



The ICAI Reader (2nd ed):
1992-2020

Tricia Bertram Gallant, Ph.D.

Lead Editor

© International Center for Academic Integrity, 2022

The ICAI Reader: 1992-2020

The 1st edition of the ICAI Reader was created in 2009 to celebrate 20 years of academic integrity research and the anniversary of the International Center for Academic Integrity. The goal was to highlight the seminal pieces (published in English between 1992-2009) that any practitioner or researcher new to the field should read because they are considered to be of good overall quality, as well as made an important addition to the literature, had a relevance to a broad international audience, and/or offered something new to the field/practice at the time of publication.

This 2nd edition includes the top 42 pieces from the 1st edition, and adds another 43 pieces published in English between 2010-2020. The pieces were selected through a lengthy process. This process is described in Rogerson et al (2022)¹, which is available for free for ICAI members, and so will not be repeated here. Instead, here we would like to thank all of Editors and Reviewers who made the 1st and 2nd edition possible:

	Editors	Reviewers
1st Edition	Brad Zakarin, D.B. Christian, Art Wilson, Karen Clifford, Leah Bryant, Patricia Mahaffey, Christine Killoran	Breea Bacon, Karen Clifford, Paula Gabbert, Barbara Grano, Danielle Istl, Anne Jimenez, Charlin Jones, Charlie Myers, Esrold Nurse, Sandi Rhoten, Judy Sheppler, Mark Sheldon, Simon, Fred Van Horn, David Wangaard, Art Wilson, Tim Terpstra, Jennifer Jensen, Shawn Peoples, Neil Morpeth, Katrina Hawes, Nancy Westrup
2nd Edition	Ann Rogerson, Armando Aleman, Audrey Burnett, Bob Ives, Brook Dickison, Ceceilia Parnther, Courtney Cullen, David Carl Ison, Greg Preston, Jill LeBihan, Sara Hartley, Valerie Denney	Ann Rogerson, Armando Aleman, Art Wilson, Carl Burkart, Carmen Garcia, Greg Preston, Jake Kasper, Jennie Miron, Jill LeBihan, Laura Bizzell, Patricia Buhler, Sara Lesite, Shannon Lynn Burton, Stephanie Roach, Zachary Dixon

While we had hoped that we could create a true Reader – which would include the actual articles or book chapters in reprint – this proved to be financially infeasible. So, instead we provide a summary of the article written by a Reviewer, and we hyperlink to the piece (if available) so that readers can simply click on the title they'd like to read and find it easily. Then, after the annotated bibliography, we provide an organizer by themes that the Reviewers selected for each piece. Within these 85 pieces, readers should be able to uncover the foundational and fundamental knowledge that will help them carve either their research or their practitioner agenda. To be sure, these are not the only pieces that should be read, but we believe that if these pieces are not included in your reading list, you will surely be missing out.

And for a bonus – the last chapter is the Origin Story of the International Center for Academic Integrity, which covers the first 18 years of the Center's existence.

Happy reading!

¹ Rogerson, A. M., Bertram Gallant, T., Cullen, C., & Ives, R. T. (2022). Celebrating 30 years of research on academic integrity: A review of the most influential pieces. In D. A. Rettinger & T. Bertram Gallant (Eds.), *Cheating Academic Integrity: Lessons from 30 Years of Research* (pp. 201-232). Wiley.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Pages</u>
Chapter 1	<u>The Foundational Years: 1992-1999</u> Annotated Bibliography	3-5
Chapter 2	<u>The Banner Years: 2000-2005</u> Annotated Bibliography	6-10
Chapter 3	<u>The Plagiarism & Institutionalization Years: 2006-2009</u> Annotated Bibliography	11-13
Chapter 4	<u>The Expansion Years: 2010-2015</u> Annotated Bibliography	14-18
Chapter 5	<u>The Contract Cheating Years: 2016-2020</u> Annotated Bibliography	19-24
Chapter 6	<u>1992-1999 Themes</u>	25
Chapter 7	<u>2000-2005 Themes</u>	26-27
Chapter 8	<u>2006-2009 Themes</u>	28
Chapter 9	<u>2010-2015 Themes</u>	29-30
Chapter 10	<u>2016-2019 Themes</u>	31-32
Chapter 11	<u>“It Takes a Village”: The ICAI Origin Story</u>	33-45

Chapter 1

The Foundational Years: 1992-1999

1. Aaron, R. M. (1992). [Student academic dishonesty: Are collegiate institutions addressing the issue?](#) *NASPA Journal, Winter (2)*, 107-113.

A report on a study that included a national sample of 4-year public and private colleges and community colleges on their publication and dissemination of AI codes and policies with a total of 183 schools responding to the study survey. Vast majority of institutions did publish codes and policies, however, 4 year colleges were recognized to “more likely to possess a specific set of guidelines for violations than community colleges”. Discussion noted, “The greatest concern produced by the data is the limited extent to which faculty discuss student academic integrity in their syllabi or in class.” And thus have not implemented 1986 recommendations by NASPA on AI.

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

McCabe looks at situational ethics to help understand student rationalizations for cheating using a quantitative study of more than 6,000 students at 31 institutions. Their study concludes that students cheat on the basis of higher loyalties and a denial of responsibility; students see cheating as a victimless crime and condemn condemners. This article adds to the understanding of student motivation for cheating.

3. Kibler, W. L. (1993). [Academic dishonesty: A student development dilemma.](#) *NASPA Journal, 30 (4)*, 252-267.

This article presented a comprehensive review of the literature regarding student development theory, the causes of academic dishonesty, the extent of the problem, personal characteristics of cheaters, situational factors involved (including classroom factors and faculty attitudes and behaviors), and reasons students report for cheating. A brief outline of moral development research is provided, and a developmental framework for addressing academic dishonesty based on moral development and student development theory is presented. This framework includes a clearly written policy, opportunities for discussion and dialogue, equitable adjudication procedures, and appropriate and consistent sanctions.

4. Kibler, W. L. (1993). [A framework for addressing academic dishonesty from a student development perspective.](#) *NASPA Journal, 31(1)*, 8-18.

A seminal piece which is well researched with broad implications for the field on applying student development theory to academic dishonesty. The author developed a foundational framework for assessing how universities address academic dishonesty which has been used as a benchmark since it's publication. Excellent article which should be included in the best of the last 20 years. Has helped to shape the conversation since the 90's.

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

This article presents research findings relating to faculty reports of cheating at honor code and non-code schools. These findings support previous studies that more faculty choose to deal with cheating internally rather than report it to the proper authorities under their schools' policies/procedures. The reasons are provided. This study demonstrated that this is the case even at schools with “longstanding honor code traditions,” such that honor codes do not guarantee that faculty will follow the appropriate

procedures. Nevertheless, the results also showed that more faculty at code schools are likely to report than faculty at non-code schools. Both groups support the involvement of both faculty and students in adjudication of cheating; however, faculty at non-code schools are much more reluctant to turn over adjudication to students only. These results are important because they demonstrate how honor codes may have a positive effect on faculty perceptions and behaviors about how to handle cheating incidents, but essentially caution that they are not a “quick fix.” The article further suggests that the key to improving student integrity on campus is to ensure that all members of the campus community share responsibility for its promotion and adjudication.

6. McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (1993). [Academic dishonesty: Honor codes and other contextual influences](#). *The Journal of Postsecondary education*, 64 (5), 522-538.

An excellent article. I've been struck by the relative lack of empirical work in this area, and was not sure if this reflected my ignorance, or the nature of the field. This paper goes a long way to addressing that. The authors send 15,000 surveys to 30+ schools, 14 with “honor codes” the balance with other approaches to academic integrity. They conclude that honor codes have a useful effect in reducing survey acknowledged cheating, but that other factors, such as student's perception of peer dishonesty, understanding of institutional policy on academic integrity, the probability of being reported, and the severity of sanctions, were also important.

7. McCabe, Donald L., & Bowers, William J. (1994). Academic dishonesty among males in college: A thirty year perspective. *Journal of College Student Development*, 35 (January), 5-10.

This study compares the data from surveys of students by Bowers in the early 1960's with surveys by McCabe in the early 1990's to document longitudinal trends in college students' self-reported cheating behaviors. A major contribution was the study's affirmation that there were significantly lower levels of self-reported cheating among students at honor code schools. The study found a dramatic rise in unpermitted collaboration on written assignments from the 1960's to the 1990's but found little support for the popular belief that there were major increases in cheating among college students during the 1980's and 1990's.

8. Payne, S.L., and Nantz, K.S. (1994). [Social accounts and metaphors about cheating](#). *College Teaching*, 42, 90-96.

This article begins with a brief review of the literature on college student cheat and then moves on to report on a study conducted by the authors where they asked students to describe cheating through metaphor. They then consider some of the metaphors offered by students suggest that the understanding acquired could provide possible approaches to reducing cheating. Very original articles. Makes significant contribution to an understanding of how students view cheating.

9. Davis, S. F., & Ludvigson, H. W. (1995). [Additional data on academic dishonesty and a proposal for remediation](#). *Teaching of Psychology*, 22, 119-122.

The authors present survey data on the responses by over 2,000 undergraduates in the junior or senior year regarding, “the frequency of cheating, reasons for cheating, and influence of penalties on cheating.” A model is suggested and discussed to resist cheating. Results included the recognition that cheating in college was incrementally less than cheating reported in high school. Women appeared to be more deterred from cheating if instructors announced strict penalties. Grades were cited (29.5%) most frequently as a motivation to cheat with time constraints (14.3%) followed by “usually don't study” at 13.6%. The article includes a suggested model to guide teaching practice to reduce cheating.

10. Genereux, R. L., & McLeod, B. A. (1995). [Circumstances surrounding cheating: A questionnaire study of college students.](#) *Research in Higher Education*, 36 (6), p.687-704.

This article sought to highlight beliefs and behaviors associated with cheating. The article builds on previous research in indentifying the circumstances that were most likely to increase and decrease cheating. The authors made a clear distinction between planned cheating and spontaneous cheating, yet no difference in response was found between them. The article adds to the bevy on research on the reasons why students cheat, but also attempts to offer some ways in which we might predict student behavior around cheating.

11. McCabe, D. L., & Treviño, L. K. (1996). [What we know about cheating in college: Longitudinal trends and recent developments.](#) *Change*, January/February, 29-33.

This article examines and compares two large studies of cheating on college and university campuses: the 1963 Bowers study and the 1993 author's study. Attention is given to why students cheat, the type of cheating and how students feel about it. Excellent article for an overview of academic integrity at the collegiate level.

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

This article provides a meaningful review of 107 studies “of the prevalence and correlates of cheating among college students published between 1970 and 1996.” The author acknowledges limitations of the study due to sampling limitations as variables may have only been in “one or a few studies”. However, for other researchers and those interested in AI, there are multiple tables and analysis of correlates for student cheating that can continue to guide new research and supports the author's conceptual model for predicting cheating behavior.

Chapter 2

The Banner Years: 2000-2005

13. Cole, S. & Kiss, E. (2000) [What Can We Do about Student Cheating?](#) *About Campus*, May–June, 5–12

The article discusses the problem of academic integrity, and the recent wave of media attention devoted to it. They go on to note that there are two broad approaches one can take to academic integrity - an “arms race” approach, based on punishing wrong doing, and a “values” based approach, based on promoting the things that lead to good choices apart from sanctions. Specifically, they refer to an ICAI initiative that distilled these down to: honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility. They then go on to illustrate the application of these values with a series of case studies. They also make the point that instances of questionable conduct represent “teachable moments”. A particularly useful part of the article are the “tips for discouraging plagiarism”, as well as a list of “useful resources on student cheating. While the media attention has come and gone several times since 2000, the latter insights remain quite useful.

14. McCabe, D. L., & Pavela, G. (2000). [Some good news about academic integrity.](#) *Change*, September/October, 32-38.

Is a hopeful article amid the possible gloom. The authors note that recent research has confirmed the value of “honor codes”, even on the larger campuses thought relatively less suited to honor code based approaches. Particularly, the authors argue for what they call “modified honor codes”, which share some but not all characteristics of “traditional” honor codes. The crucial aspect of these modified honor code based approaches is that students, faculty and staff are embedded in an encompassing network of policies and procedures that both emphasize and reinforce tendencies toward acting with academic integrity.

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

This quantitative study looks at why students cheat by assessing two types of motivation, perceived social norms, attitudes about cheating and institutional policy then created a list of predictors for cheating. Institutional policy is the best predictor of cheating rates. Therefore, an honor code is important in the college culture. This article offers good empirical evidence for a college honor code.

16. McCabe, D. L., Trevino, L., K., & Butterfield, K. D. (2001). [Dishonesty in Academic Environments: The Influence of Peer Reporting Requirements.](#) *The Journal of Higher Education*, 72 (1), 29-45.

This article focuses on peer reporting requirements in student honor codes to determine their impact on the incidence of cheating and to investigate situations that might improve peer reporting efforts. An extensive review of background literature on peer reporting is provided. The paper reports on a large study involving 31 institutions, 14 with traditional honor codes and 17 with other policies. Statistical analyses was provided to support the four main hypotheses of the study: 1) peer reporting is higher at honor code schools; 2) peer reporting increases as the student “role responsibilities” increase; 3) role responsibility for peer reporting increases as students perceive that the chance of getting caught increases; and 4) incidence of cheating decreases as students perceive that the chance of getting caught increases.

17. McCabe, D. L., Trevino, L. K., & Butterfield, K. D. (2001). [Cheating in academic institutions: A decade of research](#). *Ethics & Behavior*, 11 (3), 219-233.

This article reviewed a decade of research on cheating in colleges. Building on previous research this article reiterates that cheating continues to be prevalent on our college campuses. It underscores that contextual factors have the most influence on cheating. This article is a must read for anyone wanting to understand the total dynamic involved in student cheating. Unlike other research focusing on one institution, much of the research in this article is drawn from research looking at multiple institutions. The article does an excellent job of highlighting the contextual factors involved in cheating. Of particular importance is the recognition that having an honor code system and of itself is not a panacea for solving the cheating ills. The key is the extent to which the code or institutional policies are embedded in the student culture. Strong contribution to the field.

18. Nonis, S., & Swift, C. O. (2001). [An examination of the relationship between academic dishonesty and workplace dishonesty: A multicampus investigation](#). *Journal of Education for Business*, November/December, 60-76.

This paper investigates the relationship between academic dishonesty in higher education and workplace dishonesty once students graduate and start employment. The paper provides an extensive review of the literature for both workplace and academic dishonesty. The study includes business graduate and undergraduate students in six universities and explores two different hypotheses relating to the acceptability of dishonesty and the relationship between the frequency of dishonest acts in the university and dishonest acts in the workplace. The paper provides statistical analyses for these hypotheses and also proposes action items for addressing concerning outcomes from the study.

19. Stearns, S. A. (2001). [The student-instructor relationship's effect on academic integrity](#). *Ethics & Behavior*, 11 (3), 275-285.

Excellent article on a topic not often addressed: determining if there is a correlation between students' perception of the student-instructor relationship and acts of academic dishonesty. This particular study focused on student's self-report concerning acts of dishonesty in a specific class/ specific semester. Students who self-reported at least one act of academic dishonesty had evaluated the instructor lower than students who reported that they had not cheated. Provided new insight into the importance of a student's positive evaluation of an instructor in probability of cheating. I found this data extremely helpful in discussions with faculty.

20. Whitley, B. E., Jr., & Keith-Spiegel, P. (2001). [Academic integrity as an institutional issue](#). *Ethics & Behavior*, 11 (3), 325-342.

Best paper. Thoroughly and thoughtfully explores the strategy an institution should adopt in establishing and maintaining a campus-wide ethos that encourages academic integrity.

21. McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (2002). [Honesty and honor codes](#). *Academe*, 88 (1), 37-41.

This article is not from a scholarly journal but rather from the AAUP magazine *Academe*, and so it is shorter and does not present the results of a new study. Rather, it is an essay on honor codes that makes a pitch that they are good things and we need them. A good introduction to the differences between traditional honor codes and modified honor codes. Well written for the generalist.

22. McCabe, D.L., Trevino, L.K., & Butterfield, K.D. (2002). [Honor codes and other contextual influences on academic integrity: A replication and extension to modified honor code settings.](#) *Research in Higher Education*, 43 (3), 357-378.

This article reviews whether students at schools with modified honor codes, which are becoming more popular, cheat more frequently than students at traditional honor code schools, but less frequently than those at no-code schools. (The key differences between both types of codes are clarified for the reader.) The answers to both questions were yes. These results are not surprising and reflect what one might have expected. The schools participating differed from those in previous studies by these authors in that they were larger, less selective, and had fewer students living in residence. The study also considered three key contextual influences on academic dishonesty: perception of whether relevant policies are accepted and understood by faculty and students, perception of whether one will be reported by a peer, and perception of how severe the penalties are. The strength of this article is that it highlights for large campuses – where the use of traditional honor codes is usually not feasible – the benefits that modified codes may provide. It also highlights the importance of suitable peer role models as one way to reduce academic dishonesty.

23. Moeck, P. G. (2002). [Academic dishonesty: Cheating among college students.](#) *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 26, 479-491.

This article reviews cheating in community colleges by identifying attitudes and situations that create a climate for dishonesty, discussing prevention strategies, and concluding with recommendations about how to deal with dishonesty when it occurs. While not as theoretical and detailed as other academic integrity literature where in-depth studies have been done, the value of this article is that (1) it may be of greater interest to those who teach in smaller community colleges where the culture is different than at larger universities; (2) it provides an overview of existing literature in a “user-friendly” fashion; (3) it offers many practical pieces of advice for discouraging dishonesty that educators and administrators can readily implement; and (4) it directs the reader to actual resources that are of assistance. (Regrettably some of these resources are dated now given technological advances).

24. McCabe, D. L., Butterfield, K. D. & Trevino, L., K (2003). [Faculty & Academic Integrity: The Influence of Current Honor Codes and Past Honor Code Experiences.](#) *Research in Higher Education*, 44 (3), 367- 385.

Article reports on research exploring attitudes of faculty in honor code and non-code schools relative to their support for institutional academic integrity policies relating to fairness and effectiveness.

25. Pecorari, D. (2003). [Good and Original: Plagiarism and Patchwriting in Academic Second-Language Writing.](#) *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 317-345.

A deep study of 9 draft theses and 8 completed ones, with thorough examination of the writing for inappropriate use of sources, and, in the case of the draft theses, interviews with the writers and their advisers to explore how and why the inappropriate use came about. Finds that in none of the cases, some of which appear to be extreme examples of plagiarism, was there any intent to plagiarize: the inappropriate use was clearly a matter of inadequate textual skill rather than dishonesty. Concludes that plagiarism is often (generally?) unintentional, and should be dealt with by pedagogical intervention rather than punishment.

26. Simon, C. A., Carr, J. R., McCullough, S. M., Morgan, S. J., Olsen, T., & Ressel, M. (2003). [The other side of academic dishonesty: The relationship between faculty skepticism, gender](#)

[and strategies for managing student academic dishonesty cases.](#) *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 28 (2), 193- 207.

The study looked at academic dishonesty from a different perspective: researchers sought to determine whether a connection exists between the degree of faculty confidence in the institution and the extent to which faculty use formal deterrence strategies for academic misconduct. It also looked at the differences between male and female faculty on these points. I found this to be of particular interest given that academic integrity professionals are indeed challenged by faculty perceptions about the extent to which they feel supported by the institution and this does affect how they choose to process misconduct cases: either formally (through established institutional protocol) or informally (internally on their own). Two types of faculty were identified: the “trusting” vs. the “skeptical.” The “trusting” faculty were confident in the institution and trusted its processes for dealing with misconduct. Thus, they were more likely to use those processes. The “skeptical” members did not share that confidence and therefore were more likely to deal with misconduct on their own. The two groups differed little in size; however, taking in to account gender differences, far more females were in the skeptical category. Researchers offer reasons for this contrast. In summary, this study shows that increasing institutional confidence among all faculty may lead to more effective and consistent adjudication of cheating complaints. This is useful information for academic integrity professionals who are challenged with obtaining as much institutional support for “the cause” as possible.

27. Eisenberg, Jacob (2004). [To cheat or not to cheat: effects of moral perspective and situational variables on students’ attitudes.](#) *Journal of Moral Education*, 33 (2), 163-178

This article reviews the correlation between moral development and one’s actual behaviors through a study of junior high school students in a collectivist society. The author differentiated between students who viewed exam cheating as a moral issue and those who did not and discovered that the former were less approving of cheating than the latter, although this did not necessarily correlate to their behaviors in the face of certain situational variables. The variables studied were the exam’s importance, the level of supervision at the exam, and peer norms. Two types of exam cheating behaviors were examined: active and passive copying. The study revealed that passive copying was viewed as more justified than active copying. With respect to the variables, test importance had a marginal effect on active copying and no effect on passive copying, while both supervision and peer norms had significant effects on both types of copying. These results are instructive in that, among other things, they give educators a sense of how moral development affects cheating perceptions and behaviors, the importance of clarifying moral standards at an early age and creating a climate where cheating is unacceptable, and how best to control situational variables to control cheating.

28. Sowden, C. (2004). [Plagiarism and the culture of multilingual students in postsecondary education abroad.](#) *ELT Journal*, 59 (3), 226-233.

The article provides a very cogent way of recognizing that “cultural values of multilingual students are sometimes at variance with Western academic practice.” The author believes that we should respect the traditions that students bring and work within those constricts to help multilingual gain a better understanding of Western academic expectations. This article is essential, more so today than in the past, as more students are landing on our doorsteps to further their study. The author takes a very proactive and scholarly approach to defining the issues and does so in a very easy to read style.

29. Townley, C., & Parsell, M. (2004). [Technology and academic virtue: Student plagiarism through the looking glass.](#) *Ethics and Information Technology*, 6, 271-277.

This paper puts plagiarism in the context of the phenomenon of the internet, and points to the many ways in which the internet has challenges various ethical assumptions. Very original paper,

first one that I have read that really provides an analysis of the way in which the availability of the internet has had a thorough going impact on many areas of modern life.

30. McCabe, Donald L. (2005). [Cheating among college and university students: A North American perspective.](#) *International Journal of Educational Integrity*, 1 (1), 1-11.

Examination of surveys of undergraduate, graduate and faculty. Focused on other forms of cheating and global perceptions of cheating. Offered strategies to encourage Academic Integrity.

31. McCabe, D. L. (2005). [It takes a village: Academic dishonesty & educational opportunity.](#) *Liberal Education*, Summer/Fall, 26-31.

McCabe finds that some forms of cheating have increased dramatically in 30 years and offers suggestions for managing cheating from both student and faculty perspective. McCabe notes that institutional culture is an important deterrent to cheating and that “programs aimed at distributing, explaining and gaining student and faculty acceptance of academic integrity policies may be particularly useful.” McCabe also suggests building a “hidden curriculum” which would pose ethical questions about cheating to help students learn the implications of cheating through discussion. This article adds to the understanding of the importance of institutional policy as mentioned in previously reviewed articles.

Chapter 3

Plagiarism & Institutionalization Years: 2006-2009

32. Bertram Gallant, Tricia, & Drinan, Patrick (2006). [Institutionalizing academic integrity: administrator perceptions and institutional actions.](#) *NASPA Journal*, 43 (4), 61-81.

This article reviews how student affairs professionals may be more successful at institutionalizing academic integrity if they understand the most significant obstacles they face and recognize who the best champions and catalysts are for strengthening academic integrity on campuses. It also provides some insights into the differences in perceptions about the success of institutionalization depending on institution type. It suggests that focusing more attention on faculty than students will lead to greater success, and provides examples of how this might be achieved. It contributes to the field in that it narrows for academic integrity administrators where they should choose to focus their greatest efforts in order to move their schools closer to academic integrity institutionalization.

33. Christensen Hughes, J. M., & McCabe, D. L. (2006). [Understanding academic misconduct.](#) *Canadian Journal of Postsecondary education*, 36 (1), 49-63

Excellent comprehensive overview of academic integrity research, publications and strategies in US higher education with suggestions for new focus and research in the Canadian higher education institutions. Great recap of academic integrity principles, research and assumptions essential for knowledge of the field.

34. Hutton, P. A. (2006). [Understanding student cheating and what educators can do about it.](#) *College Teaching*, 54 (1), 171-176.

This article arrives at three key conclusions: (1) that persons who cheat are motivated by self-interest and decisions arrived at by a cost/benefit analysis (which analysis ultimately favors cheating); (2) that because cheating is not often observed by professors, improving social norms about academic integrity is important (this is achieved by the use of institutional codes/policies *coupled with* detection and reporting); and (3) that strong student relationships – and weak student/faculty relationships – lead to a greater acceptance of cheating and increased cheating behaviours. Specific recommendations are provided that involve both faculty and administration. This information is useful to our understanding of how to address cheating because it gives specific practical “tips” about how (and why) academic integrity information can be shared by administration and how faculty can strengthen their relationships with students, so as to ultimately combat the peer norms that make cheating acceptable and reduce opportunities to cheat. It challenges the common belief that individual student characteristics contribute most to cheating. To the contrary, instructors have a greater role to play; likewise, the role of the administration/institution should not be discounted.

35. Passow, H. J., Mayhew, M. J., Finelli, C. J., Harding, T. S., & Carpenter, D. D. (2006). [Factors influencing engineering students' decisions to cheat by type of assessment.](#) *Research in Higher Education*, 47 (6), 643-684.

This is a very meticulous study of engineering student cheating by type of assessment, specifically exams and homework. They make the point that “cheating” differs greatly across assessment forms, and that factors associated with cheating also differ across assessment forms. Beyond that, they conclude that: 1) schools should carefully define what constitutes cheating for each of the relevant assessment forms, and 2) that student’s perceived moral obligations to refrain from cheating was an important predictor of their refraining from cheating.

36. Bertram Gallant, T. (2007). [The complexity of integrity culture change: A case study of a liberal arts college.](#) *The Review of Higher Education*, 30 (4), 391-411.

This case study examines the efforts of a four-year American liberal arts college to change the academic culture from one characterized by dishonesty to one of integrity during the 1997-98 school year at Lasallian College. A faculty committee decided that the most effective way to change the culture was to create an academic honor code that would express support for integrity, discourage academic dishonesty, and operate as a symbol of the mutual trust and respect between students and faculty. However, faculty resistance, supplemented by the college's own culture, hampered efforts for cultural change with little chance of an implementation of a culture of academic integrity. The failure was more one of an improperly implemented organizational change of culture than one of denying academic honesty. The strength of this article is a Scheinian understanding of the importance of organizational change and the need for total buy in to change a college's culture to one of academic honesty.

37. Granitz, N., & Loewy, D. (2007). [Applying ethical theories: Interpreting and responding to student plagiarism.](#) *Journal of Business Ethics*, 72, 293-306.

Comprehensive study on ethical theories students apply to justify plagiarism as well as strategies to counteract such justification. Well developed construct of applicable theories and content analysis for a specific cohort with generalized implications. Very helpful for on-going discussion concerning understanding student motivation. Disclosure: I was the "dean of students" who helped provide the student's rationalization for cheating as part of the author's content analysis.

38. Strom, P. S., & Strom, R. D. (2007). [Cheating in middle school and high school.](#) *The Educational Forum*, 71 (Winter), 104-116.

This article, on cheating in middle and high schools summarizes a number of studies on the topic, and more importantly, offers useful suggestions to parents and teachers concerned with issues of academic integrity. While the focus is on middle and high school, many of the suggestions are equally relevant to college students.

39. Bertram Gallant, Tricia, & Drinan, Patrick. (2008). [Toward a Model of Academic Integrity Institutionalization: Informing Practice in Postsecondary Education.](#) *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 38 (2), 25-44

Theory to practice case study model of institutionalized academic integrity. Practical application that provides new look at the role of academic affairs leadership to sustain academic integrity institutionalization.

40. Compton, J. & Pfau, M. (2008). [Inoculating Against Pro-Plagiarism Justifications: Rational and Affective Strategies.](#) *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, February: 98 – 119.

This article uses the metaphor of inoculation to propose fighting viral plagiarism. The authors hypothesize that "inoculating" students before they are tempted to plagiarize ultimately helps reduce the incidence and severity of plagiarism much as a polio vaccine protects one from polio. Three types of inoculation can take place: guilt-based, fear-based and rational with the first being the most effective. The article is long and at times pedantic, but ultimately offers a "vaccine" to potential plagiarists and makes an intriguing contribution to the literature.

41. Howard, R. M. & Davies, L. (2009). [Plagiarism in the Internet Age.](#) " *Educational Leadership*, March: 64-67.

Howard and Davies make excellent suggestions on how to build pedagogy that combats cheating. The pedagogy "should both teach source-reading skills and take into consideration our increasingly wired world. And it should communicate that plagiarism is wrong in terms of what society values about schools and learning." They then provide an outstanding step-by-step curriculum based on the work of Sue Shirley (2004). This article gives excellent anti-cheating strategies for the classroom instructor.

42. Power, L. G. (2009). [University students' perceptions of plagiarism.](#) *The Journal of Higher Education*, 80 (6), 643-662.

Although the sample comes from a group of students at one university, I think the responses are ones that will seem to fit students of many skill levels at many universities. More significantly, the author does a very good job with her analysis of the interview and focus group material. Her examination of agency and externalization were innovative, and her subsequent discussion was well wrought. She speaks of issues that Valentine also addresses, but she does it in a way that will be understandable to a broader audience. More readers of the CAI volume are likely to agree with Power's point that "Perhaps teachers and university faculty should consider that their current methods of prevention are no longer working for every student... We cannot assume a one-size-fits-al approach will work in preventing plagiarism" (p. 658) than her comments that "Perhaps we should also re-examine the concept of intellectual property for ourselves as well... As our worries about students' plagiaristic behavior evolve with changing times, perhaps our own view of intertextuality is due to evolve as well" (p. 658) – but she opens the area for discussion in an appealing way.

Chapter 4

The Expansion Years: 2010-2015

43. Elander, J., Pittam, G., Lusher, J., Fox, P., & Payne, N. (2010). [Evaluation of an intervention to help students avoid unintentional plagiarism by improving their authorial identity.](#) *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 35(2), 157-171.

The authors provided an intervention for 364 psychology students at 3 universities in London designed to increase their authorial identity as a way to decrease incidents of plagiarism. To measure the efficacy of the intervention, students were given the Student Authorship Questionnaire both before and after the intervention. This questionnaire measures beliefs and attitudes about authorial identity with questions from categories like confidence in writing, understanding authorship, knowledge to avoid plagiarism, top-down approaches to writing, bottom-up approaches to writing, and pragmatic approaches to writing. The authors found that the students who participated in the intervention increased their confidence and understanding of authorship to a significant extent. Follow-up focus groups confirmed the studies finding that the students with the most benefit are those in their first year. The institution did not appear to see a decline in numbers of prosecuted cases of plagiarism, but the authors speculate that that may have been due to the fact that the intervention was focused on unintentional plagiarism not the more serious violations that typically result in hearings.

44. Simkin, M. G., & McLeod, A. (2010). [Why do college students cheat?](#) *Journal of Business Ethics*, 94(3), 441-453.

This article reports the results of a study that applied the theory of reasoned action and partial least squares methodology to analyze the responses of 144 students to a survey on cheating behavior. Approximately 60% of the business students and 64% of the non-business students admitted to such behavior. Among cheaters, a “desire to get ahead” was the most important motivating factor – a surprising result given the comprehensive set of factors tested in the study. Among non-cheaters, the presence of a “moral anchor” such as an ethical professor was most important.

45. Teixeira, A. A. C., & Rocha, M. F. (2010). [Cheating by economics and business undergraduate students: an exploratory international assessment.](#) *Higher Education*, 59(6), 663-701.

The authors of this study survey 7,213 students enrolled in 42 universities located in 21 countries from around the world. Specifically, they looked at one kind of cheating behavior--copying on exams. The authors used self-reporting by students and a means to gauge the prevalence of cheating. Based on the literature, they came up with six hypothesis to test. Based on their findings, they were able to corroborate 5 of the six: students are more likely to copy when they believe it will be effective, and when prohibitions and enforcement are weak. High perceived sanctions for copying and the existence of honor codes seem to make it less likely for students to copy. The authors were not able to corroborate their hypothesis that students will copy if they think that they will not do well without copying. They did find, however, that copying on tests strongly correlated with overall levels of corruption in the countries studied. Thus, Scandinavian students reported 5% copying while the Eastern European countries reported 88%. They also found a significant difference by gender across countries, with women being less likely to copy than men. Overall, the authors speculate that significant reductions in cheating may need to come from society wide efforts to inculcate honesty.

46. Bretag, T., Mahmud, S., Wallace, M. J., Walker, R., James, C., Green, M., East, J., McGowan, U., & Patridge, L. (2011). [Core elements of exemplary academic integrity policy in Australian higher education.](#) *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 7(2), 1-10.

In this paper, authors identified five core elements of exemplary academic integrity policy, based on preliminary analysis of the publicly available online academic integrity policies at each of the 39 Australian universities. They conclude that an exemplar policy needs to provide an upfront, consistent message, reiterated throughout the entire policy, which indicates a systemic and sustained commitment to the values of academic integrity and the practices that ensure it.

47. Shu, L. L., Gino, F., & Bazerman, M. H. (2011). [Dishonest deed, clear conscience: When cheating leads to moral disengagement and motivated forgetting](#). *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 37(3), 330-349.

This article explores moral disengagement and motivated forgetting as a result of one's cheating behaviors; behavioral consequences through the action of cheating. Using the work of Bandura, the authors add to the literature with this study by exploring how students justify or employ "mechanisms" to (somewhat) self-soothe and morally disengage from their behaviors that they themselves consider to be wrong. The authors test 5 hypotheses related to their claim(s) that there is a relationship between cheating/unethical behavior and the moral disengagement and motivated forgetting that comes after. Student cheating scenarios are used to measure attitudes towards morals and behaviors comparing tolerances to personal cheating and the cheating of others.

48. Van Yperen, N. W., Hamstra, M. R. W., & van der Klauw, M. (2011). [To win, or not to lose, at any cost: The impact of achievement goals on cheating](#). *British Journal of Management*, 22(s1), S5-S15.

The paper examines the relations between achievement goals and cheating in 2 studies. For the first study, and after measuring their motivation to achieve, the undergraduate students were asked to rate their intention to cheat on a scale of 1-10 (absolutely not- absolutely) against each of four vignettes. Study 1 found that the extent that someone was prepared to cheat related to the dominance of their achievement goals in a particular setting, and that this dominance varied from setting to setting. Study 2 used a GRID concentration task (Harris & Harris, 1984) where students were asked to focus on a particular goal, and then complete the task which did permit some cheating. Students using achievement goals were found to cheat more than students who chose to master the task. The key contribution of this paper is that it lends further support to other studies that suggest cheating behaviour is more prevalent in educational settings when compared to work or sporting situations.

49. Dee, T. S., & Jacob, B. A. (2012). [Rational ignorance in education a field experiment in student plagiarism](#). *The Journal of Human Resources*, 47(2), 397-434.

This paper looks at the prevalence of plagiarism by randomly collecting samples of papers from 573 students in 28 different courses rather than relying on self-reporting data. Evidence from the literature suggests that students do not understand plagiarism and have little incentive to learn since it is unlikely to be detected. The authors rely on a rational ignorance model of decision-making to explain this fact and predict student behavior, theorizing that introducing the tutorial would result in decreased plagiarism because students would understand plagiarism and believe that it is more likely to be detected. They followed up the random sampling with a survey to participants. The authors found that students who did receive the treatment did plagiarize significantly less, but they also found that these same students did not appear to think that plagiarism was more likely to be detected or punished than the students in the control group. The authors conclude that this indicates that decline in plagiarism is explained by the students attaining a greater understanding of plagiarism.

50. Evering, L. C., & Moorman, G. (2012). [Rethinking plagiarism in the digital age](#). *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 56(1), 35-44.

This theoretical article proposes to reconsider plagiarism as a complex, and not only academic but literacy issue. It postulates that academics should focus more on the underlying reasons for plagiarism, rather than the concurrency of it. Due to the digital revolution, the way Millennials see intellectual property is different from previous generation perspectives; they have a more participatory view of it, in which ideas and knowledge are co-constructed. Thus, the authors recommend that educators should focus on developing fresh, literacy instruction, converging on how Millennials think and learn and what matters and interests to them. By taking advantage of these student properties, faculty can modify assignments and research practices, creating ones that are interesting for students and that engage them in learning. The idea is to teach skills, knowledge, and expertise through writing activities that are valuable for students.

51. Hu, G., & Lei, J. (2012). [Investigating Chinese university students' knowledge of and attitudes toward plagiarism from an integrated perspective](#). *Language Learning*, 62(3), 813-850.

The study explores Chinese university students' knowledge and attitudes toward plagiarism as well as factors that may contribute to their ability to identify them in actual writing samples. This cross-sectional design study sought to know Chinese students' knowledge of plagiarism and their ability to recognize two types of it: blatant plagiarism and subtle plagiarism. The purpose was to understand if these Chinese university students knew and shared the Anglo-American notions of plagiarism. Also, the authors sought to comprehend how students conceive blatant and subtle plagiarism and the factors that permit students to detect plagiarism. Through a mixed methodology, 270 students from two different socioeconomic Chinese universities rated three English passages. They gave a quantitative and qualitative evaluation of the texts. The authors of this paper analyzed students' quantitative rating and qualitative commentaries to know if they recognized blatant and subtle plagiarism and how they understood the problem. Only the minority of students identified unacknowledged paraphrasing as plagiarism. The students who identified subtle plagiarism were also able to recognize blatant plagiarism. Results showed that there are cultural differences in how Chinese and American students understand plagiarism.

52. Neville, L. (2012). [Do economic equality and generalized trust inhibit academic dishonesty? Evidence from state-level search-engine queries](#). *Psychological Science*, 23(4), 339-345.

The author combines several interesting databases to explore the relation between Income inequality, trust and cheating. They use data from Google on search queries by persons looking for cheat web sites, using a set of nine search terms such as “free term paper”, or “buy term paper”. They proxy “trust” with results from eleven different surveys, which ask questions such as: “Generally Speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you can’t be too careful in dealing with people?” They proxy income inequality with “gini” coefficient estimates for US households, based on census data. They find that there is an inverse relation between income inequality and these apparent cheating efforts, and that the bulk of that relation from Income inequality to cheating seems to be captured by “trust”.

53. Walker, M., & Townley, C. (2012). [Contract cheating: A new challenge for academic honesty?](#) *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 10(1), 27-44.

This article is more informational (non empirical), being perhaps one of the first to synthesize definitions causes, ethical issues, and strategies to prevent contract cheating. The argument is made by the authors that contract cheating is “arguably more fraudulent”, but that the best responses to this issue is “avoid moral panic”. The authors note that contract cheating is here to stay, given the supply

and demand that exists between students and those they contract with. The article provides 6 stages of Detection, 8 causes of Contract Cheating, and several methods of prevention/deterrence. Since this is perhaps one of the first publications to tackle the issue of contract cheating in this manner, its importance cannot be understated.

54. Bretag, T., Mahmud, S., Wallace, M., Walker, R., McGowan, U., East, J., Green, M., Partridge, L., & James, C. J. S. i. H. E. (2014). [‘Teach us how to do it properly!’ An Australian academic integrity student survey](#). *Studies in Higher Education*, 39(7), 1150-1169.

The purpose of the study was to explore the student experience with awareness, and satisfaction with academic integrity policy. As well the researchers examined students' reported experiences with breaches to integrity follow up. The study had a large sample size of over 15,000 students that were secured across six different post-secondary organizations. This was the largest study in Australia and provided valuable insight to the student experience to support better approaches to building cultures of academic integrity.

55. Glendinning, I. (2014). [Responses to student plagiarism in higher education across Europe](#). *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 10(1), 1-17.

Data included in this study came out of the larger project, Impact of Policies for Plagiarisms in Higher Education across Europe, funded by the European Commission. The study focuses on institutional policies, best practices, and areas of concern. The study found that across institutions surveyed, not all policies were applied consistently while coercion and intimidation to drop cases of plagiarism was also found. Best practices included effective pedagogy and assessment. This article reviewed data from the Impact of Policies for Plagiarism in Higher Education across Europe (IPPHEAE) project. The article discussed the near 5,000 responses from students and faculty. The data was insightful and provided a great baseline of policies and attitudes across the European landscape.

56. Pecorari, D., & Petrić, B. (2014). [Plagiarism in second-language writing](#). *Language Teaching*, 47(3), 269-302.

The writers offer a thorough review of literature, including methodological approaches to research focused on plagiarism with a specific lens on students writing in a second language. They challenge the reader to re-consider plagiarism with this specific group of students as a developmental process to their writing and an issue with textual relationships rather than a moral transgression. Writers speak to patchwriting issues and problems with the oversimplification of educational efforts to thwart plagiarism. They consider methodological implications and future research.

57. Sutherland-Smith, W. (2014). [Legality, quality assurance and learning: competing discourses of plagiarism management in higher education](#). *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 36(1), 29-42.

This study examines plagiarism management from a learner-centered approach. The article proposes a model and framework focused on quality assurance that encompasses a strategic plan, institutional self-evaluation, and learning experiences for students. The article references Australia, Sweden and the United Kingdom as example countries to further examine how the model could enhance their current practices. This model is an asset to the field because it contains a centralized plan that can be utilized across nations.

58. Dalal, N. (2015). [Responding to plagiarism using reflective means](#). *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 11(1), 4.

This paper is an exploratory study on reflective means of addressing academic integrity breaches. The paper argues for a learning approach in contrast to a punitive approach. The main strength of the work lies in the links between the reflection process and the theories behind such approaches including Transformative Learning theory and Reflective Practice. The work includes a range of definitions and frameworks for exploring reflective responses to academic Integrity breaches and learning more generally. The paper is nicely organized and includes important information about the existing literature to reflection. Practical examples from an experience with employing reflection as an intervention brings life to the content. The paper almost feels like a precursor to restorative approaches to remediation with students that is now gaining traction in the field of academic integrity.

59. Giluk, T. L., & Postlethwaite, B. E. (2015). [Big Five personality and academic dishonesty: A meta-analytic review](#). *Personality and Individual Differences*, 72, 59-67.

This study was the first of its kind - a meta-analytic study of the Big Five personality traits and academic dishonesty. Results differed from earlier research on this same topic yet was consistent with other research on deviant work-place behavior and anti-social behavior. Out of the Big Five, conscientiousness and agreeableness maintain the strongest relationship with academic dishonesty. Students scoring higher in conscientiousness and agreeableness were less likely to cheat than students who scored lower. This study provides valuable insight to better understand the personality traits of those who engage in academic dishonesty.

Chapter 5

The Contract Cheating Years: 2016-2020

60. Curtis, G. J., & Vardanega, L. (2016). [Is plagiarism changing over time? A 10-year time-lag study with three points of measurement.](#) *Higher Education Research & Development*, 1-13.

The writers report findings from a longitudinal study that compares student rates, understanding, and appreciation for the seriousness of plagiarism. Findings indicate that rates at their post-secondary organization are trending downwards while understanding and appreciation for the seriousness and implications of committing plagiarism are increasing. The writers suggest that combined efforts that include education with students may be positively impacting their findings. The research questions are clear, method is well explained, and findings reported clearly.

61. Ehrich, J., Howard, S. J., Mu, C., & Bokosmaty, S. (2016). [A comparison of Chinese and Australian university students' attitudes towards plagiarism.](#) *Studies in Higher Education*, 41(2), 231-246.

The paper presents survey results for a cross cultural study to explore the difference in attitudes to plagiarism between Australian and Chinese University students. Innovatively, both groups were surveyed in their “home” context. There were differences found between the cultural groups on justification of plagiarism under stressful workload conditions, copying “with permission” and loaning your work to others. The work is valuable in addressing myths around cross-cultural attitudes to academic integrity.

62. Hylton, K., Levy, Y., & Dringus, L. P. (2016). [Utilizing webcam-based proctoring to deter misconduct in online exams.](#) *Computers & Education*, 92-93, 53-63.

The paper considers the use of remote proctoring of examinations as a deterrent for cheating behaviours. There were no significant differences in examination results between proctored and non-proctored groups, although the non-proctored groups perceived a greater opportunity for misconduct, and there were difference in overall time taken to complete the tasks. The study contributes to the understanding of issues in terms of exam outcomes, completion timing and perceptions of misconduct opportunities in online examinations taken under various proctoring conditions.

63. Lines, L. (2016). [Ghostwriters guaranteeing grades? The quality of online ghostwriting services available to tertiary students in Australia.](#) *Teaching in Higher Education*, 21(8), 889-914.

This article seeks to understand the quality of ghostwriting services and outcomes to further universities understanding of detection. Researchers purchased two ghostwritten papers and submitted them to academic professors. The professors were unable to tell they were written by a ghostwriter and believed they were an original work by the student. Researchers understand this poses a problem for detection and policing in ghostwriting services.

64. Newton, P.M. (2016). [Academic integrity: A quantitative study of confidence and understanding in students at the start of their higher education.](#) *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 41(3), 482-497.

This research study looked at the attitudes, ability and confidence of undergraduates newly enrolled at an institute of higher education in the UK. Researchers found that confident students did better on tests of referencing and recommended more severe penalties for violations of academic integrity. This study

contributes to the understanding of students who engage in academic dishonesty and provides key insight into root causes of the behavior. The purpose of this article was to assess the confidence and understanding of incoming undergraduate students. The author was exploring implications student self-efficacy when it came to academic misconduct. The study determined that students seemed confident and understood plagiarism. However, the data also showed that the students had a significantly different perspective of penalties for misconduct in comparison to staff. The article did a great job sharing data and conclusions for practice.

65. Bertram Gallant, T. (2017). [Academic Integrity as a teaching & learning issue: From theory to practice](#). *Theory Into Practice*, 56(2), 88-94.

The paper presents a case for the integration of academic Integrity issues into the “mainstream” of teaching. The work argues for a change from punitive approaches to educative approaches and specifically addresses the notion of a 'cheating moment' as a teachable moment within instructional processes. The work provides excellent examples of specific strategies to link academic Integrity with instructional methods and provides specific theoretical support for the approaches recommended. .

66. Curtis, G. J., & Clare, J. (2017). [How prevalent is contract cheating and to what extent are students repeat offenders?](#) *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 15(2), 115-124.

This article provides a meta-analysis of five recent studies of contract cheating. The authors used research methodologies to assess the prevalence of contract cheating in Iran and Australia. The authors then used theory from criminal justice about repeat offenses to stimulate further surveys with students who admitted to contract cheating. The article does a solid job of laying out the issues of assessing contract cheating and pointing to the re-offense concerns.

67. Draper, M. J., & Newton, P. M. (2017). [A legal approach to tackling contract cheating?](#) *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 13(1), 11.

Draper and Newton define contract cheating, describe related legal concepts and key legal basics, and discuss the problems with current laws to combat contract cheating. They argue for new law based in legal principles of “strict liability,” and test this proposal “against many of the other legal and cultural issues associated with contract cheating” (6). They include discussion of contract cheating across countries and implications of contract cheating law, including questions related to criminal prosecution of students, deterrents to reporting cheating, metrics for success, and the supply and demand problem outside of the law.

68. Rogerson, A. M. (2017). [Detecting contract cheating in essay and report submissions: process, patterns, clues and conversations](#). *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 13(1), 1-10.

The writer provides a thorough discussion of the challenges related to detecting contract cheating with student work. She also offers practical tips and a framework to approach how evaluations are assessed that will help detecting contract cheating. Helpful figures and tables are provided that aim to help academics in their efforts to accurately assess work. She also offers commentary on the importance of doing preventative work with students and in establishing quality in assessment efforts.

69. Stephens, J. M. (2017). [How to cheat and not feel guilty: Cognitive dissonance and its amelioration in the domain of academic dishonesty](#). *Theory Into Practice*, 56(2), 111-120.

The paper considers cognitive dissonance and the factors which can explain, ameliorate, and contribute to student action in the academic integrity field. Attribution theory and social norms theory are applied to the domain, and suggestions are raised for interventions. The work has interesting conceptual

applications to the AI field and provides a strong link between social psychology and student actions and justifications in relation to conduct. Specifically, the discussion of the interventions proposed provides useful foundational considerations for institutional action.

70. Bertram Gallant, T. (2018). [Part-time integrity? Contingent faculty and academic integrity](#). *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 2018(183), 45-54.

This article highlights the issue of contingent (casual) community college faculty and some of the barriers that inhibit these educators in supporting academic integrity initiatives such as a lack of paid time for training and development. Of particular importance are the summary action items provided to assist colleges and institutions implement effective ways of communicating integrity. These action items include: creating spaces for academic integrity as a teaching and learning issue (as opposed to a compliance issue), how to integrate integrity lesson for faculty, and how faculty can leverage academic integrity as teachable moments.

71. Bretag, T., Harper, R., Burton, M., Ellis, C., Newton, P., Rozenberg, P., Saddiqui, S., & van Haeringen, K. (2018). [Contract cheating: A survey of Australian university students](#). *Studies in Higher Education*, 44(11), 1837-1856.

Large-scale, robust Australian study conducted by recognized experts in the field. Identifies 7 distinct contract cheating behaviours, and looks at student attitudes (grouped by those who admitted cheating and those who did not). The study identifies prevalence, and factors that contribute to the likelihood of cheating including dissatisfaction with the teaching and learning experience, opportunities to cheat, and speaking a language other than English. Their solution focuses on building close relationships between educators and students, working on feedback on formative assessment.

72. Cronan, T. P., Mullins, J. K., & Douglas, D. E. (2018). [Further understanding factors that explain freshman business students' academic integrity intention and behavior: Plagiarism and sharing homework](#). *Journal of Business Ethics*, 147(1), 197-220.

Study of behavioral factors that contribute to or influence academic misconduct behaviors. Study follows large n of business students over two years, focused on sharing homework and plagiarism behaviors. Well-cited, clearly rigorous. Study finds “attitude,” “perceived behavioral control,” “past academic integrity behavior,” and “moral obligation” as the primary influencing behavioral factors. Study offers variety of general recommendations for influencing student academic integrity behaviors based on said factors; none particularly novel or compelling.

73. Morris, E. J. (2018). [Academic integrity matters: Five considerations for addressing contract cheating](#). *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 14(1), 15.

This piece is a commentary on the issue of contract cheating and how higher education should respond to it. The authors discuss five areas that should be considered: Strategy for academic integrity: holistic approaches to all forms of academic dishonesty Institutional policy: similar to strategy, policy should address academic honesty holistically Understanding students: the prevalence of contract cheating and the reasons for cheating Assessment practices: developing assessments that prevent contract cheating Professional development: training for detecting contract cheating and for working with students around this issue

74. Newton, P. M. (2018). [How common is commercial contract cheating in higher education and is it increasing? A systematic review](#). *Frontiers in Education*, 3(67).

This study sought to identify if commercial contract cheating is increasing through the use of systematic literature review between 1978 and 2016. Papers were included if the study has responses

from higher education students who had paid for an assignment, but excluded papers where they examined paying for test taking, perceptions about contract cheating, any ambiguity over the source of supply and where the papers related to community colleges or further education. Through an analysis of 71 samples from 65 studies the study concludes that both contract cheating and general academic misconduct appear to be increasing.

75. Rowland, S., Slade, C., Wong, K.-S., & Whiting, B. (2018). [‘Just turn to us’: The persuasive features of contract cheating websites](#). *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(4), 652-665.

This study examined the features and strategies used by contract-cheating websites to persuade students to purchase materials. Through an environmental scan using search terms and engines 11 sites were identified as being the highest ranked and therefore most likely to be seen by students. Sites were then analysed against the use of persuasive devices such as ‘informativeness’, ‘credibility’ and ‘involvement’. Sites were found to use a number of credibility features to entice students to purchase by solving their ‘problem’. The authors provide a number of useful talking points to highlight to students the dangers of engaging with these sites.

76. Amigud, A., & Lancaster, T. (2019). [246 reasons to cheat: An analysis of students’ reasons for seeking to outsource academic work](#). *Computers & Education*, 134, 98-107.

This study used discourse analysis to examine a dataset of 5,000 Twitter messages from students seeking to outsource academic work. The unsolicited messages were not subject to reporting biases therefore presenting contextual accounts of interactions with contract cheating providers. Five influencing factors were identified as catalysing agents that had influence on academic misconduct. These were a lack of academic aptitude, a lack of self-discipline, difficulties with perseverance, and personal issues. The fifth issue, competing objectives related to difficulties with prioritization and scheduling.

77. Ives, B., & Nehr Korn, A. (2019). [A research review: Post-secondary interventions to improve academic integrity](#). In D. M. Velliari (Ed.), *Prevention and Detection of Academic Misconduct in Higher Education* (pp. 39-62). IGI Global.

A meta-analysis (97n) of research on the effectiveness of academic misconduct intervention strategies. Methodically sound, and rigorous in scope and depth of review. Study acknowledges and negotiates other key methodological concerns in research attempting to measure intervention effectiveness. Findings are extremely detailed, at times a bit difficult to sift through, but thorough nonetheless. Ultimate findings: similarity detection works, but only on similarity; education works, but inconsistently; honor codes consistently work, need more focus; proctoring is inconclusive, needs better research; AI needs development.

78. Jamieson, S., & Howard, R. (2019). [Rethinking the relationship between plagiarism and academic integrity](#). *Revue internationale des technologies en pédagogie universitaire / International Journal of Technologies in Higher Education*, 16(2), 69-85.

Article offers a very thoughtful interrogation of how modern (current) perceptions of authorship and intellectual property shade concepts of integrity and misconduct. Primarily a well-cited, soundly structured historiography, the article unpacks key vocabulary such as “integrity,” “academic integrity,” and “plagiarism” alongside a concise history of how literacy transitions between 19th, 20th, and 21st Centuries. Authors conclude with call to simplify taxonomy of misconduct where more is viewed as simple errors not misconduct, with literacy-oriented pedagogy as misconduct mitigation practice. Timely and well-reasoned.

79. Peled, Y., Eshet, Y., Barczyk, C., & Grinautski, K. (2019). [Predictors of academic dishonesty among undergraduate students in online and face-to-face courses](#). *Computers & Education*, 131, 49-59.

This study across six institutions and comprising 2475 undergraduate students in the USA and Israel used a five part survey to measure academic dishonesty against motivation, personality traits, attitudes, perceived opportunity in addition to socio-demographic variables. Results indicate that the principal variables predicting a tendency to cheat are related to personality traits, staff attitudes and institutional policies. Course type was the most significant predictor of academic misconduct, with students choosing to study online less likely to cheat as they are reliant on intrinsic rather than extrinsic motivation.

80. Rundle, K., Curtis, G. J., & Clare, J. (2019). [Why students do not engage in contract cheating](#). *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 22-29.

A methodologically robust study using criminological theory to understand why students do not engage in contract cheating. It was a large survey of 1204 students. The authors explain contract cheating as analogous to crime, arguing, those with low self-control are more susceptible. Other factors that contribute to students engaging in contract cheating include time pressure; lack of perseverance/grit; and personality traits including narcissism, Machiavellianism, and lack of remorse. The practical implications are tentative, placing a focus on motivation to learn, morals and social norms, and risk of detection and punishment.

81. Amigud, A., & Lancaster, T. (2020). [I will pay someone to do my assignment: An analysis of market demand for contract cheating services on twitter](#). *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 45(4), 541-553.

This study investigated tweets in which students sought contract cheating services. The most common discipline was math. Students sought a wide variety of services, including essays, discussion posts, papers, creative writing, letters of recommendation, and exam impersonation. For some tweets, researchers were able to calculate a price per page for written work. The median was \$8.33 per page. The authors note that this rate is too low to attract good writers based in the United States, so much contract cheating is outsourced. Another finding was that many students who cheat rely on people they know to complete their assignments.

82. Ellis, C., van Haeringen, K., Harper, R., Bretag, T., Zucker, I., McBride, S., Rozenberg, P., Newton, P., & Saddiqui, S. (2020). [Does authentic assessment assure academic integrity? Evidence from contract cheating data](#). *Higher Education Research & Development*, 39(3), 454-469.

This article tests common Academic Integrity recommendations that “authentic assessment” can help mitigate academic misconduct. Study uses Iverson et al.’s (2008) five parameters of “authenticity:” relationship to a professional activity; frequency of performance; setting of performance and assessment; use of higher-order thinking and complexity; degree of inherent reflection/feedback. Study tests for markers of authenticity among datasets of orders from a contract cheating service, and known contract cheating cases from a university. Study finds no conclusive evidence that authentic assessments correlate with less frequent misconduct.

83. Lancaster, T. (2020). [Academic discipline integration by contract cheating services and essay mills](#). *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 18(2), 115-127.

This paper explores contract cheating from a discipline related context using Google search terms with

discipline +essay. Nineteen discipline groups were identified as being targeted by contract cheating firms, yet acknowledges through measurement of organic results, paid results and competition that some disciplines are at greater risk of exploitation. The analysis further notes the shift of the contract cheating industry to shift its promotional spend from search terms such as “buy essay” to discipline specific searches and thereby circumvent restrictions imposed by search engines to try and limit the practice.

84. Perkins, M., Gezgin, U. B., & Roe, J. (2020). [Reducing plagiarism through academic misconduct education](#). *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 16(1), 3.

This paper outlines and evaluates an intervention program designed to improve the academic writing skills of students studying while reducing levels of academic misconduct. Through the use of a writing sample obtained every semester the intervention program also seeks to assist in the detection of contract cheating by establishing a benchmark to measure the usual standard of writing for each student. The paper reports on 12 semesters worth of student data gathered between 2014 and 2019, that the use of collecting writing samples is an effective tool to help detect instances of academic misconduct.

85. Sefcik, L., Striepe, M., & Yorke, J. (2020). [Mapping the landscape of academic integrity education programs: what approaches are effective?](#) *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 45(1), 30-43.

Very useful study of academic integrity programmes in 44 Australian and NZ institutions, aimed at identifying effectiveness as well as identifying weaknesses, and calling for a greater emphasis on underpinning values. Robust participant recruitment process, with strong questionnaire design, plus semi-structured interviews. Future-looking design recommendations include staff and student co-design; the need for delivery to be both online and classroom-based, and just in time; the need for students to practice their skills; use of innovative T&L strategies (e.g. a Facebook live stream).

Chapter 6: 1992-1999 THEMES						
		The Numbers: Establishing the Problem	Perceptions & Attitudes about Cheating/AI	What Shapes Cheating/ AI	Strategies & Responses	Other
1.	Aaron, R. M. (1992). Student academic dishonesty: Are collegiate institutions addressing the issue?	X	X	X	X	
2.	McCabe, D.L. (1992). The influence of situational ethics on cheating among college students.		X	X		
3.	Kibler, W. L. (1993). Academic dishonesty: A student development dilemma.	X		X	X	
4.	Kibler, W. L. (1993). A framework for addressing academic dishonesty from a student development perspective.	X	X	X	X	
5.	McCabe, D. L. (1993). Faculty responses to academic dishonesty: The influence of honor codes.		X		X	
6.	McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (1993). Academic dishonesty: Honor codes and other contextual influences.	X	X	X	X	
7.	McCabe, Donald L., & Bowers, William J. (1994). Academic dishonesty among males in college: A thirty year perspective.	X	X		X	Trends
8.	Payne, S.L., and Nantz, K.S. (1994). Social accounts and metaphors about cheating.	X	X	X	X	
9.	Davis, S. F., & Ludvigson, H. W. (1995). Additional data on academic dishonesty and a proposal for remediation.	X	X	X	X	
10.	Genereux, R. L., & McLeod, B. A. (1995). Circumstances surrounding cheating: A questionnaire study of college students.	X	X	X		
11.	McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (1996). What we know about cheating in college: Longitudinal trends and recent developments.	X	X	X	X	
12.	Whitley, B. E., Jr. (1998). Factors associated with cheating among college students: A review.	X	X	X	X	

Chapter 7: 2000-2005 THEMES						
		The Numbers: Establishing the Problem	Perceptions & Attitudes about Cheating/AI	What Shapes Cheating/ AI	Strategies & Responses	Other
13.	Cole, S. & Kiss, E. (2000) What Can We Do about Student Cheating?	X	X	X	X	
14.	McCabe, D. L., & Pavela, G. (2000). Some good news about academic integrity.	X	X	X	X	
15.	Jordon, A. E. (2001). College student cheating: The role of motivation, perceived norms, attitudes, and knowledge of institutional policy.		X	X		
16.	McCabe, D. L., Trevino, L., K., & Butterfield, K. D. (2001). Dishonesty in Academic Environments: The Influence of Peer Reporting Requirements.	X	X	X	X	
17.	McCabe, D. L., Trevino, L., K., & Butterfield, K. D. (2001). Cheating in academic institutions: A decade of research.	X	X	X	X	
18.	Nonis, S., & Swift, C. O. (2001). An examination of the relationship between academic dishonesty and workplace dishonesty: A multicampus investigation.		X	X	X	
19.	Stearns, S. A. (2001). The student-instructor relationship's effect on academic integrity.	X	X	X	X	
20.	Whitley, B. E., Jr., & Keith-Spiegel, P. (2001). Academic integrity as an institutional issue.	X	X	X	X	
21.	McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (2002). Honesty and honor codes.		X	X	X	
22.	McCabe, D.L., Trevino, L.K., & Butterfield, K.D. (2002). Honor codes and other contextual influences on academic integrity: A replication and extension to modified honor code settings.			X	X	
23.	Moeck, P. G. (2002). Academic dishonesty: Cheating among college students.	X	X	X	X	
24.	McCabe, D. L., Butterfield, K. D. & Trevino, L., K (2003). Faculty & Academic Integrity: The Influence of Current Honor Codes and Past Honor Code Experiences.	X	X	X	X	Attitudes of Faculty

Chapter 7: 2000-2005 THEMES						
		The Numbers: Establishing the Problem	Perceptions & Attitudes about Cheating/AI	What Shapes Cheating/ AI	Strategies & Responses	Other
25.	Pecorari, Diane. "Good and Original: Plagiarism and Patchwriting in Academic Second-Language Writing."	X		X	X	
26.	Simon, C. A., Carr, J. R., McCullough, S. M., Morgan, S. J., Olsen, T., & Ressel, M. (2003). The other side of academic dishonesty: The relationship between faculty skepticism, gender and strategies for	X	X	X	X	
27.	Eisenberg, Jacob (2004). To cheat or not to cheat: effects of moral perspective and situational variables on students' attitudes.	X	X	X	X	
28.	Sowden, C. (2004). Plagiarism and the culture of multilingual students in postsecondary education abroad.	X	X	X	X	
29.	Townley, C., & Parsell, M. (2004). Technology and academic virtue: Student plagiarism through the looking glass.	X	X	X	X	
30.	McCabe, Donald L. (2005). Cheating among college and university students: A North American perspective.	X	X	X	X	
31.	McCabe, D. L. (2005). It takes a village: Academic dishonesty & educational opportunity.			X	X	

Chapter 8: 2006-2009 THEMES						
		The Numbers: Establishing the Problem	Perceptions & Attitudes about Cheating/AI	What Shapes Cheating/ AI	Strategies & Responses	Other
32.	Bertram Gallant, Tricia, & Drinan, Patrick (2006). Institutionalizing academic integrity: administrator perceptions and institutional actions.		X	X	X	
33.	Christensen Hughes, J. M., & McCabe, D. L. (2006). Understanding academic misconduct.	X	X	X	X	
34.	Hutton, P. A. (2006). Understanding student cheating and what educators can do about it.			X	X	
35.	Passow, H. J., Mayhew, M. J., Finelli, C. J., Harding, T. S., & Carpenter, D. D. (2006). Factors influencing engineering students' decisions to cheat by type of assessment	X	X	X	X	
36.	Bertram Gallant, T. (2007). The complexity of integrity culture change: A case study of a liberal arts college.	X			X	
37.	Granitz, N., & Loewy, D. (2007). Applying ethical theories: Interpreting and responding to student plagiarism.	X	X	X	X	
38.	Strom, P. S., & Strom, R. D. (2007). Cheating in middle school and high school.	X	X	X	X	
39.	Bertram Gallant, Tricia, & Drinan, Patrick. (2008). Toward a Model of Academic Integrity Institutionalization: Informing Practice in	X	X	X	X	
40.	Compton, J. & Pfau, M. (2008). Inoculating Against Pro-Plagiarism Justifications: Rational and Affective Strategies.	X	X	X	X	
41.	Howard, R. M. & Davies, L. (2009). Plagiarism in the Internet Age.		X	X	X	
42.	Power, L. G. (2009). University students' perceptions of plagiarism.		X	X		

Chapter 9: 2010-2015 THEMES						
		The Numbers: Establishing the Problem	Perceptions & Attitudes about Cheating/AI	What Shapes Cheating/ AI	Strategies & Responses	Other
43.	Elander, J., Pittam, G., Lusher, J., Fox, P., & Payne, N. (2010). Evaluation of an intervention to help students avoid unintentional plagiarism by improving their authorial identity		X	X	X	
44.	Simkin, M. G., & McLeod, A. (2010). Why do college students cheat?		X			
45.	Teixeira, A. A. C., & Rocha, M. F. (2010). Cheating by economics and business undergraduate students: an exploratory international assessment	X	X			
46.	Bretag, T., Mahmud, S., Wallace, M. J., Walker, R., James, C., Green, M., East, J., McGowan, U., & Partridge, L. (2011). Core elements of exemplary academic integrity policy in Australian higher education.			X	X	
47.	Shu, L. L., Gino, F., & Bazerman, M. H. (2011). Dishonest deed, clear conscience: When cheating leads to moral disengagement and motivated forgetting.	X	X			
48.	Van Yperen, N. W., Hamstra, M. R. W., & van der Klauw, M. (2011). To win, or not to lose, at any cost: The impact of achievement goals on cheating.			X		
49.	Dee, T. S., & Jacob, B. A. (2012). Rational ignorance in education a field experiment in student plagiarism.			X	X	
50.	Evering, L. C., & Moorman, G. (2012). Rethinking plagiarism in the digital age.		X	X		
51.	Hu, G., & Lei, J. (2012). Investigating Chinese university students' knowledge of and attitudes toward plagiarism from an integrated perspective.		X			
52.	Neville, L. (2012). Do economic equality and generalized trust inhibit academic dishonesty? Evidence from state-level search-engine queries.	X		X		
53.	Walker, M., & Townley, C. (2012). Contract cheating: A new challenge for academic honesty?	X	X		X	
54.	Bretag, T., Mahmud, S., Wallace, M., Walker, R., McGowan, U., East, J., Green, M., Partridge, L., & James, C. J. S. i. H. E. (2014). 'Teach us how to do it properly!' An Australian academic integrity student survey.		X		X	

Chapter 9: 2010-2015 THEMES						
		The Numbers: Establishing the Problem	Perceptions & Attitudes about Cheating/AI	What Shapes Cheating/ AI	Strategies & Responses	Other
55.	Glendinning, I. (2014). Responses to student plagiarism in higher education across Europe.	X		X		
56.	Pecorari, D., & Petrić, B. (2014). Plagiarism in second-language writing.		X		X	
57.	Sutherland-Smith, W. (2014). Legality, quality assurance and learning: competing discourses of plagiarism management in higher education.				X	
58.	Dalal, N. (2015). Responding to plagiarism using reflective means.				X	
59.	Giluk, T. L., & Postlethwaite, B. E. (2015). Big Five personality and academic dishonesty: A meta-analytic review.	X	X	X		

Chapter 10: 2016-2020 THEMES						
		The Numbers: Establishing the Problem	Perceptions & Attitudes about Cheating/AI	What Shapes Cheating/ AI	Strategies & Responses	Other
60.	Curtis, G. J., & Vardanega, L. (2016). Is plagiarism changing over time? A 10-year time-lag study with three points of measurement.	X			X	
61.	Ehrich, J., Howard, S. J., Mu, C., & Bokosmaty, S. (2016). A comparison of Chinese and Australian university students' attitudes towards plagiarism.	X	X			
62.	Hylton, K., Levy, Y., & Dringus, L. P. (2016). Utilizing webcam-based proctoring to deter misconduct in online exams.	X			X	
63.	Lines, L. (2016). Ghostwriters guaranteeing grades? The quality of online ghostwriting services available to tertiary students in Australia.	X				
64.	Newton, P.M. (2016). Academic integrity: A quantitative study of confidence and understanding in students at the start of their higher education.	X	X	X		
65.	Bertram Gallant, T. (2017). Academic Integrity as a teaching & learning issue: From theory to practice.		X	X	X	
66.	Curtis, G. J., & Clare, J. (2017). How prevalent is contract cheating and to what extent are students repeat offenders?	X				
67.	Draper, M. J., & Newton, P. M. (2017). A legal approach to tackling contract cheating?				X	
68.	Rogerson, A. M. (2017). Detecting contract cheating in essay and report submissions: process, patterns, clues and conversations.				X	
69.	Stephens, J. M. (2017). How to cheat and not feel guilty: Cognitive dissonance and its amelioration in the domain of academic dishonesty.		X	X	X	
70.	Bertram Gallant, T. (2018). Part-time integrity? Contingent faculty and academic integrity			X	X	
71.	Bretag, T., Harper, R., Burton, M., Ellis, C., Newton, P., Rozenberg, P., Saddiqui, S., & van Haeringen, K. (2018). Contract cheating: A survey of Australian university students.	X	X	X	X	
72.	Cronan, T. P., Mullins, J. K., & Douglas, D. E. (2018). Further understanding factors that explain freshman business students' academic integrity intention and behavior: Plagiarism and sharing homework.		X	X		

Chapter 10: 2016-2020 THEMES						
		The Numbers: Establishing the Problem	Perceptions & Attitudes about Cheating/AI	What Shapes Cheating/ AI	Strategies & Responses	Other
73.	Morris, E. J. (2018). Academic integrity matters: Five considerations for addressing contract cheating.				X	
74.	Newton, P. M. (2018). How common is commercial contract cheating in higher education and is it increasing? A systematic review.	X				
75.	Rowland, S., Slade, C., Wong, K.-S., & Whiting, B. (2018). 'Just turn to us': The persuasive features of contract cheating websites.		X	X		
76.	Amigud, A., & Lancaster, T. (2019). 246 reasons to cheat: An analysis of students' reasons for seeking to outsource academic work.	X		X		
77.	Ives, B., & Nehr Korn, A. (2019). A research review: Post-secondary interventions to improve academic integrity.			X	X	
78.	Jamieson, S., & Howard, R. (2019). Rethinking the relationship between plagiarism and academic integrity.		X	X		
79.	Peled, Y., Eshet, Y., Barczyk, C., & Grinautski, K. (2019). Predictors of academic dishonesty among undergraduate students in online and face-to-face courses.	X	X	X		
80.	Rundle, K., Curtis, G. J., & Clare, J. (2019). Why students do not engage in contract cheating.		X	X		
81.	Amigud, A., & Lancaster, T. (2020). I will pay someone to do my assignment: An analysis of market demand for contract cheating services on twitter.	X		X		
82.	Ellis, C., van Haeringen, K., Harper, R., Bretag, T., Zucker, I., McBride, S., Rozenberg, P., Newton, P., & Saddiqui, S. (2020). Does authentic assessment assure academic integrity? Evidence from contract cheating data.	X		X	X	
83.	Lancaster, T. (2020). Academic discipline integration by contract cheating services and essay mills.	X		X	X	
84.	Perkins, M., Gezgin, U. B., & Roe, J. (2020). Reducing plagiarism through academic misconduct education.				X	
85.	Sefcik, L., Striepe, M., & Yorke, J. (2020). Mapping the landscape of academic integrity education programs: what approaches are effective?				X	

“It Takes a Village”²:
The Origins of the International Center for Academic Integrity (1992-2010)

[Tricia Bertram Gallant](#)

The International Center for Academic Integrity (Center) has, for the last 30 years, been a leader in the international academic integrity movement. Other organizations have sprung up around the world in its likeness, but it continues to be a guiding light for research and practice.

So, how did it all begin? What is the origin of this Center that has persisted for 30 years despite being primarily led by a group of volunteers through recessions, leadership turnovers, and shifts in organizational structures? And what can we learn from the early years that might help the Center define its path for the next 30 years?

To answer these questions, I interviewed Don McCabe, the man resolutely credited with founding the Center back in 1992. In his usual style of humility and grace, Don rebuffs that accolade and instead talks about all of the folks who were key to creating the Center. So, in 2010, I not only interviewed Don, but 13 other founders and early leaders. And this is their story.

The “Grandfather” of Academic Integrity

While Don may rebuff being credited as the grandfather of the Center and the contemporary academic integrity movement, there is no argument that it was his research that catalyzed the formation of the Center and much of the research that has followed. So to start this story, we need to start with the origins of Don’s academic integrity research.

One urban legend among the Center membership is that Don became interested in academic integrity because he was dismayed with the amount of cheating in his business class at Rutgers. Don, however, quickly debunked that legend and instead credits his Dean at the time who advised him to establish a second area of research in case his first area went “sour” so that he would keep open his options for tenure. It was this, as well as his experience with the honor code while a Princeton undergraduate, that got him interested in studying academic integrity in business schools. According to Don:

I had gone to an honor system at Princeton. I was always intrigued as to why it worked. And I came out of a catholic high school where everybody cheated and then I go to Princeton, a place of secularism, and nobody cheated that I knew. I was always intrigued. Also, my son was a student at Princeton at the time. And I got involved in a conversation with him and some of his classmates about the honor code and it was clear to me, or seemed clear to me, that it was held in slightly different regard than when I was there. Not certainly negative by any means, just different. So I was curious to see what that was all about as well.

Specifically, Don said he was interested in examining the difference in the perceptions of cheating, and self-reported cheating rates, between students enrolled in honor code schools and those who were not. It was through this process of identifying schools to participate that Don got in touch with Sally Cole at Stanford (an honor code school).

Sally Cole was, at the time, the Assistant Director of the newly formed Academic Planning Office as well as a Judicial Affairs Officer at Stanford. In her role as Assistant Director for the Academic Planning

² McCabe, D. L. (2005). It takes a village: Academic dishonesty and educational opportunity. *Liberal Education*, 91(3), 26-31.

The ICAI Reader: 1992-2000

Office she collected and shared data with Academic Deans from “peer institutions” like MIT and “the Ivies”, as Sally put it, on perennial challenges they faced in areas like teaching loads, budget levels, class sizes and all other types of academic matters. As a Judicial Affairs Officer, Sally handled allegations of honor code violations and when she realized that honor code violations far exceeded those of behavioral misconduct, she reached out to the group of Academic Deans from peer institutions to launch a series of discussions about academic integrity.

It was around that same time that Don happened to reach out to Stanford because he wanted them to participate in his research. By the time Don talked to Sally Cole, he said that she quickly informed him:

we have this survey we were planning to do this year anyway, so if you are willing to use those form, or basically those forms with certain key questions, we'll participate.

Don said “I don’t see why not. Send me those forms and I’ll take a look at them” and it turns out that the survey Stanford was planning to do was the one used by Bowers in his 1964 dissertation. This was the first that Don had heard of the Bowers survey, which was the first multi-institutional survey conducted on cheating. So, Don decided to use it so he would have a comparison data set from 30 years prior.

Don then released his survey (adapted from Bowers), which was completed by 6,096 students at 31 American colleges and universities³. However, once he had this data set, the question was – what should institutions do with their data? It was John Margolis from Northwestern University (which had participated in Don’s survey), who inspired the idea of a gathering of participating institutions. According to Don, John said:

McCabe, you know you’ve met every milestone you set for yourself. You’ve given me everything you’ve promised and I have no complaints whatsoever, except for one. He said, I don’t know what the hell to do with all of this information!

So, Don, who came to academe from the corporate world, started to raise some money from his corporate contacts to bring the participating institutions together.

Around the same time, and unbeknownst to Don, Bill Kibler was at Texas A&M finishing up his dissertation exploring academic integrity through a moral development theoretical lens. Independently, Bill had drafted up this idea of a “Center for the Study of Academic Integrity” and had presented it to the Association for Student Judicial Affairs (ASJA, which is now known as the Association for Student Conduct Administrators) for consideration of adapting it into their organization. While ASJA thought it was interesting, according to Bill, they had no money to fund it.

But a colleague of Bill’s had read an article about Don McCabe and shared it with Bill along with the suggestion he reach out to Don. So, Bill did and since this was before the days, or at the earliest days of email, Bill actually called Don and, according to Bill:

I had a long conversation with this guy named Don McCabe who I’d never met before, didn’t know anything about him other than what I had read in an article. We struck up a conversation and he told me about this meeting he was having...this was probably in the late fall of 1991. And he told me about this conference he was going to have in March of ‘92...and he said “I’ve got some money. I want to invite you to come to this meeting.” So I was kind of the....odd man out in there in that the school where I was at the time, which was Texas A&M, had not participated in

³ McCabe, D.L. (1992). The influence of situational ethics on cheating among college students. *Sociological Inquiry*, 62 (3), 365-374. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-682X.1992.tb00287.x>

The ICAI Reader: 1992-2000

his study, meaning that I was not one of the representatives from one of the schools but he wanted me to come and make a presentation at that meeting about my dissertation. and so I did that. And also got to participate in the entire conference and hear all of these presentations from other schools who participated in that study.

Don also invited a couple of other folks who were not study participants like Linda Trevino (who also studied business ethics and eventually became Don's co-author) and Gary Pavela (because of the modified honor code at University of Maryland).

The First Meeting: March 1992

This first meeting occurred at the Newark/New Jersey airport hotel in March of 1992. It was hosted by Don and was largely a sharing event for the participating campuses to talk to one another about what they were doing and why. Don asked Jim Lyons to close the event by facilitating a discussion of "where do we go from here." According to Bill, it was a very unstructured discussion but very interesting. Bill had brought along his thoughts about forming a Center for the Study of Academic Integrity because he really felt that there was a

need for a place that would try to bring some commonality to the language and some commonality to the studies that were going on. I was very struck by how dramatically different these studies were done on various campuses, because almost all of these were just campus-specific studies that had been done. And my favorite two examples...[were] the University of Delaware...[whose study] showed that 71% of their students admitted to cheating, [while] the University of Arkansas study showed that 25% of their students admitted to cheating. Does that mean that Delaware students are 3 times more dishonest than Arkansas students? Well of course not. It was just about the fact that they had defined cheating differently and asked their questions differently and so they got dramatically different results which meant, in terms of any comparison with any other schools or whatever, those two studies were useless. and so that was kind of one of my little crusades, I guess.

For Don, however, the key at that first meeting in March of 1992 was not to encourage research (which he was doing) but to have an organization that involved students. Don recalls:

I had done this project and had all of this information from students that suggested to me that the only way we were going to get our minds around this issue was to look to the students. So my objective was to form an organization that gave students equal standing and...they eventually agreed with me that the students were the key to this thing because they heard what the students had to say at this meeting. Students who were really committed. We had students from Duke, students from Virginia, we had students from Brimar, MIT (that was the other group that came that wasn't in the original survey), and a couple of other students as well, Vanderbilt. There were only 2 faculty. As a result of that meeting, people quickly became to understand why I was so intent on including students in this process and nobody stood in the way of that decision.

Mary Olson, from Oakton Community College, attended that first meeting to get help for her college but also because she wanted Oakton to be affiliated with other institutions that cared about academic integrity. Mary was impressed with the student involvement, and that people were respected as people, whether students, faculty or administrators and that really "appealed" to her. As Mary said "it was very egalitarian" - it didn't matter if you were from the most prestigious university or not because:

there was a mutual commitment to an idea. The curiosity of it. Wanting to help one another with no hidden agendas. Nobody was running for office or had anything at stake other than finding things that they could bring back to their own institutions. The inclusion of students and faculty and administration all together was significant. We didn't have any speakers. It was like "okay,

The ICAI Reader: 1992-2000

here's a problem" and we could solve anything. And that felt really good. The people were certainly terrific and that's what kept me coming back.

The meeting ended with a large gathering of all attendees to engage in a conversation facilitated by Jim Lyons. According to Mary, Jim's "remarks were just so different from anything I had heard before. It was the most excited I had been in an academic setting...it felt very alive and that things were possible". And, according to Don, the results of that discussion facilitated by Jim was that

yes, people wanted to keep getting together...to provide a forum where people could get together and discuss the issue of academic dishonesty and improve their own policies and perhaps share what they knew, what they were learning.

This, then, marked the official beginning of the Center.

The Early Evolution of the Center

In the beginning, the annual meetings continued in this manner. They weren't structured as traditional conferences, with external speakers coming in to tell the participants what they should think or know. Instead, the meetings were focused on discussions and problem solving. Members, or Don from his research, would bring forward different projects or problems and everyone would split into groups to tackle the presented problems/projects. As Mary recalled, everyone present at these meetings believed they could solve any challenge. The meetings were very involved and engaging. One or two people would step up, or be asked, to lead a group. Mary herself, at her first meeting, was asked to lead a discussion of how to create and improve academic integrity policies. For Mary, then, the purpose of joining the Center early on was quite clear and simple - you joined to be a part of these meetings and so Don would do his research on your campus.

In those early days, the operation of the Center was also quite simple. Don relayed that it "operated off of my dining room table for the first two years." Don credited that "slow build", in part, to the initial, and unfortunate, identification of the Center as an "honor code organization" because of the enthusiastic participation by honor code schools in the meetings and the research. However, Don was adamant to point out that the intent of the Center was never to focus on honor codes and he recognized a need to break beyond that stereotype in order to pave the way for the integrity conversation to occur across multiple types of schools, colleges and universities.

When Pat Drinan (University of San Diego) attended the second meeting in 1993 and joined the Center, he immediately bought into Don' vision. Pat, who had himself been a product of an honor code school (the University of Virginia), could clearly see the potential of the Center which, in his words, was to:

have a deeper reach into the academy...[because]...there was such a need for not only diffusion of best practices but for deep conversations about how essential academic integrity is in the academy. Other organizations like NASPA paid some attention to it, but there had not been a broader effort to engage faculty and higher education administrators (or necessarily students) in the discourse.

It was just two years later, in 1995, when the Center experienced its first evolution from "Don's project" into an independent non-profit organization. Sally Cole, who was supposed to have become the second President, ended up as the Center's first Executive Director (and she held that position until 1999) and Wanda Mercer, who was to have been Vice-President, stepped up into the President role for two years (1995-1997)⁴. However, it would be a misrepresentation to infer that the non-profit organization status

⁴ For a full listing of the Center's Presidents and Directors, see <https://academicintegrity.org/about/board-of-directors>

The ICAI Reader: 1992-2000

now meant that the Center had an office space, staffing, and a solidified structure. In reality, the operations moved from Don's dining room table to Sally's.

Despite these humble beginnings, Wanda Mercer insisted that the goal at the time was to “become a national player”. So, during the initial years of the non-profit organization, a lot of time was spent on finding funding. They needed money to pay the Executive Director (and any other staff that came along) and they needed money to achieve the mission. This changed the focus of the leadership, from tackling interesting academic integrity problems and challenges, to: working to justify and substantiate the Center's existence; strategic planning for the long term; and, looking for an institutional home for the Center.

The stars aligned for the Center at the 1996 fall conference being hosted by Duke University. A keynoter at that conference was Elizabeth Kiss, incoming Director of Duke's newly formed Kenan Institute for Ethics. As a result of her participation in that conference, Kiss (also an alum of an honor code school, Davidson College), became very impressed with the Center. So, when Sally (the Executive Director) asked if the Kenan Institute would be interested in hosting the Center, Elizabeth was intrigued. So even though Elizabeth hadn't even begun her position yet, and the Institute was just a thought (not an enacted reality), she started enquiring with the Kenan Institute's Board about the possibility. At Elizabeth's second Kenan board meeting in the spring of 1997, there was a “yes” vote to move forward with carving out a path for the Center for Academic Integrity to be hosted by Duke at the Kenan Institute for Ethics.

A yes from Kenan was just the first step though. Now, the Center's leaders had to determine if this was the path for the future on which they wanted to travel. To make this determination and to chart their vision, five leaders (Mary Olsen, Sally Cole, Don, Jeanne Wilson (University of California, Davis) and Patrick Drinan) sequestered themselves for days in a cabin in the Sierras. In the end, they decided they were interested in this partnership with Kenan but only under specific terms (including remaining a separate, independent non-profit organization). Elizabeth Kiss referred to this meeting as a “seminal meeting” for the Center.

The Center shared their proposal with the Institute and Duke, and eventually an agreement was reached. So, in the fall of 1997, the Center (and Sally) moved from Stanford to the Kenan Institute for Ethics at Duke. According to Wanda, this partnership provided the Center with “a little more permanence and [the] grounding [it needed], and it seemed particularly appropriate to move into an ethics program”. Elizabeth sums it up this way:

I was this brand new, wet-behind-the-ears director and I was saying ‘let's bring this national association here. So I think some people thought it was crazy. But I think it was a great relationship that helped both the Kenan Ethics Program and the Center. For CAI, it was a really important step in the growth process of the organization and the institutionalization of CAI. I also think that in that stage in the organization's development, it was helpful to have the Duke affiliation. And certainly from my perspective, it was really great to have this intensely practical and academy-related topic that Kenan was committed to, an anchor that was real and tangible.

According to Jim Lancaster (Appalachian State University), this move to Duke transformed “a loosely affiliated group of interested persons” who almost came together accidentally because they were “interested in the same thing” into an institutionalized Center, giving it form and focus.” The core focus, Elizabeth recounts, was to continue to promote academic integrity on college campuses, to understand the state of academic integrity and to be an incubator or promoter of additional research on academic integrity.

The Center's tenure at Duke wasn't free of strife or challenges. There was always a push and pull between the independent Center and Duke, especially for the Executive Director (ED) who only worked

The ICAI Reader: 1992-2000

part-time for the Center and part-time for Duke. So, when Daisy Waryold took over as Executive Director in 1999, she categorized the Center as being in its adolescence stage - about 12 years old - and “trying to find our way into adulthood”. Thus, Daisy’s main responsibility at the beginning was to shore up the financial structure (having been handed the finances in a literal shoe box), create a “hit by the bus manual” (so anyone could take over), and work as a marketing professional to increase membership (including by making cold calls to universities around the country). Daisy recounts:

I can remember buying a map and putting all these universities all over it and trying to motivate myself to make these cold calls. I would be looking at this map, thinking ‘how am I going to build this thing without any, really, resources?’ But I think it worked. The critical thing was [getting] the website [up] and getting some help.

Daisy thought that while the Board was fantastic at the time, there was a lot of responsibility on her (and the office) to really get things done because the Board was all volunteers. It was really a one-person show for the first couple of years. Then a membership coordinator was hired to help build the membership base. So, for most of Daisy’s tenure as ED (1999-2004), the main foci was on the annual conference and growing the membership.

After Daisy left the Executive Director position in 2004, the Center had an interim Director (Mindy Dalgran) for a year, until Tim Dodd (Board President at the time) became the Center’s fourth Executive Director. Tim was passionate about the mission of the Center and he saw the Center becoming more and more relevant to society. He recalls that:

the Center was a catalyst for the emerging conversation around academic integrity and [we decided] that we were going to provoke that conversation through multiple means. We would provoke it through the dialogue that would develop within the membership. We would provoke it certainly at the conference. We would provoke through the dissemination of information like the Fundamental Values Guide. We would provoke it by being the “go-to” organization for media who are going to do stories on integrity. And I think that...we did become the “go-to” organization in the media’s eyes. We were in enough media rolodexes, getting calls from the New York Times regularly, getting calls from the Chronicle of Higher Education, getting calls from the Wall Street Journal, getting calls from the Christian Science Monitor and even the secondary markets began to see us. Stories would break nationally and the secondary markets would immediately go to Don or me or Gary [Pavela] or whatever, to get commentary and so that aspect, insinuating ourselves in the media rolodexes was very, very important.

As the Center grew in its prominence, it reached another crossroads in its trajectory - it needed to find a new home. In 2007, the Center moved from Duke University to Clemson University and gave up its status as an independent non-profit organization. So, as a university program, the Board of Directors became an Advisory Council with no fiscal responsibility but rather primarily programmatic and content responsibilities. The Council, with Teddi Fishman as the Executive Director of the Center, focused once again on the annual conference and on bringing value to its members.

It was in 2010 that the Center added International to its name. However, even at the beginning of the Center, there were signs that at some point, it would become international. Don was doing research with colleges and universities around the world and as early as 1996, members from outside of the U.S. were attending the conference from Australia, Canada, Egypt, the United Arab Emirates, and other middle east countries.⁵

⁵ As a side note, the name change mattered. In 2011, the first conference outside of the United States occurred in Toronto. In 2012, Mohamed Abou-Zeid from the American University in Cairo (Egypt) became our first Board President/Advisory Council Chair from outside of the United States, followed by Tracey Bretag from the University of South Australia (Australia) and Chris Lang from the University of Toronto (Canada).

The ICAI Reader: 1992-2000

The Center's Initial Accomplishments

When the Center was formed in the early 1990s, many ethics-focused organizations were forming, but Mary saw the Center as “leading the charge for integrity” or as John Margolis would say “getting [integrity] on the radar screen”. At the time, there was a general thought within higher education that integrity was “important”, but yet something that students, faculty and administrators didn’t think about very often. So, the goal of the Center was to try “to get people thinking about [integrity] in a broader way.” Despite this goal, the primary activity continued to be hosting the annual conferences because the Center did not have sufficient resources or bandwidth to coordinate many other activities.

However, the Center received its first major grant - a two-year grant from the Hewlett Foundation - in 1995 to support its fundamental operations. The Directors used this funding to hold in-person Board meetings twice per year so that they could develop a mission and a strategic plan for the future. It was during this time, according to Wanda, that the Directors “realized we had to do more...we were just not going to be a kind of loosely organized group supporting academic integrity. We wanted to be a group that promoted integrity, encouraged dialogue, promoted principles of integrity and [created] ongoing discussions.”

The first major attempt to accomplish this mission was through the development of the Fundamental Values project, which was funded by a second Hewlett Foundation grant in 1998. According to Sally, the purpose of the Fundamental Values project was to:

to identify and affirm the conditions under which student honesty would flourish. And we had the wisdom to recognize that it was an issue with campus climate that we were talking about. It was not just the student behavior but the environment/the settings in which a student decides to cheat or not to cheat.

Elizabeth reflects on the momentous accomplishment of the Fundamental Values Project:

So I think part of what was so motivating through that process of doing the Fundamental Values was the great synergy between people with different strengths and that’s a serendipitous thing. Mary Olson was in a position to have a colleague do the design work on it. Sally is such a good thinker about these things. And I’m really good at facilitating groups. At one stage of the process, we had something like 200 words up on the board around all four sides of the room. So I was like, ‘okay, we have to start getting rid of redundancies and start picking the best word to represent an idea’ and just started facilitating that process of coming to the five values. I think that was my personal contribution to it. We (Elizabeth Kiss, Jim Larimore, Gary Pavela, Don McCabe, Bill Kibler, Pat Drinan, Mary Olson, and Sally Cole) called ourselves The Durham 8.”

During the process of creating the original Fundamental Values document, Mary recalls that they “weren’t thinking in grandiose terms at the time...[that this would be] a contribution for the ages”. However, Wanda and Pat recalled believing that the document would fundamentally alter the conversations happening on college campuses and potentially impact the international academic integrity movement. Wanda says: “We were becoming more grandiose, we were trying to embrace the issue of integrity through the Fundamental Values Project to promote and shape a national discourse about integrity, which [would] become a benchmark for accreditation, assessment, intellectual discourse and professional ethics.”

Sally agreed with Wanda: “I think all of us that were involved were extremely proud of that document. it represented our best thinking and the response of the colleges around the country was...overwhelming...Sometimes it was required reading for new faculty or it was discussed in student

The ICAI Reader: 1992-2000

orientation.”

And according to Jim: “it was a very seminal experience because it literally got everyone on the same page thinking about how we talk about it and truly at the fundamentals, what are the values and where do we go from there. And I think that was a turning point for the organization.”

The Center’s leaders used this opportunity of the Fundamental Values Project to make its first major push for increasing membership. To start, they asked for presidential endorsements of the Project. Donald Kennedy, Stanford President, wrote a letter to presidents of private universities and Arthur Hughes, University of San Diego President wrote a letter to presidents of religiously affiliated colleges and universities. The leaders then sent the Fundamental Values document to 4,000 U.S. college and university presidents and saw, as a result, its first real bump up in membership. By 1997, the Center had about 200 members.

It was in 1999 that the Center received its third grant, this time from the The John Templeton Foundation, to develop and test an Academic Integrity Assessment and Action Guide. The purpose of the Guide was to take Don’s research and extend it out to: 1) provide the steps that institutions needed to take to move forward on creating cultures of academic integrity; and, 2) to help institutions analyze and understand their survey findings so that they could address problems and barriers to culture creation, as well as celebrate what they were already doing well. Twelve schools participated in the one-year project to test and develop the Guide and the final guide was released in 2001.

Another early accomplishment for the Center was “The State of Academic Integrity”, an annual newsletter sent each fall to university and college presidents in the United States. Daisy was proud of this newsletter because it took a lot of effort to keep the list of presidents up-to-date and to provide content to the newsletter. She said they would include “the latest statistics about cheating in the U.S. and then it would give them reasons why their institution needed to be a part of the movement. Give them 10 tangible reasons and from that we got tangible memberships. It had an executive summary “why does this matter to me?” that had visual appeal.”

It was these activities, primarily the Fundamental Values project and the State of Academic Integrity newsletter, which are credited with contributing to a substantial growth in Center membership. According to Tim:

back in 1997, when I was first attending the conferences, membership was probably under 200 schools at that time. By the time I left in 2007, we were 400 and something schools. Doubling the size of the organization was certainly important and you think of the number of copies of fundamental values guides that have been distributed over the years. And you know you’re talking about in the 10s of thousands and that really did become an amazing publication that is. It was accepted without rebuke or rebuttal as the statement on academic integrity in higher ed. And that’s impressive! People would go to the website and order it and it became the training material for schools undertaking academic integrity projects.”

Tim also believed that the annual conference itself was responsible for attracting new members and was

truly our signature effort and I mean far and away the most impressive that we did. We recruited good people to present. People got value from that conference. The formal program was always very, very strong and the informal interactions were always deeply appreciated...I [myself] found the conference absolutely enthralling, as everybody who goes to the conference did! I loved the mission of the conference. The idea that students, faculty and administrators came to the table on equal footing to have this very important conversation [about academic integrity].

In 2004, the Center received its fourth grant, again from the John Templeton Foundation, to establish the

The ICAI Reader: 1992-2000

Templeton Fellows Program. One senior and four junior scholars were selected to receive the grants to support their academic integrity related research. This was a massive project at the time because it was thought to continue the Center's projection as the leading thinker and research producing organization on academic integrity.

The Early Strengths of the Center

The interviews with the founders and early leaders of the Center made it clear that a true and shared passion for integrity and honesty, without the self-righteousness one might assume with such folks, was the driving force for the creation and initial development of the Center. However, passion without commitment are dreams that fail to turn into reality. So, the commitment of the initial founders, board members and Executive Directors, as well as of Elizabeth Kiss, is the true strength that enabled the Center to come to fruition. It just seemed that at the founding of the Center, there was "great synergy in terms of different people's strengths, and that's a serendipitous thing" (Elizabeth).

The focus on institutional, rather than individual membership, was also cited as a strength and an intentional choice. As Mary noted, "we wanted institutional members because that meant that the institution was committed, rather than just that particular individual. And we recognized that what we were doing required institutional backing." Too true. Academic integrity cannot be brought about by a single individual, but as Don has said "it takes a village" (McCabe, 2005). According to Daisy, the institutional membership encourages the active individual members to build awareness among key people on their campuses, champions, so that the realization that that academic integrity is important spreads and flourishes.

Finally, Pat and Don both emphasized the student-centered nature of the organization as a key strength, through both the inclusion of students at conferences and on the board, but also in the focus of the Center on the ethical development of students. Although there were often debates about whether the organization should also look at faculty or research integrity, for example, the more focused approach seemed to work best, while hoping for "spill-over effects to other ethical areas." Pat saw the Center as a "model and lighthouse about how to get more transparency and light into the academy so we can touch other ethical issues too. You can say there are two fundamentals to the academy: teaching/learning and research. And, we're touching primarily the teaching/learning function." Specifically, countering the narrow and outdated "prevention, policing and punishing" model of cheating, and instead harnessing the understanding that cheating is a normal behavior for young people and so the focus should be on creating cultures of integrity where, when cheating happens regardless, it is responded to developmentally.

The Early Challenges for the Center

The founding and building of the Center was not without its challenges, as for any non-profit organization that is simultaneously trying to start a social movement or the spread of adoption of a value like academic integrity. The following five themes emerged as key early challenges.

The Unstable Table. In the first few years of the Center, Don was the core, the orbit around which all of the other active members circulated. Don held and communicated the passion, and he was the one doing the majority of the research and therefore the one most in touch with institutions around the country. However, once Don wanted to step back away formal leadership responsibility, Mary said "it was harder to find the people who had the vision and the ability, institutionally as well as personally, to take on more responsibilities." This challenge was reflected in the instability at the head of the table - the Executive Director. Between 1997-2005, there were four different Executive Directors, none of whom were full time because they split their time between the Center and Duke University.

The Elusive Member. Identifying and targeting who the Center's members should be seemed to be a perpetual challenge in the early days. There wasn't a natural group of professionals that the Center appealed to because few if any people had academic integrity as their main job or even a large portion of

The ICAI Reader: 1992-2000

their portfolio. Colleges and universities either had honor codes (run by students who rotate in and out quickly), decentralized faculty-run systems, or policies run by student conduct offices (who typically were members of a different association). So, typically at the conferences, the Center would attract new institutions who were just learning or starting a focus on academic integrity, but then they'd get what they need and not return. There was also a constant debate about whether the Center was a higher education organization or a K-12 organization or both. According to Tim "Don was very, very much the dominant voice on including high schools and for quite logical reasons". Obviously students start cheating a long time before college, but it was a "very, very tough challenge" to infiltrate the complex high school system (through boards, superintendents, and principals). And, Tim thought that by widening the Center to include high schools, there was a

danger of conflating missions. Character development in the high schools is a very different focus and academic integrity is a small if not totally obscured element in that conversation in the high schools. At the top of the character development stuff is addressing bullying, addressing respect. These are all good things to address but our institution, our organization, was really focusing on academic integrity as the gateway to those conversations. High schools do that in reverse in many ways.

The Curse of Money. Every non-profit organization struggles with money, and the Center for Academic Integrity was no different. When the Center didn't have any money, the leaders were always focused on trying to find it. And when they did have some money from grants, the limited staff struggled to maintain focus and energies on all of the Center's activities. According to Mary, we "debated [where to find money] until we're blind." They debated different ways to pull in more money. For example, having members serve as Center consultants who would go out into the field to help institutions, but figuring out who gets paid and how seemed complicated. They debated about asking for-profit private industries or people for funding, but, Mary says, "we were always afraid of potential scandals in the future". So the Center avoided such asks even though there was some thought that they might have led to "some good, fruitful relationships that broaden us beyond "academic integrity" to helping people realize that "academic integrity" is connected to broader personal, professional, business, etc., integrity." The founders and original leaders also talked about finding stable foundation support, but that never panned out either. Tim mentioned that they had even hired a fund raising consultant at one point, who was unfortunately not very good. According to Tim:

We face that conundrum of never being big enough to grow ourselves. There's that sort of critical mass or critical size of an organization where you can then hire distinct skill sets and focus on distinct projects. We've never been able to dive into donor exploration. You hope for that first big donation which allows you to expand the organization which allows you to develop a development feature, but we never got there.

In the end, the Center continued to survive mostly on membership and conference fees.

The Barrier to Institutionalization. One of the earliest challenges for the Center was convincing accreditation agencies and stable organizations like the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and the American Association of Colleges & Universities (AAC&U) that academic integrity should be integrated in what they do. However, Pat noted that because the Center was primarily run by volunteers, it wasn't easy to do the sustained work required to develop such partnerships. To that point, Pat wondered:

how do you move a volunteer organization to a sustained campaign rather than an intermittent campaign" when "most of the enthusiasm comes from people at lower levels of the organization, like students themselves, student personnel, student affairs people, some faculty? At some point, the leadership of higher education and foundations need to recognize the power and potential of

The ICAI Reader: 1992-2000

this movement to make a difference in the academy and have them nurture it. It needs to get that kind of leadership higher in the academy.

The Conspiracy of Silence. Let's be frank. Higher education institutions, faculty and leadership, do not really want to talk about academic dishonesty and misconduct. So, a tremendous challenge for the Center was the conspiracy of silence that surrounded this topic. When a scandal or event caused a surge of media coverage, the Center was called upon for expertise, but then the news cycle would quickly move on to something else. Governing boards and accreditation agencies just didn't want to touch the topic. As Mary noted, institutions

don't want big numbers to come out about how many people are cheating in their institution or conversely, how few people are being brought up on charges when everybody knows the numbers are far greater than that. So it's a dicey issue. Everybody wants to be associated with "we're the good guys, we have an honor code, we pursue a life of honor and dignity" and nobody wants to talk about the other side of the coin. And it's hard to do it without being [viewed] as a negative person [or organization].

Conclusions: A Look to the Future

This origin story was written in 2022, even though the interviews were conducted in 2010. Arguably, the Center's leaders between 2010-2022 should be interviewed so we can write the story of the third decade of the Center's existence. But, what can we learn from the founders and leaders of the first two decades? First, to borrow a turn of phrase, "nevertheless, we persisted". The Center faced multiple leadership and foundational challenges over the first 20 years, crisis of revenue, and uncertainty of focus and purpose. Yet, nevertheless, we persisted. According to the founders and early leaders, we persisted largely because of the passion for the cause. This is even more remarkable when you think about integrity being at the top of Maslow's hierarchy of needs – despite struggles at the bottom (in terms of shelter and security), the Center continued to reach for the idea that cultures of integrity could be created at colleges and universities around the world. The future will undoubtedly continue to present challenges to the Center, but I hope that we learn from the past that we can persist.

Second, that first 20 years also taught us that the Center has a responsibility to endure. At least in the United States, there are no other prominent higher education organizations that will carry the academic integrity banner. American accreditation agencies still are not attending to the importance of academic integrity, and there is little research being published or presented at major education conferences like the American Educational Research Association, the Association for the Study of Higher Education, or at the Association for Student Conduct Administrators. The Center, along with its sister organizations, have a responsibility to continue our work to keep academic integrity on the radar screen of higher education institutions and higher education affiliated organizations, especially given the 21st century threats to integrity via technology and the contract cheating industry.

And finally, we should learn from the first 20 years is that Bill Kibler was right – it is critical for the Center to be research-driven. After all, the Center only came to be because of Don's research and the desire of institutions to use the data he collected to transform their institutions. Under the leadership of David Rettinger, we have managed to revive and revise the McCabe Survey, which is currently being deployed at multiple colleges and universities in the U.S. and beyond. This data, along with data collected through the Academic Integrity Rating System (AIRS), will likely propel the Center through the next 20 years. Data inspires action, and data-drive actions are the only way for institutions to make real progress on creating and maintaining cultures of integrity. And cultures of integrity are the only way to truly ensure that we maintain the quality and integrity of higher education in the twenty-first century.