Simon Fraser University

Promoting Academic Integrity in the Internet Age
2002/2003 Survey

- Canada
  - Students, faculty, TAs, first year students
  - 11 schools – Nova Scotia to B.C.

- United States
  - Students, faculty, TAs
  - 23 schools – N.J. to California
## Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>U.S.</th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>SFU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergrads</td>
<td>16,060</td>
<td>13,643</td>
<td>1,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad students</td>
<td>2,175</td>
<td>1,318</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First year survey</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,269</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>2,608</td>
<td>1,902</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAs</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methodological Issues

• Self-report data
• Web-based surveys (US = 85%)
• Low response rates
• Large sample size
Canadian First Year Survey

- 58% (vs. 74%) of respondents reported one or more instances of serious test cheating.
- 73% (vs. 72%) reported one or more instances of serious cheating on written work.
- Yet only 20% agreed with statement, ‘Cheating was a serious problem in my high school.’
- 68% expect less test cheating at university. 19% not sure. (54%/21% on written cheating.)
Canadian First Year Survey

- 58% (vs. 74%) of respondents reported one or more instances of serious test cheating. (58%)
- 73% (vs. 72%) reported one or more instances of serious cheating on written work. (72%)
- Yet only 20% agreed with statement, ‘Cheating was a serious problem in my high school.’ (19%)
- 68% expect less test cheating at university. 19% not sure. (54%/21% on written cheating.)
  (67%/20% and 58%/21% at SFU.)
Undergraduate Students
Factors associated with greater cheating

- Cheating is campus norm (cheating culture)
- School has no honor code
- When students feel:
  - faculty support of integrity policies is low
  - there is little chance of getting caught
  - penalties are not seen as significant
- Males/business majors/lower GPAs
A new concern

- Both Canadian and US data suggest more students are starting to cheat earlier in their college careers.

- It’s important to address academic integrity early. ‘The McCabe Hypothesis’.
Traditional Honor Codes

• Unproctored exams
• Pledge
• Student judiciary
• Non-toleration
Modified Honor Codes

- Student judiciary
- Pledge & unproctored exams optional with faculty member
- Academic integrity a campus priority
- Rehabilitative sanctions
# Summary Cheating Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1993</th>
<th>1995</th>
<th>1999/00</th>
<th>2001/2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test Cheating</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>30%-45%</td>
<td>23%-45%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Cheating</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>42%-58%</td>
<td>45%-56%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Cheating</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>54%-71%</td>
<td>53%-68%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Cheating</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>62%-83%</td>
<td>68%-83%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat Test Cheating</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>7%-17%</td>
<td>6%-17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1793</td>
<td>4273</td>
<td>2230</td>
<td>2526</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Web Surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001/2</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>SFU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test Cheating</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%*</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Cheating</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>47%**</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(51%)</td>
<td>(53%)</td>
<td>(45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>2,526</td>
<td>14,729</td>
<td>9,160</td>
<td>1,457</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 85% via Internet = 20%; 15% via paper = 32%

** 85% via Internet = 46%; 15% via paper = 53%
### Plagiarism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>SFU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written ‘cut &amp; paste’</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written plagiarism</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet ‘cut &amp; paste’</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet plagiarism (e.g., paper mills)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using technology to cheat

Cellphone messaging during exams.

Taken a minicamera..., taken photos of the exam, sold the photos to students taking the course the following semester.

Answers programmed into graphing calculator.

As a tutor-marker, I have students that have purchased papers off the Internet, paid others to take exams for them, and have plagiarised Internet sources unmercifully.
Student suggestions

SFU does a good job of making it plain what is and is not cheating and what the penalties are...

SFU should provide more supervision during exams.

Stricter measures for anyone caught cheating.

Academic success trumps academic ethics, generally speaking. How about a mandatory course for all freshman which deals with the philosophical benefits and glory of academic/intellectual achievement?

Profs usually give strong warnings [about cheating]... but rarely invoke the formal process.

There should be a single university-wide policy...
Student role

Student senate type thing where students dictate the punishment.

Students should be encouraged to help... but in order to do this there needs to be some anonymous way of reporting.

Students should not have to deal with the responsibility of turning in other students.

Student tattling is not exactly the type of environment I’d like to study in.
Faculty role

Start at the professors and get them to stress the importance of academic integrity.

The teachers need to be more vigilant...

There is NO WAY that a student will report anything when they KNOW that nothing will be done.

Profs... must apply the same strict standards to their own work – this is not always done.

The professors and ta’s talk about cheating but it is never seriously enforced.
Other student comments

Stress motivation for learning the material, other than grades.

Students need to be more accountable to each other, rather than to professors or administration.

I can’t believe how prevalent it is.

Students should be given a second chance. People make mistakes.

I am glad to see that the university is going to do something about this problem.
**Student concerns**

Students themselves should hold to integrity. But that is hard in a society where the push is on to be the best no matter what the cost.

I am an engineering student, and can say that cheating is rampant in that department, because the expectations and pressures are so great...

First year science courses suck and students need to do whatever they can to get through [them], whether it means cheating or not.

As long as people care more about the mark than the content of the course there will be a motivating force to cheat.
**BUEC 333 Case**

I feel that SFU is too nice in regards to punishing serious cheaters. Specifically, in regard to the BUEC 333 case, simply suspending the cheaters are not enough. They willingly and knowingly hired someone to do their work, the people should be kicked out of school.

I feel SFU is doing a good job to limit the number of incidents since the occurrence last year.

I think SFU is doing a great job.
Faculty
# Students vs. Faculty

## Moderate & Serious Cheating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>United States</th>
<th></th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copy on exam/crib notes</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plagiarism</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written ‘cut &amp; paste’</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet ‘cut &amp; paste’</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper from mill</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SFU students and faculty slightly higher than Canadian means.*
### Faculty Safeguards – A lost opportunity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>U.S.</th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>SFU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change exams regularly</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor students closely on tests</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space students out for tests</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss views on integrity</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info in syllabus about cheating</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet to confirm plagiarism</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>2,608</td>
<td>1,902</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty ignore cheating on occasion

- 45% of faculty in US, 46% in Canada & 63% at SFU acknowledge they have ignored cheating ‘on occasion’.

- Primary reasons:
  - Lack proof - 39% US, 39% Canada, 54% SFU
  - No time - 5% US, 9% Canada, 20% SFU

- 58% US, 46% Canada, & 41% SFU never referred incident of cheating to anyone.
Faculty dissatisfaction with existing process

I felt like I was on trial. In the end, the penalties imposed were light.

Nothing was done. I was thanked for reporting it. End of story.

What is desperately needed is a way of tracking on a university-wide basis who has cheated, so that repeat offenders can be dealt with severely.

The burden of preparing a case for UBSD is so great as to discourage most faculty from going that route.

The present system/bureaucracy doesn’t support faculty, and discourages further pursuit of these issues.
Role faculty should play

Faculty need to set clear standards and expectations about academic honesty.

I think Faculty are key to this role, however, it is the University’s responsibility to provide the resources to support Faculty, TA’s and sessionals.

Set standards they can enforce.

Encourage assignments that are unique and require the student to use her voice.

As long as the demands on professors remain high there will be a limited impact on cheating.
A growing issue?

Faculty need to adapt to the new demographics and increasing numbers of students trained in non western cultures.

Since all the students I teach are NNS of English, I am primarily concerned with the reasons [they cheat]. Although they engage in behaviors the university... considers cheating, I do not... Their weak paraphrasing skills and failure to understand western citation practices are the causes.

Higher education in the West needs to take account of the different literacies represented by students trained in Asia and our values need to adapt to this new reality.
A student plagiarized an assignment verbatim from the web. I assigned a grade of zero... The faculty member disregarded the zero, and gave them a high grade.

I was told to ignore the incident.

In the past I have informed faculty and the reaction seemed to be indifference.

My concerns were met with very little support.

The instructor did not act upon the information I provided.

The professor gave the cheaters a good grade in the course because it’s “required course” for students in other departments and he didn’t want to cause a stir with them.
“Some Good News About Academic Integrity”
McCabe & Pavela
Sept./Oct. 2000

The basic elements of a modified honor code strategy.
Implementing a Modified Honor Code

- Ask students about the nature and extent of campus cheating.

Perhaps form an Academic Integrity Advisory Council consisting of a diverse group of student leaders. Invite key faculty to participate.
Implementing a Modified Honor Code

- *Give interested students and faculty a voice in setting campus policy.*

Many, who are troubled by widespread academic dishonesty, will want to take action.
Implementing a Modified Honor Code

- Allow students to play a major role in the resolution of contested cases.

  Faculty members can also make major contributions.
Implementing a Modified Honor Code

- Enforce significant sanctions, keyed to an academic integrity seminar.

Simple penalties may not be effective deterrents. Consider the ‘XF’ sanction with the opportunity to remove the X.
Implementing a Modified Honor Code

- *Help student leaders educate their peers.*

Communicate a culture of integrity to students, especially new students.
Implementing a Modified Honor Code

• Develop fair, prompt and efficient due process procedures.

Faculty participation will be encouraged if faculty members are allowed some discretion to resolve less serious, first offenses.
Implementing a Modified Honor Code

- Give student leaders support and guidance.

This will minimize the potential for litigation and is especially important in the absence of a long-standing honor code tradition.
Implementing a Modified Honor Code

- Keep faculty and administrators informed.

This will not only minimize possible distorted impressions of the code’s effectiveness, it will also allow faculty to evaluate the educational aspects of a modified honor code approach.
Implementing a Modified Honor Code

• Encourage vice-chancellor’s leadership.

What vice-chancellor chooses to emphasize becomes a campus-wide focus. Interest the vice-chancellor through student-led initiatives.
Implementing a Modified Honor Code

- Evaluate and benchmark.

Any honor code approach requires a significant investment of administrative, faculty and student time. Careful evaluation and benchmarking are important aspects of any new initiative.
“Academic Integrity: 10 Principles”
McCabe & Pavela
December 1997

Principles of academic integrity for faculty.
Principles of Academic Integrity for Faculty

- Foster an environment of trust in the classroom.
- Clarify expectations for students.
- Reduce opportunities to engage in academic dishonesty.
- Challenge academic dishonesty when it occurs.