I recognized a sense of commitment to the institution, and to each other.

Mid-West Community College has expanded opportunities for enrollment, providing online courses and even reaching out to international audiences. This is not surprising. Many community colleges are looking for ways to address lower enrollments (Chen, 2016). Mid-West Community College has seen a 9.8% decline in the last 5 years (Mid-West Community College Board of Trustee meeting minutes, 2016). The institution had altered other policies as well, adopting a revised academic integrity policy in 2011-2012 academic years. In three of the interviews I conducted, I learned that the institution
developed a social campaign focused on personal identity in an effort to increase student engagement on campus. This is a current campaign. The campaign asks students to develop and determine a legacy, at the institution and beyond.

**Academic Integrity Policy at Mid-West Community College**

Mid-West Community College has long had an academic integrity policy; administrators recall the policy being the same as it has been since the 1990’s; however, process changes occurred in 2004 and again in 2011. The process in 2004 was adapted to create a more defined process. At the time, the change represented an opportunity to document incidents of academic misconduct in a centralized way. An additional reason was to afford due process for students, that, according to the Vice President for Student and Community Services, was important from a student learning and risk management perspective. Students should understand their rights and responsibilities as a member of an academic community; likewise, an academic integrity process may serve as a contract in matters of academic misconduct. To accomplish this, the senior leader for student and community services revised the policy to include an outlined appeals process. Senior administration consulted with the national leaders and contracted legal counsel representing Mid-West Community College (Cortell, 2016; NCHERM, 2016). This group ultimately revised the process. Included in this change was the elimination of the Dean of Student Services addressing academic misconduct violations. The Vice President of Student and Community Services describes the revised process; she noted, “the process in 2004 included the dean of student services, which it had not in the past. You had an office outside of instruction actually handling the penalties outside of a course, and handling the process outside of the course.” In interviewing the Vice
President, I interpreted the statement to mean that faculty had little control over what happened with regard to resolving incidents of academic integrity.

The change in process aligned with a decision to provide faculty with a greater role in addressing academic misconduct. The Vice President for Student and Community Services explains,

I think it was by the time it went into the handbook, was clarifying the process a bit more as far as faculty, what they do within their course is their decision, but we have a system software where we can report (centralized documentation) now.

Changes to the policy in 2011-2012, were to provide faculty with additional autonomy and to reflect greater transparency for students and faculty involved in the process. The faculty requested a clear directive in addressing academic misconduct. The Vice President of Student and Community Services explained that her predecessor focused on building relationships with the faculty. Part of this relationship was to change the way faculty language in academic discipline language. While faculty did not express current or prior dissatisfaction in their interviews, a desire for more autonomy and clearer policy was evident.

Documents such as syllabi, course catalogs, and student and faculty handbooks provide information on academic integrity at the institution. The 2004 language in the student handbook was a specific directive to faculty with little room for interpretation. The documents were both specific and rigid in language. Comparing and contrasting documents over a five-year period allowed me to gain a better picture of the changes made in the language. Overall, the policy remains largely the same. The organization of
the policy and procedure has changed, focusing more on student responsibility. The new language removes faculty directives in favor or examples of consequences faculty may impose.

The practice of reporting has changed to include formal documentation and a software system called *Retention Alert*. Several individuals referred to the system in interviews. The system records almost any event that could affect student retention, including behavioral concerns such as academic integrity. According to staff and administrator interviews, they explain the process to faculty, and, while some faculty use it, others prefer word of mouth and face-to-face interactions. This was also confirmed by the faculty interviews. The administration makes every effort to promote the system.

Despite the promotion of the system, there are few reports of academic misconduct when compared to survey data indicating that most faculty have witnessed academic misconduct in a classroom at Mid-West Community College. According to the academic misconduct violation data, from 2002-2005, there were no documented cases of academic misconduct. From 2005 to 2010, there were 28 cases, 12 of which were in 2007. While there was no event or reason identified for the small increase in cases in 2007 there is opinion that an updated reporting system played a role in the increase. According to one of the interviews, the overall increase in reporting was because of a new reporting system.

Survey data indicates that the majority of faculty participants know that academic misconduct occurs, and that they see it in the classroom. There are differences in the data between what faculty believe occurs, what faculty experience in the classroom, what faculty personally address, and what faculty formally report. The information gathered
suggests that individualized responses to academic misconduct occur often, and without formal documentation.

The following diagram illustrates the academic discipline process at Mid-West Community College.

Figure 6: Academic Discipline Process

The steps of the formal academic discipline process are as follows: According to institutional policy, Faculty should address instances of academic misconduct with a department chair and then directly with the student. The faculty member presents information supporting the allegation, submitting to the department chair, who speaks with the academic dean. Following this consultation, an academic resolution is offered to the student. Academic resolutions include but are not limited to warnings, grade adjustments, and required resubmissions, failure of the course, dismissal from the course, or dismissal from the program within the students’ course or academic department are
potential outcomes. The student responds to the allegation. Following this, the reporting faculty member is no longer involved in the process. If the student admits responsibility, the resolution is final and the case is complete. Student services then administers a sanction based on the number of times a student has violated the policy, and/or perceived severity of the sanction. There are four outcomes: Warning, Probation, Suspension, and Dismissal.

If the student does not admit responsibility, the department Chair who will attempt a resolution hears the case. If the student accepts, the academic and institutional resolutions will finalize the case. If student continues to deny responsibility, the Academic Dean, who will hear the matter and attempt a resolution, hears the case. If the issue is not resolved, the student may submit a written request to for a hearing through a judicial board at the institution.

There were no training documents on academic integrity standards for judicial board members, however, a judicial board that according to the (2016) Mid-West Community College Student Handbook consists of three staff and two students at Mid-West Community College.

The reporting faculty member enters the details of the incident, into a shared information system known as Retention Manager. From this system, students receive a form letter via certified mail acknowledging the violation(s) and the resolution. Faculty receive a copy through campus mail. Records of the resolution are maintained in an excel spreadsheet compiled by an academic integrity staff person. Students may withdraw from a course prior to a case being resolved if the withdrawal date falls within the guidelines. Students are required to sign a letter indicating responsibility, and that
they agree to accept the sanctions listed. If a student chooses not to participate, a decision on academic and institutional outcomes may occur in absentia.

In this structure, only two cases have reached the level of a judicial board hearing (appeal level) in the last thirteen years. Learning this increased my curiosity about the faculty and staff perspective of the case because conversations with administrators at the institution lead me to believe that many incidents go unreported. This suggests that many cases are resolved without formal documentation.

**Policy Language.** The current policy remains in informational materials today. The policy change coincided with the adoption of the online reporting software, *Retention Alert.* This software is a relationship management database encompassing most aspects of the student and academic life at the institution. The Vice President of Student and Community Services explained that the system provided faculty with an electronic method of notifying the institution when dealing with an issue of academic misconduct. The current statement framing the academic integrity policy reads as follows:

> Ethical conduct is the obligation of every member of the Mid-West Community College community. Breaches of academic integrity constitute serious breaches of ethical conduct. Academic integrity requires that all academic work be wholly the product of an identified individual or individuals. This policy demonstrates the College’s concern for academic integrity and guarantees a fair procedure for handling these concerns. (*Mid-West Community College Student Handbook, 2016*)
The policy addresses and defines specific behaviors of academic dishonesty: *cheating, denying others access to material, fabrication, facilitation,* and *plagiarism*. In cases of alleged academic misconduct, the language framing the disciplinary procedure reads as follows:

Procedures in cases of academic integrity infractions will begin with the individual instructor who has reason to believe an incident has occurred. The instructor must first review the information and determine whether there is sufficient reason to proceed with the charge of academic integrity violation. If the instructor determines to proceed, they must communicate, in writing, the charge to the student with a copy to the instructor’s Chair or director. *(Mid-West Community College Student Handbook, 2016)*

Students charged with a violation of academic integrity receive a letter addressing the accusation. At that time, students receive standard due process to respond to the allegation by admitting or denying responsibility. Due process includes the student’s ability to appeal the complaint of misconduct at various levels.

Beyond the policy language, students and faculty receive information on the academic integrity policy through the syllabus, resource documents, and interviews.

**Academic Integrity Policy Dissemination and Resources**

The institution provides information to students and faculty on academic integrity in several ways. First, the student and faculty handbooks are the primary mode of communication. Survey data that indicates most faculty participation gained knowledge on the academic integrity policy through the faculty handbook supports this. Course syllabi also reference the policy throughout the institution. Department Chairs encourage
all faculty to include language acknowledging the academic integrity policy on the syllabus. Faculty orientation sessions occur twice a year. These sessions are dedicated to faculty meeting and planning sessions. These half-day sessions are open to full-time faculty. According to faculty interviews, these sessions provide the Student Services office less than one hour to discuss all student services on campus, including resolutions for academic misconduct.

Student handbooks are provided to all students according to interview data. The handbooks contain the academic integrity policy in detail. Students are responsible for the written policy. The course catalog and course syllabus language also reference the policy listed in the student handbook. Some students did receive supplemental resources. For example, students who check out a book in the library receive a writing guide known on campus as *The Pocket Prof*, a small, blue, 60-page composition handbook. This handbook was designed as a supplemental guide to the Mid-West Community College writing initiative, a faculty collaboration focused on “creating an engaging and exciting culture of writing, reflection, revision, and assessment” (*The Pocket Prof*, 2016). *The Pocket Prof* contains writing tips that address issues of plagiarism and appropriate citations. This book focuses on effective writing, and describes plagiarism, paraphrasing, and synthesis. Outside of the listed resources, the majority of conversations dealing with academic integrity occur within in the classroom. This is important as faculty at the institution identify plagiarism as the most common form of academic misconduct.

Mid-West Community College has chosen to eliminate a traditional fall orientation session. The Vice President of Student and Community services explains,
As you know with orientation, you can put so much into orientation, and after a few minutes, they hear, ‘Nah nah nah, nah nah.’ We did make a shift this year. We actually moved traditional orientation away from before students began their first semester. We've moved it to the end of their first semester. This shift is to allow students to ask questions after they have experienced some time on campus. Prior to this shift, academic integrity was not a standalone topic presented at student orientation. While international students attend Mid-West Community College and are recruited (Mid-West Community College, 2016), academic integrity education has not been presented for this population. The interviews indicate that there are not enough international students on campus to warrant the resources necessary to provide academic integrity education for this population.

Beyond written materials, the institution offers plagiarism and information literacy modules addressing the issue for individual classrooms through the library and English Composition courses. One librarian offers these modules as a resource to faculty who request her services. In spring 2016, the librarian shared with me that she visited eight courses, and designed an online module for two additional courses. The modules offer face-to-face, and in some instances, online instruction. Interested faculty may consult with the library to have these modules included as a part of course design.

In terms of professional development, orientation sessions for full-time and part-time faculty include academic integrity as one of many topics in a half-day session. Academic administrators explain to faculty that they should use a standardized language detailing the policy, processes and potential consequences within the course syllabus.
Part-time faculty are not eligible for professional development funding; this is a benefit reserved for full-time faculty through a faculty committee. Faculty describe the committee and the funding decisions “as a fair way to distribute available funds” (Mid-West Community College, 2016).

There is a sense that faculty are invested. They have a personal responsibility to promote academic integrity and prevent academic dishonesty. The faculty also expect their peers to feel the same way. Faculty wanted to talk about academic integrity. Dr. Abbott and Dr. Frair recalled years past where interested faculty would propose a topic of interest and hold a small working group. Some faculty I spoke with indicated that the small working groups no longer exist, citing financial and time resources as barriers for continued professional development in the area of academic integrity. Academic integrity is not a federal mandate, and there is little perceived urgency to create opportunities for academic integrity education. There does appear to be strong institutional support for college level writing, but a reluctance to bring the campus community together to promote integrity. The sample syllabus language shows that faculty note the importance of the policy, and alludes to the policy.

**Academic Integrity in Practice**

Academic integrity is resolved at the discretion of the faculty and to a lesser extent, through the department Chairs and academic deans of the institution. The policy sets an expectation that reports of academic misconduct occur when issues arise. In practice, there is confusion about what notification entails. While a standard is set to notify department Chairs, this occurs at varying levels. Some faculty address issues with the department Chair, while others choose to leave violations unreported. There are also
differences between department Chairs. Some choose to handle violations through their own departments or units, while others have an expectation of formal reporting. Examples of these differences occur in the variances within syllabi language between departments. Some departments add language specifically addressing a particular violation, or listing information specific to their academic program.

Student education on academic integrity policies beyond the syllabus includes the handbook, writing guides, online library resources, curriculum design, and classroom management. There is no student group promoting academic integrity. Students are not required or asked to hold each other accountable.

Prior to 2011, the policy did not contain a clearly defined due process procedure. In order to formally report an instance of academic misconduct prior to the 2011-12 school years, faculty would submit a hard copy documentation of the incident to a central office through interoffice mail. Specifically, students did not have a written method of appealing an academic misconduct violation. After this time, the faculty member would address the incident with the student, document the interaction using Retention Manager, and submit the final paperwork through interoffice mail.

The Vice President of Student and Community Services discussed her thoughts on this personalization after compiling this list:

I thought about the fact that a lot of faculty keep the academic integrity conversation within their own classroom, and they don't report it, and then we can't see the entire picture for a student, even within the class or among classes across the institution. I have had some faculty who thought they could manage this at the beginning of a semester, and then it's midway
through the semester when they finally come and say, "I got ten cases." (I respond,) "But you haven't submitted any to me yet, so now you're going to submit one."

Interviews with the faculty suggested that many actions involving academic integrity are decentralized, not mandated, and do not include formal recordkeeping. Senior administrative staff described the informal nature of response to academic misconduct. Dr. Cortell explained, “I don’t know what they do, and they don’t necessarily share.” Dr. Cortell went on to elaborate on how the decision to change the process to a more faculty centered process, sharing, “with empowering faculty, there can be a definite line between academics and student services. Whether you have personal power within individuals or positional power over individuals, but power between the two divisions is a bit difficult.”

From a faculty perspective, some felt that communication was decentralized. While recalling an instance of academic misconduct, Dr. Galmacci, a recently promoted department chair described his frustration with a student alleged to have multiple complaints of academic misconduct as a faculty member, as he stated “it was happening here, and everywhere else (on campus). Same excuses, but nobody (none of the faculty) knew.” Academic integrity staff noted that faculty receive a copy of the outcome letter that the student receives. The staff also explained that academic integrity staff maintain a record of reported violations. Faculty do not receive information on previous academic integrity violations.
if a violation is reported and recorded in their office, faculty become aware of previous violations by virtue of an outcome letter sent to the student and copied to the faculty member alleging the behavior.

Perhaps more so than formal procedures, faculty understand the important role they play in the classroom and see classroom management curriculum design as effective tools as instructors, and a champions of academic integrity. This aligns with theme one, It’s on us: We are all responsible, personally and collectively, for understanding and promoting academic integrity that emerged from the interview data. Personalizing coursework to require context and synthesis was of great importance. Personal relationships and knowledge of student behaviors in the classroom were also important as well.

There is no documented or anecdotal focus on academic integrity in online education at this institution. In terms of technological tools, the institution used to have a subscription to turnitin.com but no longer has a subscription to the detection software. There have been attempts to use technology to educate students on academic integrity. Concerned faculty designed online modules addressing academic misconduct, but the interviews suggest that some faculty colleagues seem to lack interest. This was suggested because the modules were not used often (Laning, 2016), and the project was ended. A group of six faculty, from English composition, history, manufacturing trades, and information literacy, designed the online modules. Despite their efforts, Dr. Laning described the project in an interview as “a failure of electronic proportions.” A lack of participation, funding, and changing goals ultimately ended the project. Given the decline in participation, the institution would not financially support the trainings and
module upkeep. As this was occurring, an innovative way of advising and directing students became an institutional focus, lessening academic integrity education as a priority on campus. This incident is an example of limited resources in time, money, and interest, as summarized in theme four of the interviews: *Lean times limit resources for academic integrity education.*

Ultimately the way that the faculty address academic integrity education varies, relying on professional experiences and personal feelings on the topic. Theme three, *Faculty take personal approaches to academic integrity education,* which emerged in interview analysis, was made evident here. While reviewing the syllabi, it was evident that a number of faculty made choices to use, alter, or add to the standard academic integrity policy language. These factors affect the choice to formally report academic misconduct, changing the information with colleagues who may be future instructors of the same students. The majority of the participants do not formally report, although there are indicators that conversations within academic departments do occur.

The frequency of academic misconduct and the formal reporting shared with the administration do not aligned. Most faculty participants indicate perceiving and experiencing academic misconduct. The institution has few formal reports on violations of academic integrity. Interviews indicate that for some faculty, the penalties for academic misconduct are strict, and could negatively affect the student through outcomes such a failure or dismissal. Theme two, *Faculty set a tone of integrity with classroom management and curriculum design* emerges here. Despite a relative lack of reporting, faculty indicate in both the survey and the interviews that they address academic misconduct in some way.
Most consider addressing the issues of academic misconduct in more informal, instead choosing to remind students to put items away, noting places where paraphrasing may have led to plagiarism, or having conversations off of the record. Even with participants who decide not to pursue formal recording of academic misconduct, there is a desire to teach students how to be successful. Faculty internalize this expectation as seen in Theme one, *It’s on us: We are all responsible, personally and collectively, for understanding and promoting academic integrity.* For some faculty, Academic integrity is a moral imperative. Dr. Weil, a department chair described his perspective and his charge as he stated; “Integrity is everything. It’s not a minor thing. You have to understand, we’re trusting these people with other individual’s lives… There’s just so much that we could cause damage to and so integrity becomes absolute.”

**Case Summary**

Mid-West Community College is an institution that represents a typical community college in the United States in size, academic offerings, faculty gender balance, and percentages of full and part-time faculty (Cohen et al., 2014). Faculty, staff, and administrators at the institution are aware that academic misconduct occurs on campus and that academic integrity is important. Despite the introduction of new reporting software, faculty do not regularly use a common reporting structure, often relying on undocumented and informal solutions to academic integrity violations. These informal decisions do not relay to faculty colleagues, sometimes presenting challenges as students move through the institution. Faculty understand the impact that they make in the classroom on student learning, and devise personal and professional strategies to address academic misconduct and promote academic integrity. At times, multiple factors
confound the decision to address academic integrity. In most cases, there is no request for students to be involved in promoting academic integrity. Some of the challenges for faculty include limited budgets, increased responsibilities, and a perceived lack of support.

**Implications of the Case**

This case represents a complex interpretation of polices and a decentralized academic integrity policy. The case is important not only in what it represents as a policy with varying degrees of adherence, but for the innovation that goes unshared as it relates to student learning.

There are many opportunities for Mid-West Community College and similar institutions based on this study. There are champions of academic integrity using their own approaches to managing misconduct and promoting academic integrity. These dedicated faculty and staff are committed to student success. Faculty at the institution act independently, and, with few exceptions, do not often share or collaborate in efforts to promote academic integrity.

There are disconnects in the communication between faculty, academic administration, and the formal reporting system. Most faculty report sharing information with an administrator, however, these reports are either internal or nonexistent. Understanding the messaging Academic Deans and Department Chairs give to the faculty is of utmost importance.

Mid-West Community College does not formally include students in integrity promotion. This is a missed opportunity for the institution. From policy changes, to
technological interfaces, to advertising policy, students can promote social learning and represent the best intentions of any institution promoting academic integrity.

The challenges for Mid-West Community College and others include a lack of resources. Faculty indicate a desire for tools such as turnitin.com, professional development opportunities, or lower course loads for quality programming. An additional challenge is urgency. Bertram Gallant (2008, 2012) asserts that the path to academic integrity institutionalization starts with an inciting incident. Waiting to address the needs of an academic integrity education program exposes the flaws in both the system and the process, and takes much longer to resolve. Consider the cases of Harvard (2015), the University of North Carolina (2015), and Rockland Community College (2012). All have revised polices because of scandal, rather than as a proactive solution to a policy at risk.
CHAPTER VI

The purpose of this study is to address the gap in community college academic integrity research by examining the components of academic integrity education within one Mid-Western community college, as perceived by faculty and staff.

Chapter I serves as an overview of the study describing the problem, defining the purpose of this research, and providing questions that guide the study. The chapter conceptualizes the idea of academic integrity education through a conceptual lens of academic misconduct prevention and academic integrity promotion, using theoretical frameworks guiding academic integrity practice today.

Chapter II synthesized the current literature on academic dishonesty and policies to prevent academic misconduct and promote student integrity. The chapter included trends and definitions of academic dishonesty, the prevalence of academic misconduct on campus, a history of policy and practice, modern policy and practice, modern issues affecting academic honor, and academic integrity in the community college context. Chapter III provided an overview of the methodology used in this study, a partially mixed, concurrent, dominant status design (Johnson et al., 2007) which is conducted through an in-depth, single bounded case study (Creswell, 2013). Data for the study includes a survey distributed to all faculty, semi structured interviews, and document analysis. Methods included details such as sampling, subjects, and access, instrumentation, data collection and data analysis procedures. In addition, reflections of research identity and a summary of limitations and delimitations conclude the chapter.
Chapter IV provides a review of the findings present in the case. An in-depth study into the perceptions of academic dishonesty by faculty and staff was beneficial to understanding academic integrity education as it relates to the policies and practices occurring within the institution. This includes interviews of six faculty and four staff at a public community college using an open-ended, semi-structured interview process.

Chapter V is a description of the case as it unfolded, combining the results of data analysis for each of the methods used in the study. Chapter VI provides an overview of the problem statement and statement of purpose. The implications of the research connect to the purpose, the significance of the study, and to the existing literature and theoretical base. The implications of the research findings and conclusions provide additional information. Recommendations for the practical applications of the study conclude the chapter.

**Discussion of Findings**

To discuss the findings, the research questions serve as a guideline. This section presents conclusions for each of the research questions. In this study, a document analysis, *Academic Integrity Survey*, and semi structured interviews captured the components of academic integrity education at a Mid-West Community College.

The reviewed documents offered additional insight into the academic integrity process and policy at the host institution. They are the written proof of what students, faculty, and staff receive regarding academic integrity education. The documents indicate that course catalogs, handbooks, and syllabus language address academic integrity. At least two reference sites provide reinforcement. It became apparent that in order to understand the policy and procedure for academic misconduct, faculty and
students must reference at least two to three documents based on the document analysis. In addition, resources containing the information do not often link electronically. Instead, page numbers are included for reference. While looking across multiple documents over a five-year period, edits to the policy and process language provide clarity. Reorganization, such as using bullet points, explains the process for students who are addressing academic integrity allegations. Moreover, the language has also changed to be more inclusive of faculty decision making in the last five years. The procedure language indicates a shift from a more formal resolution to one with increased faculty involvement and departmental support. The documents show little to no indication of specialized programs for academic misconduct prevention and academic integrity promotion.

The analysis shows that faculty identify and communicate the unique nuances that academic integrity has in the classroom. In response, several faculty have addressed specific types of behaviors in an effort to provide expectations for students and prevent academic misconduct. In addition, the documents represent a sense that consequences are an important element of educating students on academic misconduct with all documents linking to language that alludes to a punitive resolution.

These documents are evidence of academic integrity promotion and academic misconduct prevention information over a five-year period of information for faculty, staff, and students. While there are important differences in language and structure, it is also apparent that a shared message of policy language existed in some form at the institution. The documents reviewed also provide a context for the multiple audiences discussed within the study.
Data from the *Academic Integrity Survey* provides a baseline description of faculty knowledge of policy, beliefs about misconduct, and what, if any initiatives prevent or resolve academic misconduct. These findings provide context to additional data points within the study. Faculty recognize their peer group to be knowledgeable about institutional policy. Data also indicate that faculty perceive students as less knowledgeable of academic integrity policy. When considering the ways faculty learn about the policy, most faculty selected the faculty handbook as the primary source of information around academic integrity. The findings also suggest that faculty are aware that academic misconduct occurs on campus. More than half of faculty indicate experiencing academic misconduct in their own classrooms. This recognition is important when having conversations around academic misconduct and the promotion of academic integrity. It is apparent that the majority of faculty feel that they address academic misconduct on campus. Findings from this survey suggest that Mid-West Community College faculty witnessed plagiarism as the most frequent occurrence of academic misconduct. This finding supports most literature in academic integrity education identifying plagiarism in particular as a frequent occurrence. It also supports the reported violations that show plagiarism as most frequently addressed form of academic misconduct (Stone et al., 2009). In terms of resolution, faculty are most likely to report academic misconduct to a department head, and least likely to fail a student without doing so. Most importantly, the findings indicate that faculty are more likely to educate students on issues of academic misconduct directly rather than choose a punitive outcome. Given this assertion, further exploration to understand what occurs with
departmental communication around academic integrity in comparison to formal reporting using Mid-West Community College’s own written policy is important.

The interview data captured the experiences of the faculty, staff, and administration at Mid-West Community College, and provided valuable information in understanding policy interpretation on campus. Most participants have experience with issues of academic misconduct on some level. There are clear indicators that rules are in place regarding syllabus language; however, the choices to prevent academic misconduct and promote academic integrity vary greatly. This variance provides a complex picture of faculty autonomy, student understanding, and institutional collaboration that is most easily defined through the lived experiences of the institutional stakeholders who experience this on a daily basis.

The interviews paint a picture of confidence in understanding academic integrity on campus, a frustration with resources and perceived support, and a willingness to help students learn. Participants largely describe a small, welcoming environment with certain limitations, including professional development, opportunities to collaborate, funding, and time.

Despite the fact that faculty and staff share the belief that students receive the information they need to prevent academic misconduct and promote academic honesty, the data suggests that little to no collaboration ensures that this happens. Faculty autonomy and a lack of information sharing allows for a wide range of efforts addressing academic integrity education. While some faculty and staff choose to highlight examples of misconduct, others rely on the institutional language and a student’s sense of right and wrong. Some rely on a student’s choice of program to inspire honesty and integrity.
It is also important to note that the interviews, more than anything, highlight some of the differences in perspective throughout the institution. The participant responses indicate that academic integrity is an important skill that students need to be successful, and that they are willing to work with students to reach their potential. Faculty, staff, and senior administration find academic integrity to be important, but the way that they respond to promoting integrity and preventing dishonesty varies greatly. For most, the method does not include the formal reporting and/or recording of instances of academic misconduct.

To understand the totality of the data, a review of the research questions provides a cohesive review of the case. A review of the data found over the course of the study first answers each research question. A comparison or contrast to related literature explains the findings. In explaining the findings, it is important to note that the vast majority of the literature on academic integrity is based on the study of four-year institutions. Given this, issues that affect the community college, such as the: (a) larger part-time populations of faculty and students; (b) the highly diverse, nontraditional student environment; and (c) workforce orientation of the institutions (Cohen et al., 2014) are not included as factors in most academic integrity studies. Therefore, the best practices appropriate for four-year institutions may not be the same for two-year institutions, as found in Boehm et al., (2009).

Research Question 1

To answer research question one, *What are the strategies used in one community college to equip their faculty with institutional programs and policies to promote academic integrity and reduce academic dishonesty, and how have these strategies*
changed over the past five years? I reviewed how the data responds to the research question, while also comparing the findings to best practices found in the literature reviewed in Chapter II.

Mid-West Community College uses some of best practices supported in the literature. The first is having a written academic integrity policy. The institution has a written policy that is included in a variety of documents for faculty and staff audiences. Aaron (1992) found that 20.9% of community colleges maintained specific guidelines for handling academic misconduct. In the same study, Aaron (1992) found only 9.1% of community colleges had specific academic integrity literature outside of the student handbook. While it is reasonable to assume these numbers have certainly increased, to date I have not found a project that provides an updated number. Similar to Aaron’s findings, Mid-West Community College does not provide literature outside of the student handbook. In fact, all material refers to the student handbook, including the resource guide. At first glance, this suggests that common language is used. Further reflection reveals that given the number of individuals who have not read the policy, faculty and students do not share a common policy language. Staff indicate high levels of policy knowledge and understanding despite not ever reading the institutional policy.

Other best practices taken from literature of four-year institutions include common syllabus language, a centralized reporting structure, and an appeal process for students (McCabe, 2005c). As with the syllabus language, comparing this case to related literature uncovers differences in approaches. There are several other missing or unidentified best practices in academic integrity, including providing specific examples of infractions (McCabe & Pavela, 1994); providing training for faculty and students
(Bretag, 2014). Literature specifically addressing community colleges includes interventions such as dedicated professional development for all faculty, notations on transcripts; and assigned collaboration on homework (Boehm, Justice, & Weeks, 2009). These were not found over the course of the study.

There are indications that far fewer reports of cases of academic misconduct at both the department and institutional level at Mid-West Community College. Faculty at Mid-West Community College indicated that they follow up on academic misconduct issues, with the majority of faculty (63.2%) indicating that misconduct is reported to a department chair, institutional leader, or both. Given the low number of reported plagiarism violations (N=119) over a 13-year period, it is clear that the faculty at Mid-West Community College rarely report instances of plagiarism. The frequency of academic misconduct as reported in the survey and the interviews, and the formal reports of violation data at the institution indicate conflicting information. Based on the survey data, the conflicting information suggested that faculty address issues of academic misconduct themselves, rather than formally reporting them. This finding supports research suggesting that faculty address academic misconduct without using a formalized process. For example, the research of Robinson-Zañartu et al. (2005) found that only 31% of faculty choose to pursue plagiarism through a formal process.

There were several best practices found in the literature that did not surface at Mid-West Community College during this study. For example, a relevant study on community college finds transcript notations to be an important tool in preventing academic misconduct and promoting academic integrity (Boehm et al., 2009). This does not occur at the institution. Students are not included in academic integrity promotion in
an intentional way, another practice that may prevent academic misconduct (Hensley, 2013; Sweeney et al., 2015). There are no initiatives geared toward specialized populations such as international students or online learners. Another important concern is the varying definitions of academic integrity policy on campus. Within the interviews, responses varied from no knowledge of the policy, to referencing documents that were not the actual policy. Limited resources for faculty, as described in theme four, _Lean times limit resources for academic integrity education_ is a concern. The elimination of plagiarism detection software as a cost saving measure is dangerous, and removes a tool full–time and part–time faculty could use to save time and provide documentation of academic misconduct. Faculty need resources to aid in naming policy violations. This observation aligns with the survey, which found participants had difficulty articulating where they learned about the academic integrity policy, selecting items that do not exist at the institution. As a result, there is no way to prove that resolutions to issues of academic misconduct are fair and equitable, an issue that Gerdeman (2000) finds to be important in community college academic integrity administration.

Despite the relatively small size of the institution and the relational nature of faculty, the decentralized structure of the academic integrity process limits the integration of educationally purposeful sanctions beyond grade changes in the event of academic integrity violations. Course catalogs and student handbooks on academic integrity and academic discipline do not offer institutional outcomes with activity based educational components. Instead, language referring to guilt or innocence remained in institutional documents until 2012-2013. Academic warnings, probation, suspension, and expulsion are standard responses to academic misconduct. These outcomes are not in alignment
with best practices in the literature that include grade notation, curriculum development, and classroom design (Boehm et al., 2009).

There is conflicting information in this study as to the level of support the institution provides for academic integrity education. The data suggests that much of the innovation and continued education is due to personally and professionally motivated faculty and staff committed to academic integrity rather than specific institutional action. Literature that states that academic integrity interventions rely on standards of a specific academic discipline, experience, and personal definition of academic integrity (Bellows, 1994; Bretag, 2016) support this claim.

In terms of institutional support, participants mentioned limited resources in both the open-ended survey data and the interviews, as they relate to detection programs such as Turnitin.com. Limitations on professional development, especially for part-time faculty were present. Institutionally, limitations were also frequently mentioned, namely with staffing, the quality or functionality of current software, and conferences or paid trainings. Interestingly, Efforts that are low-to no-cost are included as best practice interventions to prevent misconduct and promote integrity. These include grade notations, and common language, opportunities also found in previous studies (Boehm et al., 2009). Despite the perception that resources affect institutional efforts to address academic misconduct, there are indicators that individual departments have varying levels of cohesion and success in preventing academic misconduct and promoting academic integrity.

Faculty recognize the importance of promoting academic honesty, as well as the importance of preventing academic misconduct in the classroom. The desire to
personalize coursework and integrate discipline-based expectations was evident throughout the data. These individuals make efforts to consult with each other; however, this consultation relies on one-on-one relationships rather than institutionalized efforts. While faculty at Mid-West Community College rely on close bonds and a long institutional memory, those who are new, or not as embedded in the life of the institution find themselves on the outside looking in. There seem to be low levels of institutional strategy, illustrated by the small amount of time provided to address the topic during educational sessions, low levels of participation in activities about academic integrity, and little to no funding to support prevention strategies. Overall, the institution’s strategy focuses on the faculty role in preventing academic misconduct and promoting academic integrity without providing a great deal of assistance to all faculty.

Faculty orientation sessions appear to be a standardized way to present information to full-time faculty. However, faculty note that these sessions are limited and cover a wide variety of material. Online sessions appear to be available to full and part-time faculty. Despite this, the findings conflict as to whether or not these sessions provide information on academic integrity or not.

Part-time faculty, in particular, are excluded from opportunities such as professional development and formalized orientation. Given that the majority of faculty at the institution are part-time, this means that most faculty do not participate in a face-to-face formal orientation. This decision puts part-time faculty at a disadvantage when addressing academic misconduct, an issue described by Kezar and Bernstein (2016) including low levels of engagement and investment in contingent faculty.
Additionally, the use of Retention Alert software indicates an institutional commitment to activities focused on retention. Academic misconduct in some ways represents a threat to student retention, and appears to be resolved in ways that will retain students. The shift to Retention Alert has allowed Mid-West Community College to better understand academic misconduct in some ways. This institution has doubled reports of academic misconduct when compared to previous years. While differences in reporting make up for some of the findings, the creation of an electronic process may have to increased reporting over the past five years.

Literature on faculty responsiveness (Coren, 2011; McCabe & Pavela, 2004; Robinson-Zañartu et al., 2005; Roig, 2001) supports the findings that a lack of formal reported academic misconduct suggests that faculty prefer to handle academic misconduct face-to-face. In contrast to the literature, the faculty I spoke with knew the requirements for syllabi language and included a reference to the policy in the syllabus, despite not necessarily being familiar with the policies themselves. The expectation that faculty use standard syllabus language is a policy that faculty recognize.

This perspective can alternatively pose risks. The elimination of institutional use of turnitin.com, reductions in professional development funds, and perceptions that academic integrity is not a priority may provide the message that academic integrity is not valued on campus. Messaging is important; survey results indicate that faculty learn the policy from other faculty, only second to reading and copying the required syllabus language. The last formal hearing occurred three years ago, and there are no training sessions for academic integrity boards. This indicates that there are few examples of formal misconduct resolution. A switch to decentralize the bulk of academic integrity
resolutions makes it difficult to assess strategies at an institutional level. Faculty feel the decentralization, and as a result, are more inclined to make decisions independently without regard to institutional equity. This finding aligns with previous research that shows faculty independently address academic misconduct (Ritter, 1993; Robinson-Zañartu et al., 2005; Singh & Bennington, 2012).

One of the most impactful things that has occurred is the move to Retention Alert as a data collection method. As an institution, Mid-West Community College now has recordkeeping software. An increase in violation data does coincide with the new reporting method. If efforts to refine the application continue, faculty will have an opportunity to leave detailed notes as a reference for the institution in addressing academic misconduct, or for selecting educational topics. While the presence of the software presents a strategy and opportunity, the challenges to faculty users limit the use and value of the software, a finding supported by previous literature.

**Research Question 2**

To answer research question two, *How does a community college encourage students to participate in promoting academic integrity and reducing academic dishonesty?* I first reviewed how the data responds to the research question. I then compared the findings to best practices found in the literature reviewed in Chapter II.

To do this, I considered institutional efforts in academic integrity education. The data in this study did not present evidence that staff request that students participate in promoting academic integrity or reducing academic honesty. Students are not involved in the formal process unless they are responding to an allegation. No training has occurred for the boards in recent memory, despite a requirement that student
representatives serve on a judicial board for academic integrity. In addition, no academic integrity board has convened in recent memory. It is important to note that most community colleges do not have standalone academic integrity offices (Bleeker, 2007). Qualitative data suggests that a lack of time and resources as indicated in theme four, *Lean times limit resources for academic integrity education*, affect student engagement. Survey data indicate that faculty participants most likely perceive students’ knowledge of the policies as average (35.7%) or low (28.6%). Within the interviews, several faculty questioned whether students know what academic integrity consists of, but none of the participants used examples of successful students to educate others.

Over the course of this case study, I did not observe or hear of any formal efforts to include students in institutional education around academic integrity. Specifically, there is not a perception that students are responsible for promoting academic integrity or preventing academic misconduct. This is in contrast to faculty who assumed students know or should know about academic integrity policies. This does not align with the best practices of student engagement and leadership that uses a student development framework to promote ethical decision making (Kibler 1993a; Sweeney et al., 2015), or engaging students in leadership opportunities including student proctors, related student organizations, student tutors, and peer education to promote honesty (Boehm et al., 2009; Hensley, 2013; Sweeney et al., 2015).

There was a missed opportunity to engage in character development around academic integrity, through the institutions *Define Yourself* campaign. Despite focusing on aspects of the student handbook, no specific mention of honest, independent work was evident. Campaigns and programs that support character and integrity from an
institutional perspective were recommendations of previous studies (Boehm et al., 2009). No assessment of student learning emerged during the study, as it relates to information literacy or academic integrity; therefore, it is difficult to determine how students engage with the concepts of independent learning, synthesis, or academic integrity.

This does not mean students are not learning about academic honesty. Mid-West Community College faculty have been instrumental in promoting academic integrity education through prevention, specifically classroom management and curriculum design. This includes building engaging curriculum and demonstrating integrity in the classroom, as identified by Bertram Gallant (2008) and Bertram Gallant et al. (2015). Student learning can also occur when faculty establish norms requiring independent thinking. For faculty, developing prevention measures including multiple copies of exams, writing exams that require critical thinking, such as measures identified in the research of Hollinger and Lanza Kaduce (2009) serve as learning tools because they require students to work independently. The promotion of self-confidence, as with the stories of Dr. Abbott, Dr. Kipling, Dr. Weil, and Dr. Ferris were also significant opportunities to encourage students to have academic integrity. Self-confidence is also a factor related to literature on academic misconduct, particularly linking low academic self-confidence with increased rates of academic misconduct (Murdock & Anderman, 2006; Vanzyl & Thomas Khors, 2015).

Mid-West Community College appears to be at risk in other ways. For example, Olshen’s (2013) study noted the importance of faculty staff collaboration and shared messaging. With few exceptions, these are characteristics not found between departments or within the institution. Some faculty and staff interviews seemed to
indicate a concern that students may not know how to avoid academic misconduct. In Olshen’s (2013) study, students were able to articulate that academic dishonesty could lead to dismissal, but did not have a consistent definition of what the act of plagiarism was. Common, shared messaging is also important for students, as noted by Olshen (2013). Students who may not fully understand academic dishonesty is an issue brought up by faculty and staff during interviews. Given the differences in preventative strategies that emerged in the research, which vary from warnings to course or program dismissal, the question of what students know about academic integrity is particularly pertinent. To combat this, the library at Mid-West Community College does provide resources for students. Despite this, the community college student who might be exploring majors, or who did not have academic integrity education in high school may be at increased risk for violating policies.

Perhaps most concerning is that there is little indication that anyone other than the faculty member and student would know how an issue was ultimately resolved in order to track future learning. Given the numerous faculty who admit not reading the policy and process outlined for the institution, personal approaches for academic misconduct as noted in theme three provide inconsistent messages to students. A conversation with the Dean of Student Services described the inconsistency in detail:

We probably should be talking about this a little bit more and have some better strategy around it. I hear faculty that, they get the choice, the faculty member, to address the student immediately and then make a choice within the classroom to say, ‘You're going to fail this assignment or you're going to fail the course’, or, ‘This is just a warning, redo the paper.’
Students receive dramatic differences in being caught in terms of ramifications. That approach trickles up; in this case, because I think our department Chairs do the same. There's no consistency. Some department Chairs are heavily involved and others not at all. The next level is the dean level and they're busy people.

The perceived compartmentalization of academic integrity outcomes by classroom, discipline, and department makes it difficult to present an accurate summary of what academic integrity education and process across the institution. This is common, and research on faculty who avoid formal conduct processes in favor of individualized approaches (Ritter, 1993; Robinson-Zañartu et al., 2005; Singh & Bennington, 2012) supports this position. In fact, it is difficult to summarize what is happening other than to say that faculty largely choose to do something, rather than nothing to address academic misconduct.

Two important documents that are resources for students on the academic integrity policy are the student handbook and *The Pocket Prof*. Both serve as policy and policy reference guides for students who choose to use them. The syllabus language also serves as a contractual agreement between students and faculty. All faculty used the boilerplate syllabus language, adding on when necessary, but never taking away from the academic integrity statements. This is in contrast to other findings that indicate low levels of faculty compliance in the use of standard syllabus language addressing academic integrity (Robinson-Zañartu et al., 2005). While it is important to have the boilerplate language, it is concerning that definitions of academic misconduct vary within addendum language within the syllabus.
Again, the findings require looking at what is not available for analysis to continue to answer research question two. Over the course of the study, I found that student engagement in promoting academic integrity and preventing academic dishonesty were not institutional priorities. Limited resources and projects with higher priority have made it difficult to have student leadership as a part of academic integrity. There is no student group promoting academic honor or answering student questions.

**Research Question 3**

Many of the findings in research question two align with research question three: *What are the initiatives perceived to be most effective in promoting academic integrity and reducing academic dishonesty?* I first reviewed how the data responds to the research question. I then compared the findings to best practices found in the literature reviewed in Chapter II, specifically literature supporting effective practices in promoting academic integrity and preventing academic misconduct, as perceived by faculty and staff. Most of the literature is based on the study of four-year institutions.

Overwhelmingly, faculty and staff identify faculty as being most responsible for academic integrity education. There appears to be some feeling that this responsibility has increased with the policy change. Ms. Eliot describes her perspective on the responsibility for promoting academic integrity, sharing:

I think that's really going to have to come from the instructional side of the college. When they changed the procedures and stuff, the instructional division did that. Our division didn't do that. It falls on the academic or instructional side to make those changes and to really promote students the rights and wrongs or the awareness of those procedures. They have the
biggest impact on them. They're the ones that see them. If they really want to help them, they should use it as a learning experience and make sure that they understand it. To me, it has to come from the instructional division.

Faculty participants appear to understand and take this responsibility seriously. Aligning integrity to future careers, as with fields such as Emergency Medical Services and Criminal Justice provides students with an occupational identity rooted in integrity. In core classes, such as psychology and anthropology, the inclusion of student success tips and confidence building provide students with a way to center prior to test taking, but also to recognize the care and concern instructors have for students. This study echoes Hensley’s (2013) finding that promoting self-confidence in students is a best practice in academic integrity education. In sociology and communications, faculty use their expertise to design assessments that promote learning beyond rote memorization. This is done to encourage independent learning, and as a preventative measure to reduce academic misconduct. The design aligns with research by Olt (2002) and Olshen (2013) identifying the importance of intentionally designed and individualized assessments.

Four themes emerged from the qualitative data:

1. *It’s on us: We are all responsible, personally and collectively, for understanding and promoting academic integrity,*

2. *Faculty set a tone of integrity with classroom management and curriculum design*

3. *Faculty take personal approaches to academic integrity education,* and

4. *Lean times limit resources for academic integrity*
These themes overwhelmingly suggest that faculty action is the most effective intervention to promote academic integrity and prevent academic misconduct. This supports previous findings of faculty roles. Specifically, faculty have been noted in the literature as having responsibility for academic integrity education (Volpe et al., 2008) and this study aligns with that perception. The faculty at Mid-West Community College take responsibility for this task, an action seen in previous studies. Faculty prefer to handle student issues independently, rather than going through administrative policies (Coren, 2011; McCabe & Pavela, 2004; Robinson-Zañartu et al., 2005; Roig, 2001). Despite a sense of ownership and internalized responsibility for academic integrity education, this study shows that faculty have a limited role in formally addressing academic dishonesty, especially in the appeal process. The policy does not define if or how faculty are involved if a student does not accept initial responsibility.

To conclude the discussion of the study by research question, I reviewed the three research questions that guided the study:

1. What are the strategies used in one community college to equip their faculty with institutional programs and policies to promote academic integrity and reduce academic dishonesty, and how have these strategies changed over the past five years?

2. How does a community college encourage students to participate in promoting academic integrity and reducing academic dishonesty?

3. What are the initiatives perceived to be most effective in promoting academic integrity and reducing academic dishonesty?
The data found over the course of the study answers the research questions. A comparison to best practices within the literature also provided additional context. The discussion revealed that strategies to equip faculty to promote academic integrity include boilerplate syllabus language, and faculty autonomy in proposing academic (not institutional) resolutions. There are disconnects between institutional outcomes and classroom outcomes due to a highly centralized system.

The participants in this study did not perceive examples of student engagement in integrity promotion and misconduct prevention. The decentralized nature of the process has not lent itself to provide opportunities for students to participate in best practices such as peer education, student organizations, or student proctoring.

The most important factor for Mid-West Community College in integrity promotion and misconduct prevention is the faculty. Faculty feel this responsibility. While resources are limited for everyone at the institution, part-time faculty do not receive opportunities such as professional development and formalized orientation sessions. The majority of faculty I spoke with have not read the policy, indicating personal choice in resolving misconduct that may not be equitable across the institution. The unique characteristics of the community college, including the part-time population of faculty and staff, workforce orientation, and diverse nature should be considered in understanding the academic integrity policy and process of the institution.

**Revised Conceptual Framework**

To capture the case from a theoretical perspective, a revised conceptual framework illustrates the policies and practices found on campus. The findings in this study differ from the best practices I reviewed to construct the study. Specifically, there
were not as many methods used within the institution to prevent academic misconduct and promote academic integrity. As a result, an updated framework describing academic integrity within the institution is important. The revised framework includes all educational activities related to academic integrity at Mid-West Community College. These included punitive and developmental responses, culturally focused activities, and efforts to address online education.

The methods to prevent academic misconduct and promote academic integrity at Mid-West Community College align with the theories present in the literature (Bernardi et al. 2004; Kibler, 1993a; McCabe et al., 2008, McCabe et al; 2012; Murdoch, 2006). The revised framework lists the types of peer learning that occur for institutional stakeholders (faculty, staff, and students) at the institution. The strategies, processes, and interventions present at the institution define academic integrity education at Mid-West Community College. The following graphic presents the policies and practices reviewed in the discussion.
As with the initial conceptual framework, social learning theory emerges as a vehicle for faculty peer learning. The top arrow of the image represents this emergence. The stories and relationships of faculty and staff indicate relationships built on trust and history. These relationships allow for open discussion of academic issues including handling academic misconduct. Peer learning has emerged as a predominate form of learning about academic integrity on campus. This is especially important given the number of faculty who have not read the academic integrity policy. Departmental meetings, syllabus language, and informal conversations all contribute to social learning for faculty and staff at the institutions.
A specific example of social learning is the emergence of small working groups as described by Dr. Laning. For example, the development of the writing resource *The Pocket Prof* emerged through small group conversation, even though a policy exists. In a second example, Dr. Laning described her working relationship with a history professor who sought out her services. That relationship building and observation led to the development of learning modules for the history course, and ultimately, a more common understanding around academic integrity education. Using these examples, it can be inferred that a socially normative expectation of academic honor serves the institution in promoting academically honest behavior. The expectation is evident with the existence of simulation workshops including academic integrity, and the use of success tips and support in preventing academic misconduct and promoting academic integrity.

The findings from this study do not describe moral and ethical education, as defined by student development theory (Evans et al., 2009) with any depth. In fact, the decision to exclude students and decentralize the process of managing academic integrity suggests that the focus has switched from student services to a focus on faculty action. The themes that emerged from the qualitative data support this position. Kibler’s (1993) study linking academic integrity education to student development was not a direct influence within this case, however, there are indicators that faculty and staff alike support and promote student development. Specifically, the descriptive responses of faculty who address academic misconduct within the classroom indicate a desire to assist students in the transition from student to professional. Interviews and syllabus language from faculty in professional fields requiring certification, such as law enforcement and emergency medical services, provided supporting evidence of addressing academic
integrity. Moral and ethical student development requires students to consider socially positive behavior in order to determine individual decision-making and social responsibility. In order for this to occur, academic misconduct must be addressed as an institutional issue, and violations of this conduct should be seen as an opportunity to discuss decision making, impact of behavior, consequence, and restoration (Kibler, 1993).

Handbook and syllabus language provide the clearest example of pro social behavior as it relates to social control theory. Students do not want the label associated with violating academic integrity, such as having a cell phone out during an exam, leaving a book open, or participating in inappropriate or unauthorized group activity.

Some elements of social control (Hirschi, 1969) are apparent in the prevention of misconduct through classroom management. Faculty perceive that students believe academic misconduct leads to dismissal. Academic dismissal would eliminate a student’s social standing as a member of a specific academic community and the perception of dismissal is negative. Interview data describing the honor codes present for some students studying law enforcement is an example of this. Failure to uphold the code could result in dismissal, effectively ending the opportunity to become a police officer, for example. In the Emergency Medical Services program, the responsibility students have through group work provides pro social environment of accountability through peer interaction and faculty student interaction. Outside of these examples, the theory is not demonstrative of what is currently happening at Mid-West Community College.

After reviewing the findings by question, it became clear that some of the theoretical elements of a model framework were lacking within the case. This is
common. First, student development occurring through the linkage of professional ethics and academic integrity is an unexpected, but unique opportunity for student to grapple with their responsibilities as a student, and as a professional in training (Kibler, 1993a, 1993b). Despite this, the lack of defined developmental opportunities in other disciplines may leave students without an opportunity for contextual learning. Second, social control emerged through a faculty student relationship in addition to the student-to-student relationship. There was little opportunity for student-to-student social learning. There was no evidence in this study that the promotion or expectation of student social learning on academic integrity is occurring. Absent from the framework is a link to Cultural Dimension Theory (Hofstede, 1969). There were no indicators of any student training in academic integrity, international student programming and education on academic integrity, and materials for second language learners. The personal and context-specific nature of addressing academic integrity at Mid-West Community College make it impossible to determine perceived power differences and the impact of collectivist perspectives on the institution.

Limitations of the Research

The survey instrument presented a number of limitations. The survey included a series of questions that allowed for multiple responses. The usage of choose all that apply options limited the types of quantitative analysis conducted for my study. A replicated study with modifications leading to single answers would assist with this. An additional limitation is the small sample size of my survey research. The sample size also limited the types of quantitative analysis conducted. In a close-knit environment, gaining trust was very difficult and a higher yield may have provided more clarity within the
study. Choices to purposely delimit the research, through the population, were to provide data for and fulfill the needs of the specific research site. The choice to select a smaller sample size could have resulted in cluster bias as only those faculty and staff interested in academic dishonesty may have volunteered to participate. There is some risk that the participants involved were more likely to understand, identify, and promote academic integrity. Choosing to respond to advertisements or emails with the words academic integrity in the title indicates a choice to participate in the subject matter. In addition, participants may have altered their responses, sharing a socially and/or institutionally appropriate response given their employment status with the host institution. This is especially possible because a full report to the institution is required following the conclusion of the study as part of an agreement with the host institution.

Additional limitations included the types of interactions I had on campus. My time on campus was in one-on-one interviews, in small meetings, and at a table promoting the research. Additional observations from classroom settings, departmental meetings, and/or orientation sessions could provide a more nuanced set of findings. I did not gain access to these additional observation settings.

My experiences as a student conduct administrator presented as an additional set of limitations. My previous professional roles included addressing cases of academic misconduct. As a result, I harbored preconceived notions about appropriate responses, educational activities, and student engagement. These could have influenced my interpretation of the results. To guard against this, I consistently kept notes in the margins of my audit trail, bracketed questions based on my own experience, and referred
directly to the research questions whenever possible. Despite these efforts, it is impossible to remove all bias from any study.

**Implications for Future Research**

This case represents a complex interpretation of polices and a decentralized academic integrity policy at a Mid-West Community College. The case is important in not only what it represents, a decentralized institution dependent upon faculty interpretation, faculty action, and administrative support for addressing and resolving academic misconduct.

**Institutional Implications.** There are many opportunities for Mid-West Community College and similar institutions based on this study and supported by academic integrity research. The experiences and personal perspectives of faculty addressing academic misconduct provide a contemporary perspective to academic integrity promotion and misconduct prevention (Fontana, 2009). There are faculty with a wide knowledge base who add value to the conversation on academic honesty. There are students who are not included in discussions on academic integrity at the institution. Higher education leaders should investigate ways to engage in conversations around integrity as a learning outcome, and share these ideals with faculty and staff (Bertram Gallant, 2016). Faculty at the institution act independently, and as a result, equity does not currently exist for students accused of misconduct violations. This is both a legal risk and damaging to the morale of faculty, staff, and students (Bretag & Green, 2009; Volpe et al., 2008)

At Mid-West Community College, there are clear disconnects in the communication between faculty, academic administration, and the formal reporting
system. The current system removes faculty after an initial report, making it difficult to gather information and community resolutions. During this time, students attend class, turn in additional assignments, and interact with other students. Mid-West Community College and institutions with similar systems have an opportunity to consider supporting faculty during the process by creating easy to use reporting systems, follow-ups, and representation in the appeal process. This implication is supported by studies such as Christensen Hughes and McCabe, (2006), and Scanlan (2006), who also found that faculty support is necessary to address issue of academic integrity.

In the absence of a fluid policy, faculty are not inclined to take on the arduous and cumbersome task of reporting academic misconduct (Moeck, 2010). Department Chairs, Deans, and academic integrity administrators do not demonstrate a sense of urgency, or expectation of reporting, as evidenced by the low levels of reporting that currently exist. Understanding why this occurs is necessary to address reporting and consistency.

Mid-West Community College does not formally include students in integrity promotion. This is a missed opportunity for the institution. From policy changes, to technological interfaces, to advertising policy, students can promote social learning and represent the best intentions of any institution promoting academic integrity. Research on student knowledge of academic integrity provides a clear understanding of the disconnect between faculty and students, and facilitates a conversation on how to approach educational opportunities (Bertram Gallant, 2016; Kibler, 1993a; McCabe, 2005a; Broeckelman Post, 2008).

The challenges for Mid-West Community College and others include a lack of resources. Faculty indicate a desire for tools such as turnitin.com, professional
development opportunities, or lower course loads for quality programming. For part-time faculty in particular, limited resources leave faculty unequipped to apply consistent, equitable resolutions to academic misconduct issues. At a community college, this is especially important.

There is a need for consistency in responsiveness and reporting for both faculty and students (Bretag, 2014). The inclusive mission of the community college requires adaptability and service. This also presents unique challenges with consistent language, reporting, student engagement, and policy in a rapidly changing setting (Tull & Kuk, 2015).

This study presents a description of a case that adds to the body of literature on community college academic integrity education. While not generalizable, the study affirms the challenges inherent to community college academic integrity policies including limitations of resources and the impact of developing part-time faculty, interpretation of policies and equity, student engagement and learning, and faculty action (or inaction). Considering this case when designing or reviewing academic integrity policy provides a comprehensive review of faculty perceptions within this context. For those institutions using a faculty led system, this study also provides an addition to the literature from the community college perspective. The role of part-time faculty and the support provided to them is especially important.

**Benefits of the Research.** This research supports the body of literature in academic integrity education, providing a much-needed perspective on the experiences of community college faculty and staff (Boehm et al, 2009; Gerdeman, 2000; Moeck, 2002) and is one of the few to have a substantive qualitative element. The findings put
community college faculty at the forefront of preventing academic misconduct and promoting academic integrity. Given the large number of part-time faculty on community college campuses, the research provides an understanding of the instructional experience for part-time faculty, namely the effects of limited resources and lower levels of support. The research also presents the unique and varied perspectives of faculty on what addressing academic integrity means in the community college. This study adds to the limited prior research in this area (Burke, 1997; Gerdeman, 2000). While it is important to stress that four-year institutions also struggle with issues of academic misconduct, a lack of resources and dedicated professions working on academic integrity place community colleges at a disadvantage. The findings support prior research that suggests the same (Aaron, 1992; Bleeker, 2008). This research unveils practices in fields bound by integrity, such as law enforcement, nursing, and emergency medical services, that serve as examples in the community college for soft skill development. The findings illustrate the disconnect between policy and practice, both created by the decentralized nature of the institution and a desire for faculty autonomy. The research offers an awareness that decentralization without communication can lead to inequitable outcomes. The research offers recommendations such as cohesive messaging and supportive practices to supplement the interventions to promote integrity and prevent academic misconduct in the classroom. The study descriptions of institutional decisions around policy, professional development, and student engagement around issues of integrity also present an example of effective and ineffective practices for academic integrity education (Bertram Gallant, 2016; Kibler 1993a).
In addition, there is a tremendous opportunity for higher education leaders in community colleges to include part-time faculty and students in integrity promotion. From policy changes, to technological interfaces, to advertising policy, students can promote social learning and represent the best intentions of any institution promoting academic integrity. This research provides a detailed overview of the academic policy and process at a Mid-West Community college through written words, actual and perceived experiences, and opportunities for change.

Community colleges should consider conceptualizing a framework to assist in better understanding the components of academic integrity education (Kolb et al., 2015). This research organizes best practices found in the literature and may serve as a reference when reviewing academic integrity education, the policies, processes, and interventions designed to promote academic integrity and prevent academic dishonesty. Considering current practices in managing academic integrity program through a theoretical lens provides a starting point for information sharing and assessment.

**Recommendations for Practice**

This study describes the different perspectives of faculty and staff addressing academic misconduct in the context of a Mid-West Community College. The study uncovers the following recommendations:

**Create a Common Language and Common Mission.** While the intentions of the faculty and staff were often the same, there were many varied definitions used to meet the same goal. A clear, concise, and easy to access policy as found in previous studies (Boehm et al., 2009; Bertram Gallant & Drinan, 2006) is necessary for individuals to reference and use the policy. Higher education leaders in community colleges should
consider the importance of sharing and disseminating clear, easy to read guidelines that leave room for departmental autonomy (Boehm et al., 2009; Bertram Gallant & Drinan, 2006). To adhere to a common mission, checkpoints should be in place to provide faculty a safe recorded method of noting incidents as they arise. To do so, they must consider the unique nature of the community college including the workforce orientation of the institution, the diverse student population, the part-time population of faculty and students, and students who take online courses (Cohen et al., 2014). This includes creating inclusive language understandable by all members of the campus community in both language and context. In addition, a conversation on guidelines that support all students, including those with low academic confidence is important for all students (McCabe & Pavela, 1994) but especially those enrolled in community colleges. The goal of higher education leaders should be equity in both teaching academic standards, and in enforcing academic misconduct (Scanlan, 2006; Bretag et al., 2014). As faculty understand the importance of boilerplate syllabus language, the language and mission should be made as important and be visible in a variety of settings.

Present and Celebrate Different Perspectives to a Wide Institutional Audience. It is important to create an opportunity to bring faculty together to discuss concerns, share ideas, and present effective strategies. This project demonstrated a desire for faculty to share experiences, successes and frustrations. Having this opportunity would provide an excellent learning opportunity while also providing a gauge for academic integrity education on campus. Academic departments would do well to share information and report both the unique issues that threaten academic integrity, as well as to identify and report methods that teach students the value of academic integrity. Given
the workforce orientation of the community college, departments that engage in workforce preparation could share a valuable perspective on integrity education with the rest of the institution. Part-time faculty should be included and compensated in professional development efforts. Given that part-time faculty provide the majority of instruction in the community college setting, it is important to ensure the group is included and represented in sharing information on the role of academic integrity in the classroom. The shared experiences of part-time faculty are valuable in an effort to create learning opportunities that are most easily accessible to this population. Promoting the importance of academic integrity and acknowledging the challenges of confronting dishonest behavior is a necessary step to promote integrity on campus.

Embedding academic integrity as a community college competency is an opportunity to differentiate community college students entering the workforce. Integrity is a soft skill that employers find desirable, yet few institutions formally teach or assess these skills. Providing attainable learning outcomes that demonstrate a student’s ability to act with integrity is very important. Students who can act honestly and independently are a draw for employers, who often require employees who are capable of independent thinking and problem solving without specific direction. This is especially true for those in workforce-oriented fields who require capable graduates immediately upon employment. Promoting academic integrity is an actionable way to meet this need for students. Presenting this concept as an institutional goal would prioritize academic integrity within the institution (McCabe & Pavela, 1994).

The creation of a resource for academic integrity in online courses is also important. The findings of the study indicate that faculty rely on face-to-face
conversations, curriculum design, and classroom management to prevent academic misconduct and promote academic integrity; these tactics do not easily translate in the online environment. Providing increased support for new faculty, especially part-time faculty, in online classes would also be helpful, specifically with attention paid to relationship building and curriculum design.

**Create Opportunities for Student Engagement.** The largest gap in the academic integrity education program at Mid-West Community College appears to be in the area of student participation. Faculty talk to students rather than with students, and have no specific investment in academic honesty. This is especially problematic given the part-time nature of many community college students. Making the most of the time they have on campus is very impactful. Students are not included in efforts promoting academic integrity by design at Mid-West Community College. Faculty and staff should engage students through the student life office, through academically affiliated student groups, or through jobs such as proctoring exams. In addition, a celebration of student integrity is a positive opportunity for engagement (Kibler, 1993a). Recognition programs would raise the value of promoting academic honesty. True student involvement in addressing academic integrity, such as a student advocate or proctoring would give students a stake in the outcome of academic misconduct issues. Opportunities presented like the partner simulation program in Emergency Medical Services, and the honor code in the Law Enforcement program show promise in student engagement (McCabe, at al. 2012). In addition, making more information or tips available in all classes would be helpful for students. While handbooks such as *The Pocket Prof* are useful tools,
promoting student led resources for classes including labs; group work or other types of learning would clarify expectations and promote academic integrity.

**Evaluating Student Learning in Academic Integrity.** A final recommendation would be to evaluate the learning taking place for students around the topic of academic integrity. Specifically, pre and posttests to gauge mastery of academic requirements are necessary to understand the skill building and integrity development that occurs across the community college campus. These assessments should take into consideration the varied groups of students studying within the community college, namely workforce oriented programs, four-year transfer programs, associate’s degree programs, and certification programs.

**Future Research**

There are many opportunities for future research. Much of the research in academic integrity in the community college setting is dated. Replication studies that focus on the faculty experiences of academic integrity in the community college, namely community college faculty who do not address academic misconduct (Aaron, 1992), faculty perceptions and behaviors of academic integrity in the community college, (Burke, 1997), and comparing the attitudes two and four year senior academic officers on academic integrity (Gerdeman, 2000), would help to provide an accurate representation of academic integrity in the community college. The lack of research in this area provides a wide range of topics for future research.

Factors unique to the community college population, such as the part-time population of faculty and students, workforce orientation, the highly diverse, nontraditional student environment, and the high numbers of students enrolled in online
courses as identified in Cohen et al., 2014, are important differences that may influence academic integrity and the prevention of academic misconduct. A study focused on understanding the relationship these characteristics have in managing academic integrity would be valuable.

The creation of a survey instrument to capture perception specific to the community college experience would also be very useful. This instrument should be designed to capture differences in the perceptions of various part-time faculty on campus, the different types of courses taught by faculty on campus, and the workforce orientation of the institution.

As it relates to this study, a case study of students at the host institution would offer comparative data to gauge faculty perceptions vs. student perceptions. Another study that would be interesting would be of the part-time faculty experience in the community college, specifically regarding professional development and faculty development opportunities. Additionally, a cross case analysis of community colleges of similar size and scope would shed more light on academic integrity education in the community college setting. Given that plagiarism was the most reported violation, a study understanding how community college faculty define and address plagiarism would be valuable. A study focused in a community college discipline with a proclivity for ethical education, such as allied health or criminal justice would provide additional data on the links between professional ethics and integrity education.

Understanding the perspective of employers hiring community college graduates would bring importance to the topic of academic honesty. A survey assessing employer’s perspectives on academic integrity violations would provide an important perspective to
institutions on how they prioritize integrity education. Likewise, a study that focuses on academic integrity for community college certification programs would be helpful in understanding the academic integrity to workplace integrity connection. A study of academic integrity modules for online courses in community colleges would be beneficial. This study found that only 7.7% of faculty report observing academic misconduct in the online environment. Conducting additional studies to better understand this low report rate for faculty teaching online courses in community colleges should occur. In addition, academic integrity programs in community colleges that address the international student and second language learner population is both needed and timely (Pecorari, 2016). The makeup of community colleges is increasingly diverse, and consideration of cultural differences in policymaking is increasingly important.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to address the gap in community college academic integrity research by examining the components of academic integrity education within one Mid-Western community college, as perceived by faculty and staff. To do this the research identified cultural and technological shifts to academic integrity education policy, addressed faculty and student engagement in academic integrity initiatives, and identified priorities in academic misconduct prevention and academic integrity promotion. To address the links between policy and practice, I used a descriptive survey to gain baseline information on policy and perception of policy. I followed this with a series of semi-structured interviews of faculty and staff to address perceptions of policy, and actions of faculty and staff in promoting academic integrity and preventing academic dishonesty.
Findings emerged that the institution provides faculty managed policy and process. The institution looks to administrative staff, specifically by a senior student life official and her designee, to record formal reports of misconduct, and to notify students of formal outcomes and institutional sanctions. The last five years have brought a change in the submission of reports, has increased due process, and has limited the involvement of student services. Faculty choose to manage academic integrity through one-on-one conversational settings, or within departments rather than through a formal process. In addition, the preferences of academic majors and departments affect academic integrity resolutions and student accountability. These differences are not widely discussed. Resources for engagement in misconduct prevention and promotion of integrity are limited. The study indicates that faculty are the most influential actors in preventing misconduct and promoting integrity. Faculty understand this role and use classroom management and curriculum design as the most impactful elements of maintain academic integrity in the classroom. Faculty, staff, and senior administrators see barriers to academic integrity education that include limited financial resources, limited time with students, and competing priorities.

Based on these findings, recommendations include increased student engagement, opportunities for faculty to share and disseminate ideas, demonstrated student learning, the valuation of academic integrity as a soft skills, and a shared mission, even if the methods used to address academic misconduct are different. Recommendations for future studies include studying the students at Mid-West Community College to compare their perceptions with the faculty and staff perceptions. Other recommendations include an expansion of the study to include multiple institutions, and studies based in a specific
discipline as they relate to academic integrity in the community college setting. A final recommendation includes a study solely on faculty and the ways that they address academic misconduct and promote academic integrity in the classroom.
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Appendix A

Email Invitation to Participate in Survey
Email to Faculty (Sample)

Dear Colleague,

As a faculty member at Mid-West Community College, you are invited to participate in the Faculty *Academic Integrity Survey*. This survey is an instrument designed by the International Center for Academic integrity. The goal of the survey is to explore academic integrity on campus. This survey is being administered for the doctoral dissertation of Ceceilia Parnther, M.Ed. Ceceilia is a doctoral student at Western Michigan University. The survey is voluntary and confidential. We encourage you to complete the survey as soon as possible, however the link will be available until March 11, 2016. Thank you in advance for your support of this important project.
Appendix B

Survey Consent
You have been invited to participate in a research project. The purpose of this study is to fill the gap in academic integrity research in the community college by examining the components of academic integrity education at your institution as perceived by faculty and staff.

To do this, I request your completion of the survey clicking the link below, designed by the International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI). Your perspectives are very important in helping us better understand integrity promotion and cheating prevention at your institution. This survey is distributed to all faculty at MDCC and will take less than 10 minutes of your time. A space has been provided at the end of the survey for comments.

Should you have any questions prior to or during the study, Your replies will be completely anonymous, so do not put your name anywhere on the survey. You may choose to not answer any question and simply leave it blank. Participation in the survey is completely voluntary. Clicking the survey link indicates your consent for use of the answers you supply. If you have any questions, you may contact Dr. Donna Talbot at 269-387-3891, Ceceilia Parnther at 269-910-5265, the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (269-387-8293) or the vice president for research (269-387-8298).

This survey has been approved by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB) through April 30, 2016.

There are no foreseeable risks associated with your voluntary participation. If at any point you feel uncomfortable answering questions, you may skip them or withdraw from the survey to stop your participation. Your survey responses will be confidential—no personal information will be reported.

If you agree to participate in this survey, please continue to the next page. Thank you for your participation!
Appendix C

Interview Consent
INFORMED CONSENT

Principal Investigators: Donna Talbot, Ceceilia Parnther

Title of Study: Mid-West Community College Approaches to Academic Integrity Education: A Case Study

You have been invited to participate in a research project. This consent document explains the purpose of this research project and describes the time commitments, procedures used in the study, and the risks and benefits of participating in this research project. Please read this consent document carefully and completely and ask any questions if you need more clarification.

What are we trying to find out in this study?
The purpose of this study is to fill the gap in academic integrity research in the community college by examining the components of academic integrity education at two community colleges as perceived by faculty and staff.

Why have I been asked to participate in this study?
You have been invited to participate in this study because you have been identified as a faculty or staff member in the community college.

What will you be asked to do if you choose to participate in this study?
If you agree to participate in the study, you will be asked to participate in an interview. We anticipate the interview will take no more than 90 minutes to complete. Questions will delve into your experiences with academic integrity on campus, your perception of the process, and what you find most effective in promoting academic integrity and preventing student cheating.

What are the risks of participating in this study?
Your name and other identifying features will not be used in any publications or presentations (either within the dissertation, campus reports, and/or future publication). Only the investigator will have access to this information. However, it is possible that someone very familiar with your role could identify you based on materials made public as part of this study. This could result in embarrassment.

What are the benefits of participating in this study?
This project is designed to contribute to the academic integrity research in the community college setting and will benefit your institution as well as the greater academic community.
Are there any costs associated with participating in this study?
There are no costs associated with participating in this study.

You can choose to stop participating in the study at any time for any reason. You will not suffer any prejudice or penalty by your decision to stop your participation. You will experience NO consequences if you choose to withdraw from this study.

Should you have any questions prior to or during the study, you can contact the primary investigator, Ceceilia Parnther at 269-910-5265 or Ceceilia.m.Parnther@wmich.edu. You may also contact the Chair, Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at 269-387-8293 or the Vice President for Research at 269-387-8298 if questions arise during the course of the study.

I have read this informed consent document. The risks and benefits have been explained to me. I agree to take part in this study. I have signed on the line below:

Signature

I agree to be audio recorded (Please check)
Appendix D

Interview Questions for Faculty
Interview Questions for Faculty

Thank you for agreeing to share your experiences with me. As we have discussed, I am interested to learn about your experiences with academic integrity education on your campus. I define academic integrity education as those activities or policies which work to promote integrity and/or prevent cheating. I am hoping to learn from your perspective how the process affects you and your students. As a student conduct administrator, I often experience the process without the benefit of this perspective, so hearing about your experiences will be very helpful. Again, thank you so much for your time.

1. To start, can you tell me about your role as a faculty member on campus? (R1, R1)

2. Are you familiar with the academic integrity policy on campus? (R1)

3. How did you learn about the policy? (R1)

4. Where did you learn about the policy? (R1, R1)

5. How do you feel about the policy? (R1)

6. Does your institution encourage faculty to prevent student cheating? (R1, R1)
   a. What resources are provided to do so? (R1, R1)

7. Does your institution encourage students to prevent student cheating? (R2)
   a. What resources are provided to do so? (R2)
   b. Does the institution address cheating in online courses? (R1)
   c. Does the institution address potential culture differences in defining academic integrity? (R1)
      i. Do you? Why or why not? (R1)
8. How do you promote academic integrity on campus? (R1, R1)

9. How do you prevent cheating in your classroom? (R1, R1)

10. How would you describe your feelings throughout the process? (R1, R1)
    a. Is there anything that you learned from participating in the process? (R1)
    b. Were you satisfied with the outcome of the process? Why or why not? (R1)

11. How would you describe the severity of penalties for cheating at your institution? (R1)
    a. Does this affect cheating on campus? If so, how? (R1)

12. In your opinion, does your institution encourage faculty participation in promoting academic integrity? (R1)
    a. If yes, can you share an example of how faculty participation is encouraged? (R1)
    b. In your opinion, do your faculty colleagues share this perception? (R1, R1)
      i. Why or why not?

13. Did you have the opportunity to participate in the creation of the policy? (R1, R1)
    a. Does this affect how you feel about the policy? (R1, R1)
    b. If so, did you participate? (R1, R1)
      i. (why or why not)?

14. Is there anything you would change about the policy? (R1)
    a. Why or why not? (R1)

15. In your opinion, what is the single most effective technique to promote academic integrity? (R3)
a. Does this occur on your campus? (R1, R3)

16. In your opinion, what is the single most effective technique to prevent student cheating? (R1, R3)
   a. Does this occur on your campus? (R1, R3)
   b. Do you feel it affects the academic environment of your campus? (R1, R3)

17. Is there anything I did not ask that you would like to share with me?
Appendix E

Interview Questions for Academic Integrity Administrator
Interview Questions for Academic Integrity Administrator

Thank you for agreeing to share your experiences with me. As we have discussed, I am interested to learn about your experiences with academic integrity education on your campus. I define academic integrity education as those activities or policies which work to promote integrity and/or prevent cheating. I am hoping to learn from your perspective how the process affects you and your students. As a student conduct administrator, I often experience the process without the benefit of this perspective, so hearing about your experiences will be very helpful. Again, thank you so much for your time.

1. How do you describe the tenets of academic integrity education from your perspective (R1)?

2. Can you walk me through your disciplinary case load (R1)?

3. What is the history of your academic integrity policy (R1)?

4. How have the type of academic integrity cases/ academic environment changed in regard to student cheating (R1)?

5. What changes have been made, if any in the last five years (R1)?
   a. How has this impacted academic integrity on campus (R1)?

6. Who are the stakeholders in promoting academic honesty on campus (R1, R2)?

7. How are students empowered to prevent cheating and promote honesty (R2)?

8. How are faculty empowered to prevent cheating and promote honesty (R1)?

9. What are your biggest challenges in implementing/ facilitating/ overseeing the academic integrity program at your institutions (R1)?

10. What are your biggest successes (R1, R3)?
11. What is the single most important thing your institution can do to prevent cheating (R3)?

12. What is the single most important thing your institution can do to promote academic integrity (R3)?
Appendix F

Interview Questions for Staff/Administration
Interview Questions for Staff and Administrators

Thank you for agreeing to share your experiences with me. As we have discussed, I am interested to learn about your experiences with academic integrity education on your campus. I define academic integrity education as those activities or policies which work to promote integrity and/or prevent cheating. I am hoping to learn from your perspective how the process affects you and your students. As a student conduct administrator, I often experience the process without the benefit of this perspective, so hearing about your experiences will be very helpful. Again, thank you so much for your time.

1. To start, can you tell me about your role as a staff member on campus (R1)?

2. Are you familiar with the academic integrity policy on campus (R1)?

3. How did you learn about the policy (R1, R1)?
   a. In your experience, do most staff learn about the policy in this way (R1)?

4. Where did you learn about the policy (R1)?

5. How do you feel about the policy (R1)?

6. In your opinion, who is responsible for preventing student cheating on campus (R1, R2)?
   a. How so (R1, R2)?
   b. What resources are provided to do so (R2)?

7. Does your institution encourage students to prevent student cheating (R1, R2)?
   a. What resources are provided to do so? (R1, R2)
   b. Does the institution address cheating in online courses? (R1)
c. Does the institution address potential culture differences in defining academic integrity? (R1)
   
i. Do you? Why or why not?

8. Do you feel a responsibility to promote academic integrity on campus? (R1, R1)
   
a. How/why?

9. Have you been involved in dealing with issues around preventing cheating or promoting academic honesty? (R1)
   
a. If so, what was your role? (R1)
   
b. Is there anything that you learned from participating in the process? (R1)
   
c. Were you satisfied with the outcome of the process? Why or why not? (R1)

10. How would you describe the severity of penalties for cheating at your institution? (R1)
   
a. Does this affect cheating on campus? If so, how? (R1)
   
b. How does this affect the work you do on campus? (R1)

11. In your opinion, does your institution encourage institutional participation in promoting academic integrity? (R1)
   
a. If yes, can you share an example of how participation is encouraged? (R1)
   
b. In your opinion, do your colleagues share this perception? (R1)
      
i. Why or why not? (R1)

12. Did you have the opportunity to participate in the creation of the policy? (R1)
   
a. Does this affect how you feel about the policy? (R1)
   
b. If so, did you participate (R1)
i. (why or why not)? (R1)

13. Is there anything you would change about the policy? (R1)
   a. Why or why not? (R1)

14. In your opinion, what is the single most effective technique to promote academic integrity? (R3)
   a. Does this occur on your campus?(R1, R3)

15. In your opinion, what is the single most effective technique to prevent student cheating? (R3)
   a. Does this occur on your campus? (R1, R3)
   b. Do you feel it affects the academic environment of your campus? (R1)

16. Is there anything I did not ask that you would like to share with me?
Appendix G

Permission to use ICAI Faculty Survey
Hi Ceceilia,

You are granted permission to use the survey as described in your dissertation research. Since you do plan to use so much of the survey, the Center requests that you limit its use to the institution you are studying.

Cheers,

Sam

Sam Goodman
Interim Membership Director and Program Coordinator
International Center for Academic Integrity
Robert J. Rutland Institute for Ethics
Clemson University
236 Hardin Hall
Clemson, SC 29634

864.656.1293  864.656.1293
sbgoodm@clemson.edu
http://www.academicintegrity.org
Appendix H

ICAI Survey
ICAI FACULTY SURVEY

Academic Environment

Page description:
Please tell us about the academic environment at ______________________. All answers to this survey will remain strictly confidential. NOTE: THE RED ASTERISK MEANS THE QUESTION IS REQUIRED TO PROCEED.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. How would you rate: *</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The severity of penalties for cheating at ____________? *</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The average student's understanding of campus policies concerning student cheating? *</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The faculty's understanding of these policies? *</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student support of these policies? *</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty support of these policies? *</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The effectiveness of these policies? *</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Permission to use this survey has been granted by the International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI). Purchase from the distributor is required to use the entire survey, and publishing has not been permitted. Select sample questions are included in the link above for review.
Appendix I

Select Syllabi Language
Introduction to Sociology

The Mid-West community college policy on academic integrity is included in the student handbook. If it is suspected that you are cheating, fabricating, facilitating academic dishonesty, or plagiarizing, there may be serious consequences. The incident will be documented and reported to the academic chair and/or program director for possible disciplinary actions up to and including course, program, or college expulsion. A violation of this policy will be included as a permanent part of a student record.

**Art and Communication:**

Plagiarism: Plagiarism, the unacknowledged use of someone else’s images, words or ideas as though they were your own, will result in a failing grade for the assignment. Using assignments from previous classes for current course projects is also unacceptable.

**Misty Creek University at Mid-West Community College:**

A. Definition

Academic dishonesty is unethical behavior, which in any way violates the standards of scholarly conduct. It includes such behaviors as cheating on assignments or examinations, plagiarizing, submitting the same or essentially the same papers for more than one course without the consent of all instructors concerned, misappropriating library materials, or the destroying of or tampering with computer files. Also included in academic dishonesty is knowingly or intentionally helping another violate any part of this policy.

Plagiarism is the failure to give credit for the use of material from outside sources. It includes, but is not limited to, verbatim use of a quote without quotation marks and adequate documentation, submission of a paper prepared by another person as one’s own work, using the
ideas, facts, words, or data of someone else and claiming them as your own, or not documenting ideas, facts, words, or data gathered during research.

B. Faculty Responsibilities and Penalties

Faculty must explain dishonesty and plagiarism at the start of each semester and/or state in their syllabi the policies, procedures, and penalties for such behavior. Since academic dishonesty is often more difficult to prove than prevent, each faculty member is encouraged to take every reasonable measure to prevent academic dishonesty from occurring. Faculty are encouraged to explain why academic dishonesty is critical to scholarly endeavor and to provide examples of academic dishonesty that are germane to their classes.

Faculty members who suspect a student of academic dishonesty may settle the case directly with the student. In cases where guilt is substantiated or admitted, the instructor may penalize the student in any way deemed appropriate, including the failure of the course. When a student is penalized, the faculty member must report the incident in writing to his/her department chair. A copy of the report will be sent to the Academic Dean. If the Academic Dean receives more than one report of academic dishonesty about a specific student, the Dean will review the reports, and in cases of serious offenses, could take steps to suspend the student from the university.

C. Student Responsibility

Students should familiarize themselves with the Misty Creek University Academic Dishonesty Policy, which can be obtained from instructors. Students are not excused from adherence to the policy even if they have not read it.
Math (Accounting)

ACADEMIC HONESTY:  
If I determine that you have cheated on any test or group project, then you will earn a zero for the examination or the group project. Depending on the nature of the cheating, I may consider harsher action as provided in the college “Student Handbook”

Psychology

ACADEMIC HONESTY: Integrity and honesty are valued within this course. Anyone found cheating on a quiz, test or paper at any time will receive a zero on the item for the first occurrence and an “F” for the course for any subsequent incidents. This also applies to anyone assisting someone else to cheat.
APPENDIX J

HSIRB Approvals
Date: January 8, 2016

To: Donna Talbot, Principal Investigator
Cecilia Panzer, Student Inquirer for dissertation

From: Amy Naugle, Ph.D., Chair

Re: HSRIR Project Number: 16-91-01

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research project titled “A Community College Approach to Academic Integrity Education: A Case Study” has been approved under the expedited category of review by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the application.

Please note: This research may only be conducted exactly in the form it was approved. You must seek specific board approval for any changes in this project (e.g., you must request a post approval change to enroll subjects beyond the number stated in your application under “Number of subjects you want to complete the study.” Failure to obtain approval for changes will result in a protocol deviation. In addition, if there are any unanticipated adverse reactions or unanticipated events associated with the conduct of this research, you should immediately suspend the project and contact the Chair of the HSRIR for consultation.

Reapproval of the project is required if it extends beyond the termination date stated below.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

Approval Termination: January 7, 2017
Date: March 29, 2016

To: Donna Talbot, Principal Investigator
   Cecilia Parra, Student Investigator for dissertation

From: Amy Nagle, Ph.D., Chair

Re: HSIRB Project Number 16-01-01

This letter will serve as confirmation that the change to your research project titled "A Community College Approach to Academic Integrity Education: A Case Study" requested in your memo received March 28, 2016 (to enroll individuals who have expressed interest in the study, and to conduct interviews via telephone or Skype) has been approved by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board.

The conditions and the duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University.

Please note that you may only conduct this research exactly in the form it was approved. You must seek specific board approval for any changes in this project. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date noted below. In addition, if there are any unanticipated adverse reactions or unanticipated events associated with the conduct of this research, you should immediately suspend the project and contact the Chair of the HSIRB for consultation.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

Approval Termination: January 7, 2017
DATE: January 22, 2016

TO: Cecelia Parnther, Doctoral Associate, WMU

FROM: Naomi Livengood, IRB Chair

RE: IRB Application 2016-01, titled Academic Integrity Study

The Mid-West Community College Institutional Review Board (IRB) has reviewed your request for using human subjects (faculty and staff) in a study regarding academic integrity at MWCC. Your research protocol demonstrated a lack of total anonymity due to face-to-face interviews, along with some additional concerns regarding voluntary participation. These conditions warranted a full board review.

The IRB has shared their comments and suggestions, all of which have been addressed in your updated research methodology. Therefore, your study has been approved. You may collect data according to the procedures outlined in your application and methodology through April 30, 2016. If for some reason this is not enough time, we will certainly consider an extension.

It is your obligation to inform the IRB of any changes in your research protocol that would substantially alter the methods and procedures reviewed and approved by the IRB in your application. Your application has been assigned a project number of 2016-01 which you should refer to in future communications involving this research project.

Finally, we wish to inform you that the IRB requires follow-up reports for all research protocols as mandated by the Code of Federal Regulations, Title 45, for using human subject in research. It is our understanding that you will provide MWCC access to your final dissertation.
Thank you for your compliance with these guidelines and best wishes for a successful dissertation project.
APPENDIX K

Emails to Participants
**Email invitation to participate in Survey**

Below is an invitation from Ceceilia Parnther, a WMU doctoral student, to participate in her dissertation research project on Academic Integrity. The MDCC Institutional Review Board has reviewed and approved Ms. Parnther’s research. Your participation in the survey is voluntary and your responses are anonymous. The survey should take approximately 10 minutes to complete.

Following the survey, you will be invited to take part in face-to-face interviews. The interviews are separate from the survey and are strictly voluntary.

Ms. Parnther will provide the college with the results of her dissertation when it is complete, and you will be notified when the research results are available.

If, at any time, you should have any questions regarding this project, you are free to contact Ms. Parnther directly at 269-910-5265, or me at extension 2206.

Thank you,

Naomi Livengood, IRB Chair

**Dear Colleagues,**

As a faculty member at Mid-West Community College, you are invited to participate in the Faculty *Academic Integrity Survey*. This survey is an instrument designed by the International Center for Academic integrity. The goal of the survey is to explore academic integrity on campus. This survey is being administered for the doctoral dissertation of Ceceilia Parnther, M.Ed. Ceceilia is a doctoral student at Western Michigan University in the department of Educational Leadership, Research and Technology. The survey is voluntary and confidential. I encourage you to complete the survey (link) as soon as possible, however, the link will be available until March 11, 2016. Thank you in advance for your support of this important project.

Ceceilia Parnther
Hi <<NAME>>, 

Thank you so much for reaching out to me. I am very interested in hearing about your perspectives on academic integrity. Attached you will find a copy of the interview questions, as well as a copy of the informed consent for this project. I will be on campus on and 3/14 from 11:00-4:00. The interview would take no more than an hour. Would either of these dates work for you?

Thanks,
Ceceilia
Ceceilia:

Naomi Livengood forwarded your email to me to fill the requests that are under my Division.

Item #1 -- Attached you’ll find a report with the requested information by discipline (not by department).

Item #2 is “invitations to participate on academic integrity boards.” We do not initiate invitations. We individually contact persons who have indicated their willingness to serve on a Board, and those who have been trained and previously served on a Board. In my 5 years as VP we have conducted only 5 or 6 hearings on academic integrity.

Item #3 response will come from Instruction.

Item #4 and #5 refer to staff/student academic integrity information. From my office, all printed information is contained in the Student Handbook. If there are other documents you’ll get that response from Instruction.

Items #6, 7, 8 will come from Instruction.

Kay

Hi Naomi,

Thank you very much for your approval. I would like to launch the survey as soon as possible. Please let me know how I can proceed.

The documents i request access to are as follows:

1) An anonymous report of academic integrity violations. If possible, disaggregated by department (this is to get a sense of what the most common violations are)

2) Invitations to participate on academic integrity boards (for students, faculty, and/or staff)

3) Orientation documents for full time and part time faculty regarding academic integrity

4) Staff academic integrity information (any documents outlining staff responsibility for student academic integrity)

5) Student academic integrity information (in addition to handbook, ex: handouts, promotional materials)

6) Standard syllabi language for academic misconduct (by department of possible)

7) Documents and handbooks that refer to variations in policy/consequence based on academic program

8) Documents that refer to online learning and academic integrity
Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Cecelia

Faculty and Adjunct Faculty:

First of all, Cecelia has asked me to thank you for taking part in the Academic Integrity Research survey. She is very pleased with the response rate. She is, however, experiencing low participation in the face-to-face interviews. Therefore, I would like to share a few more details about the face-to-face interview process that may ease some of your concerns.

First, if you do consider volunteering for an interview, Cecelia will do her very best to schedule you at a time that is convenient for you. Additionally, you will receive the interview consent form as well as the interview questions in advance of the interview. You will not be blind-sided by any questions and you can decline to answer any questions that make you uncomfortable.

Also, you will be provided a transcript of your interview with Cecelia. If your version of the interview differs from Cecelia’s, you will have an opportunity to edit the transcripted interview.

While the interviews are strictly voluntary, I do hope this clears up some of the concerns you have. Below is the link if you are interested in taking part in the face-to-face interviews—again, this is not a final commitment. You will be contacted by Cecelia with more information as noted above.

**Faculty interview interest form:**

[Http://goo.gl/forms/EqzoCOzgxr](http://goo.gl/forms/EqzoCOzgxr)

Thank you,

Naomi Livengood
APPENDIX L

Academic Integrity Language by Department and/or Division
Music Appreciation
Guidelines for Success

Academic Integrity Statement
The Mid-West Community College policy on academic integrity is included in the student handbook. If it is suspected that you are cheating, fabricating, facilitating academic dishonesty, or plagiarizing, there may be serious consequences. The incident will be documented and may be reported to the academic chair and/or program director for possible disciplinary actions up to and including course, program, or college expulsion. A violation of this policy will be included as a permanent part of a student's record.

Responses to Email:

From Social Sciences department chairperson:

Mid-West Community College Academic Integrity Statement

The Mid-West Community College policy on Academic Integrity is spelled out in the student handbook. If it is suspected that you are cheating, fabricating, facilitating academic dishonesty, or plagiarizing, there may be serious consequences. The incident will be documented and reported to the academic chair and/or program director for possible disciplinary actions up to and including course, program, or college expulsion. A violation of this policy will be included as a permanent part of a student's record. This includes falsifying observations and field experience hours where applicable. The instructor reserves the right to contact sites and parents to verify field experience hours.

Note: Plagiarism can take many forms including copying and pasting sources found on the Internet such as Wikipedia. Suggestion: whether or not a source has an identified author, credit it!
In addition, students are asked to obtain signatures and other verifying information to document field hours and observational visits, etc.

From Business and IT department chairperson:

Here is the Academic Integrity statement we ask our fulltime and adjunct Business & IT faculty to use:

Academic Integrity

The Mid-West Community College policy on academic integrity is included in the student handbook. If it is suspected that you are cheating, fabricating, facilitating academic dishonesty, or plagiarizing, there may be serious consequences. The incident will be documented and reported to the academic chair and/or program director for possible disciplinary actions up to and including course, program, or college expulsion. A violation of this policy will be included as a permanent part of a student's record.

From our Director of Learning Technologies:

Here is the statement that is included in all syllabi regardless of modality. We don’t distinguish between online, hybrid, LMS enhanced and/or face-to-face classes. We refer students to the handbook (typically a hyperlink is provided to the handbook PDF).

This information is also covered in the Online Learner Orientation, the prerequisite for online course registration (again, pushing it back to the student handbook and the syllabus statement).

Academic Integrity
The Mid-West Community College policy on academic integrity is included in the student handbook. If it is suspected that you are cheating, fabricating, facilitating academic dishonesty, or plagiarizing, there may be serious consequences. The incident will be documented and reported to the academic chair and/or program director for possible disciplinary actions up to and including course, program, or college expulsion. A violation of this policy will be included as a permanent part of a student's record.

Thank you and please let me know if there are further questions or more information needed.

From Nursing department chairperson:


Academic Integrity

The Mid-West Community College policy on academic integrity is spelled out in the Student Handbook. If it is suspected that you are cheating, fabricating, facilitating academic dishonesty, or plagiarizing, there may be serious consequences. The incident will be documented and may be reported to the College Administration for possible disciplinary actions up to and including course, program, or college expulsion.

Students who are members of Mid-West Community College’s Nursing program are expected to hold themselves accountable to the highest standard in regard to honesty, and academic integrity. While not all inclusive, the following behaviors listed below will be treated as academic dishonesty (aka “cheating”):
· Obtaining access to and/or use of any materials intended for instructor/faculty use only is strictly prohibited. Course book test banks are developed for faculty use only.
APPENDIX M

Academic Integrity STUDY ADVERTISMENT
Let Your Voice Be Heard!!!

Participate in Academic Integrity Research

Hello! My name is Ceceilia Parnther, and I am a WMU doctoral student. You are invited to participate in my dissertation research project on Academic Integrity. The project has been approved by the MDCC Institutional Review Board. The goal of the research is to examine academic integrity on campus. The results of this study will be shared when the analysis is complete.

Who: All MDCC Faculty and Staff

What: Survey and Interview research- There are three ways to participate:

**Faculty**

1. COMPLETE THE FACULTY ACADEMIC INTEGRITY SURVEY:
   
   https://wmichcas.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_77H8skMT0b8wgex

   and/or

**Staff**

3. SIGN UP FOR A 1 ON 1, CONFIDENTIAL INTERVIEW:

   http://goo.gl/forms/MZICVMU9VQ

When: Until February 22, 2016
No time for links? Simply **Email** me at [Cecelia.m.parnther@wmich.edu](mailto:Cecelia.m.parnther@wmich.edu) or **Text** at 269.910.5265 for information.