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Appendix E

TEACHING ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

Susan Andersen and Brock Dethier

This appendix is an academic integrity starter kit intended to be incorporated into any course that includes academic research and writing. It consists of

1. “Oh Nothing,” a Case Study in the Form of a Play
2. “Oh Nothing” Follow-up
3. Some Possible Answers
4. Five Discussion Scenarios
5. Questions About Research and Academic Integrity
6. A Sequence for Teaching Plagiarism
   - Plagiarism: Levels of Paraphrasing
   - Plagiarism: Paraphrasing Practice
7. Citation Exercise
8. Bibliography

Our goals: To give students practice in thinking about ethical questions; to help students see why there are “rights” and “wrongs” in academic ethics and develop an ability to discern the difference; to discuss why doing the right thing matters.

We want students to stop thinking about academic ethics as a game of “see what I can get away with” and start seeing their approach to academic ethics as a significant reflection of who they are, what kind of character they have, and what kind of employees they’re likely to be. A student who gets involved in seriously debating these issues and takes a stand based on a moral sense of right and wrong is on the way to taking a responsible stance toward academic integrity.

Few students, and not enough teachers, are familiar with the variety of issues that come under the heading “academic integrity.” Penalizing students who cross the boundaries of academic acceptability is not an
efficient way to teach these issues. Researchers have found that ethical thinking and behavior can be taught (CAIRE 84; Bebeau 1-2; Rest), that adults at any age can learn to think more ethically (Bebeau 2), and that using case studies to spark student discussion about ethical issues is a more effective teaching method than focusing solely on academic and philosophical definitions of integrity issues (Pimple 1; CAIRE 90).

Medical, law, and business schools have long used real world case studies; they have been the instructional method of choice at Harvard Business School for over fifty years. The case method of teaching enables teachers to “organize and bring to life abstract and disparate concepts” that lead students to draw upon principles from different disciplines as they contemplate possible problems and resolutions (“Teaching”). Ideally, a case study helps students see the issues in a vivid, memorable way and promotes thoughtful discussion. Teachers can build on and refer back to the case throughout the semester.

The core of this appendix is a case study in the form of a play, “Oh Nothing,” which can be read silently or presented to the class by three students reading the lines. We’ve avoided any personal pronouns so that a student of either sex can play any of the roles. (Perhaps mixing sexes in unconventional ways can shake up the stereotypical view of this scene, with Professor being male and Instructor being female.) Although the issues in this play are serious, the play itself is not, and we think the points will come across well even if students ham up their acting.

Just watching the play probably won’t have any effect on students; they need to get actively involved in discussing the situation and making their own ethical judgments (Pimple 4; “Teaching”). Good discussion comes from good questions that are open-ended, exploratory, relational, and probing. Therefore, we encourage teachers to use something like our follow-up questions to help students understand the issues.

The play demonstrates that while plagiarism may be the most common and most discussed academic ethics issue, it certainly is not the only one. We don’t expect students to learn any specifics about the use of human and animal subjects, but we do hope that they carry away from the play the understanding that they need to think carefully about how they’re using such subjects and check with appropriate committees if they have any questions.

We made the highest-status person, Professor, the most unethical character because we wanted to undermine the idea that plagiarism is only a student issue. After discussing Professor’s plagiarism, class members
could volunteer instances of student plagiarism and bring the discussion closer to home.

We hope that teachers will modify the play and other materials to fit their own personality, students, and situation. To simplify and clarify some of the play’s interaction, our colleague Leslie Blair rewrote the play with a narrator providing stage directions. We applaud such efforts to engage students and trust that teachers will use our materials as writing prompts to spark their own creative approaches to teaching academic ethics.

After using a class period to discuss the play, teachers will probably want to spend an additional day talking about specific examples of issues that are likely to spring up in our own classrooms—plagiarism, for instance. The final sections of this packet focus on plagiarism, each one using a different approach to engage students in making their own decisions about plagiarism.

**OH NOTHING: A CASE STUDY IN THE FORM OF A PLAY**

*Brock Dethier & Susan Andersen*

*Setting: The cramped office of a college professor. Professor and Instructor are seated, facing each other.*

**Instructor:** I read your new article in *The Journal of Hangnail Morbidity* today.

**Professor:** Why bother? You wrote half the thing!

**Instructor:** That’s kind of what I was getting at. There was a paragraph on circulatory implications that seemed just like a paragraph in my thesis.

**Professor:** That’s why I gave you a special acknowledgement in the beginning.

**Instructor:** But it’s not in quotes, and some of my numbers have been changed . . .

[Knock on the door. Instructor pulls it open and in walks Student. Professor stands up and shakes Student’s hand, then motions Student to the one free chair in the office.]

**Professor:** Student, why don’t you begin by explaining your grievance against Instructor.

**Student:** I believe that Instructor has treated me unfairly on at least two occasions. First, Instructor told me I could not use animals in my project even though I had obtained permission from the Animal Rights Board.

**Instructor:** I just try to make sure my students stay legal.
Student: On the second occasion, Instructor stopped me from videotaping an interview with three students outside the union building. By the time I convinced Instructor that they were my friends and didn’t need the Institutional Review Board’s stamp of approval, my friends had to go off to class, and I was unable to reassemble the group before my presentation.

Professor: These kinds of misunderstandings are common, especially when you’re dealing with ethical research issues. Your grievance alleges material harm as a result of these incidents. Could you elaborate?

Student: Having to postpone my first project meant I had an inadequate trial period, for which my grade dropped to a C-plus. On the second occasion, my inability to film my friends meant that I lost visual presentation points and received a B-minus on the assignment. As a result of those two grades, I received a C-plus for the course, the worst grade I’ve ever received.

Professor: Instructor, do you contest Student’s evidence or conclusions?

Instructor: I have nothing against Student. Why would I? Once Student showed me the stuff was legit, I said, “fine.”

Student: But I was doing everything right, and I lost points.

Professor: I’m not sure you were doing everything right. When you’re just doing a class assignment, the Institutional Review Board may not care about how you treat your subjects, but if you ever wanted to get your work published, you’d be in trouble.

And in the first incident, sometimes we hold our students to higher standards than those used by the Animal Rights Board. I found it surprising that the Board would approve such a project.

Student: So you’re not going to raise my grade?

Professor: That’s still Instructor’s decision. I stand behind my staff.

Student: Is there any way I can appeal that decision?

Professor: [standing up] I’m sure there are a dozen ways. But first you’d need to talk to our Chair, Dr. Pugh. And I happen to know that he, at the moment, is headed to a softball game where I’m going to pitch.

Student: [exiting] I’ll speak to Dr. Pugh then.

Professor: [to Instructor] End of that headache.

Instructor: Thanks.

[Instructor gets up and ruffles Professor’s hair affectionately. Professor grasps Instructor’s hand and they look into each other’s eyes for a long moment. Then Instructor drops Professor’s hand and turns to go.]

Professor: What did you want to tell me about that silly article?

Instructor: Oh, nothing; it’s great.
“OH NOTHING” FOLLOW-UP

Have students discuss and perhaps quickly research the following. Be prepared with definitions of each term and discussions of the answers.

Have students find in the play a possible example of each of the following concepts. Discuss the moral issues that each example brings up. Is there a right and a wrong in this case?

1. plagiarism
2. conflict of interest
3. violations of animal rights policy
4. violations of human subjects policy
5. data manipulation
6. use of hypothesis-and-evidence approach

Spend the rest of the period discussing other examples of the concepts, trying to make each concept as relevant to the students’ lives as possible . . . and/or dig into some of the questions below.

A. In your judgment, did any of the three characters behave inappropriately or make unethical decisions? Explain.
B. Is it legitimate to hold students to higher standards than those published by the University?
C. What should Student do now? What appeal channels are likely to be open?
D. Is it a good thing that Professor “stands behind the staff”?
E. In your view, would a romantic relationship between Instructor and Professor be illegal, unethical, unwise, or not a problem?

Some Possible Answers

1. Plagiarism is the use of someone else’s words or ideas without giving that person sufficient credit. Although we can’t judge Professor’s actions without hearing the whole story, it sounds as though Professor copied Instructor’s ideas and words without using quotation marks to acknowledge the borrowing and without a formal citation. Crediting Instructor in an acknowledgment is not sufficient. What Professor did is almost certainly unethical and therefore “wrong.”
2. A “conflict of interest” occurs when a person has two inconsistent loyalties or “interests” in a situation. Such conflicts are inevitable in some professions and therefore not necessarily bad—every time a teacher gives a grade, there’s a conflict between the desire to make a student happy by assigning an A and the desire to communicate necessary, realistic information with a lower grade. Professor appears to have a romantic relationship with Instructor, and Professor’s interest in continuing that relationship seems to conflict with Professor’s responsibility to ensure that Student is treated fairly.

3 & 4. The point here is that students should know not the exact policies of their institution regarding animal and human subjects, but that every institution has such policies. As Professor says, most review boards will not bother with students working on class assignments, so students needn’t worry about interviewing unless they’re asking very private questions. While most undergraduates will never need to know the “treatment of animals” policy, linking that issue with plagiarism may help students to see plagiarism in a broader moral context. (Some students may care more about animals than about “academic integrity.”)

5. Just before Student knocks, Instructor seems to be implying that Professor altered some of Instructor’s data. Data manipulation is a serious and widespread problem. Students may not need coaching to see that changing a number is unethical, but it might still be valuable for them to discuss why and when such manipulation goes on and where “rounding off” or “fudging a bit” turns into “making false statements.”

6. Student does an excellent job of presenting a thesis or hypothesis—that Instructor has treated Student unfairly—and backing it up with specific evidence. In fact, of the three, Student shows the most preparation, presents the best evidence, and offers the best argument. Professor is less convincing in presenting an alternative thesis—that Instructor was just following rules.

A. Neither Instructor nor Professor treats Student’s complaint with the seriousness it deserves. Instructor’s interference with Student’s work may well have been motivated by good intentions, to make sure no policies were broken. Instructor may not have made any ethical mistakes, but Instructor should probably
do more to reduce the penalty Student seems to have paid.
Professor’s dismissal of Student’s complaints, apparently because of Professor’s relationship with Instructor, is more clearly inappropriate and perhaps unethical.

B. This is a tricky question about which reasonable people might disagree. We feel that yes, individual units of a university may set their own, more demanding standards, but they have an obligation to publicize those standards well.

C. Student has done the right thing by using the traditional “channels” of authority to try to resolve the complaint, talking first to Instructor and then to Instructor’s supervisor, Professor. The next logical step would probably be for Student to take the complaint to the head of Instructor’s department, presumably English. If that doesn’t produce a satisfactory response, student might see if the university has an ombudsperson that handles such complaints. Student should also talk to the advisor in his/her major and, if Student thinks that Instructor was unfair because of Student’s race, sexual orientation, or other personal factor, Student might talk to the university’s Affirmative Action office.

D. Professor probably used the phrase “stand behind my staff” in order to deflect possible criticism. But since Professor is in the position of adjudicating student complaints as well as supporting writing staff, Professor must also “stand behind” students. So while Professor’s pronouncement might sound like a good thing to the staff, it ignores a significant portion of Professor’s responsibilities.

E. A roomful of ethical academics might disagree heatedly about this question. Although the relationship is almost certainly not “illegal,” it would probably be considered “unethical,” and against the institution’s faculty code, IF Professor has supervisory power over Instructor, which seems to be the case. This difference in power is a main reason why relationships between students and professors, as well as workers and bosses, are frowned upon. The person in the position of less power—in this case, Instructor—may feel pressured to continue the relationship in order to avoid the professional wrath of the more powerful person. And that desire not to offend the more powerful person may lead the less powerful to give up some rights, as it seems to have led Instructor to give up the right to full acknowledgement of Instructor’s own
work. Therefore, most people would probably agree that any such relationship involving a power differential is at least risky, and probably unwise.

FIVE DISCUSSION SCENARIOS

The following scenarios provide another way to begin discussions about academic ethics. Students can read them quickly and then discuss the issues and characters involved. Each scenario raises many different ethical issues, and we have not attempted to direct readers’ thinking with questions or provide our own analysis. Instead, we encourage teachers to use questions to lead the discussion of these scenarios in the most productive and relevant directions . . . or write their own.

1. Bob and many of his friends at a small residential college are taking a course in British Architectural History. They pick up their take-home exam at 9:00 on Friday morning and must turn it in by 12:00. When Bob returns to his dorm to start work, he finds that four of his friends are already sitting on the floor with his roommate, collaboratively figuring out answers to the exam. When invited to join, Bob wavers, then his pride takes over: He can do as well as all five of them put together. He completes the exam in the library and later hears that the “cool” teaching assistant for the course, Sue, stopped by his room, saw everyone working together, and said, “I see nothing.” All five of Bob’s friends get A’s on the exam. Bob gets a B-plus.

2. Gwen, Wren, and Sven are all working frantically the night before the American Literature paper is due. Gwen put the paper off because she had a chemistry lab to complete and figured that, as an English major, she would have no trouble coming up with a good last-minute paper for American Lit. But she racks her brains for two hours and finally decides that the only way she can finish the paper AND get some sleep before her big weekend is to reprint a paper that she wrote the year before in a Critical Analysis course. She is careful to change the date and the course number on the paper, and she even adds to the works cited page some of the critical books that the American Lit professor recommended.

Wren has a deal with Ben: she does his computer programs, and he writes her literature papers. Ben is a P.E. major, but he
has produced good papers for her before, so Wren has faith . . . and doesn’t ask if, as she suspects, Ben buys the papers on the Internet. Wren reasons she does the work for the literature class, she just writes programs instead of papers. She’s not actually buying the papers, and the professor said it was ok to get help from peers.

Sven is on the final draft of his paper about *The Scarlet Letter* when he decides to look on the Internet for a good epigraph. After only ten minutes of searching, Sven has a dozen quotes that say what he is trying to say in his paper, but much more elegantly. Frustrated at what he considers his own weak writing, Sven rewrites a number of his sentences using the phrasings from the quotations.

3. Professor Shrek always gives the same Human Sexuality exam. Students flock to his course because it fulfills a science requirement, because of the subject matter, and because many fraternities, sororities, and dorms already own copies of previous years’ exams. Graham has a friend in a fraternity who can get him a copy of the exam. He doesn’t actually know anyone in the course who is planning to cheat, but he knows that Prof. Shrek grades on a bell curve, and he feels sure that all the cheating students will skew the curve. He has to get an A in the class to keep his scholarship; without it, he’ll have to return to the Siberian salt mines where his ancestors have labored for generations.

4. Randy, a master’s student in geology, is excited when Professor Dumble asks him to write a chapter for her book on the formation of the Wasatch mountains. She promises both pay and credit. Randy slaves on the chapter, putting everything else aside, figuring that his name on the chapter, perhaps even on the cover of the book, will be his ticket to a Ph.D. program and a big step toward career success. When the book finally comes out, Randy is devastated: he gets a check for $50, and the only place his name appears is in the acknowledgments, which include Professor Dumble’s dog and forty-eight other graduate students and colleagues.

5. As part of her work/study job, Bunny does photocopying, typing, and other clerical work for Professor Snoid. Most of the work is dull, but she chuckles when she copies Snoid’s Ancient Civilizations syllabus and notices that the students have to buy
Snoid’s own textbook, a massive and no doubt expensive tome. Coincidentally, Bunny starts dating Ralph, who is taking Ancient Civilizations and is worried about writing the big essay on the final exam. A few days before the final, Bunny finds the final in her photocopying pile and without even meaning to, she reads the big essay question. And that night she has a date with Ralph.

QUESTIONS ABOUT RESEARCH AND ACADEMIC INTEGRITY*

Write true or false next to each statement below and be ready to discuss your answer.

1. Plagiarism is a problem only when it is intentional.
2. The safest way to make a good paper is to string together quotations from others.
3. Photocopying a page is the best way to ensure that you have all the bibliographic information you need.
4. Much bibliographic information can be found on the library’s website, even when the library itself is closed.
5. When taking notes, it is crucial to use quotation marks to distinguish quotations from paraphrases.
6. Only English teachers care where you get the material for your paper.
7. The best way to use most reference books is to start at the end, with the index.
8. Sources like class texts and government documents don’t need to be referenced.
9. If you paraphrase someone’s ideas without quoting them directly, you can skip the citation.
10. If your paper is becoming overwhelmed with citations, you can leave some out to make it less messy.
11. If you list a person in “acknowledgements” or put a source in your bibliography, you don’t need to cite the source in your paper.

* May be used in conjunction with pages 1 and 2 of Ballenger’s The Curious Researcher. Some ideas suggested by Janice Newton, “Plagiarism and the Challenge of Essay Writing: Learning from our Students.” Answers: 1-F, 2-F, 3-F, 4-T, 5-T, 6-F, 7-T, 8-F, 9-F, 10-F, 11-F, 12-T, 13-F, 14-F, 15-T, 16-F, 17-T
12. Even professional writers refer often to citation reference manuals.
13. Most students learn all they need to know about source citation in high school.
14. It works fine to worry about citations as the final step in proofreading.
15. It’s possible to do great research, properly reference all sources, and still make the paper your own, with plenty of your own ideas.
16. You can assume your reader is intelligent enough to see the implications of quotations; you don’t need to link them overtly to your thesis.
17. Professors (and bosses) generally want writers to think for themselves.

A SEQUENCE FOR TEACHING PLAGIARISM *

Our USU colleague Charlene Hirschi demonstrated for our staff a sequence of plagiarism activities, some of which she had learned from USU’s Daren Olsen, who in turn had added on to an activity demonstrated by the late L.H. Rice of Idaho State University. We don’t know if Professor Rice himself had borrowed in his turn, but the complex authorship and ownership of these pages demonstrates an important issue for teaching about plagiarism: academics, writers, and teachers at all levels borrow other peoples’ words and ideas in a variety of legitimate ways. Each discipline, possibly each department, has its own not-always-well-articulated definition of what is appropriate and inappropriate sharing and borrowing. While there may be no moral or practical ambiguity about buying a paper from the Internet and turning it in as your own, much “plagiarism” is simple misunderstanding of the rules of the game and should be treated, we believe, as “ignorance” rather than “cheating.”

Teachers whose students did not grow up in American school systems must constantly remind themselves that our concept of “plagiarism” is a cultural construct, and in other cultures behavior that could lead to expulsion from an American university might receive praise. We think all students getting degrees from American institutions need to learn currently accepted research writing practices, but when legitimate misunderstanding is involved, the emphasis should be on learning not punishment.

Overhead 1: A list of famous people who have been accused of plagiarism, eg. Joseph R. Biden, Jr., Merril J. Bateman, Janet Dailey, Richard

* Used by permission of Daren Olsen and Charlene Hirschi.
Paul Evans, Stephen Ambrose, Doris Kearns Goodwin, Alan Dershowitz. Caption: Who are these people, and what do they have in common?

_Overhead 2:_ After students have answered the first question, present the same list with each person’s occupation: Biden, U.S. Senator from Delaware; Bateman, B.Y.U. President; Dailey, best-selling author of 51 books; Evans, author who has sold 8 million copies worldwide including _The Christmas Box_; Ambrose, historian; Goodwin, historian, Pulitzer Prize judge, TV talk show personality; Dershowitz, Harvard law professor. Discuss what anyone knows of their plagiarism cases and other recent high-profile cases.

_Classe freewrite and discussion:_ What is plagiarism?

_Overhead 3:_ Definition of plagiarism. Charlene Hirschi’s: “In writing, plagiarism is the intentional or unintentional borrowing of another person’s words, ideas, or structure without giving that person proper credit.”

_Small group discussion:_ How is it possible to “steal” another person’s ideas? What is the difference between an idea and its expression? Why is it important to acknowledge the source of ideas or writings that you use?

_Overhead 4:_ The official University policy on plagiarism. _List five or more school-related activities that might be considered a form of plagiarism._

_Overhead 5:_ Levels of Plagiarism. Help students see the wide range of activities that might qualify as plagiarism, including different types of paraphrasing. These range from word-for-word copying to paraphrasing that uses none of the words in the original. Present examples of different reworkings of the same material, showing how as a writer uses different words and sentence structure and adds more of the writer’s own ideas and voice, the passage becomes more a legitimate paraphrase, less susceptible to charges of plagiarism.

_Plagiarism Practice:_ Give students a quotation to start with and have them write different versions of it, gradually moving away from the wording and structure of the original.

_Plagiarism Identification:_ Give students passages from a made-up “student paper” that uses material from something the class has recently read. Each passage should be fine except for one flaw: not using necessary quotation marks or not including enough of the passage within the marks, not including the author’s name or a page number in the passage, not having something in the works cited list to correspond to each in-text
citation. Have students record whether they think each passage could be considered plagiarism, then discuss each one.

Charlene includes in her discussion of plagiarism a word about how she handles cases: because she cannot be objective about her own students, and because she takes student plagiarism in her class as a personal betrayal, she automatically takes plagiarism cases to the department chair. That seems like an excellent way to impress upon students both how serious and how personal plagiarism is.

**Plagiarism: Levels of Paraphrasing**

The Utah State University Student Code asserts that even paraphrasing another person’s ideas or work can be considered plagiarism. In fact, there are many levels of paraphrasing that qualify as plagiarism—ranging from nearly word-for-word copying to heavily altered paraphrase. Here are some examples related to a famous quote by President Kennedy to help you see the different levels of plagiarism.

“My fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country.”

*Level 1*: Outright copying word for word.

My fellow American, ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country.

*Level 2*: Substituting a few words and phrases while keeping the same sentence structure.

My fellow citizens, ask not what this country can do to help you—ask what you can do to help this country.

*Level 3*: Substituting a few words and altering the sentence structure.

My fellow citizens, ask what you can do to help your country, instead of asking what your country can do for you.

*Level 4*: Light paraphrase—adding your own words and altering sentence structure so that it sounds more like you.

So, to my fellow American citizens, I would say it is important that you ask what you can do to help out this country, instead of asking what the country can do to assist you.

*Level 5*: Heavy paraphrase—changing almost everything you can to make it sound different, but essentially keeping the same ideas.

If, like me, you are a citizen of the United States, you shouldn’t ask what this country is capable of doing for you. Instead, your duty should be to look for things you are able to do to help out this country.
Plagiarism: Paraphrasing Practice

Now see if you can take the words of someone else through all five levels of paraphrasing.

*Original Phrase:* “Where there is a lack of honor in government, the morals of the whole people are poisoned.” Herbert Hoover

*Level 1:* Outright copying word for word.
*Level 2:* Substituting a few words and phrases while keeping the same sentence structure.
*Level 3:* Substituting a few words and altering the sentence structure.
*Level 4:* Light paraphrase—adding your own words and altering the sentence structure so that it sounds more like you.
*Level 5:* Heavy paraphrase—changing almost everything you can to make it sound different, but essentially keeping the same ideas.

CITATION EXERCISE

These five short passages are from a (made-up) student paper that uses the first two pages of this document, “Teaching Academic Integrity,” as a source. For the purposes of this activity, we are pretending that the document was published in the first issue of a journal called *Integrity*. Which of the following contain adequate citation information and punctuation, and which might need more?

1. According to Andersen and Dethier, not enough teachers are familiar with “academic integrity” (1). [On its Works Cited page, this paper lists: Andersen, Susan and Brock Dethier. “Teaching Academic Integrity.” *Integrity* 1.1 (2004).]

2. Not a lot of students understand what academic integrity means. [no citation]

3. Andersen and Dethier suggest that “mixing sexes in unconventional ways can shake up the stereotypical view.” [no citation] [On its Works Cited page, this paper lists: Andersen, Susan and Brock Dethier. “Teaching Academic Integrity.” *Integrity* 1.1 (2004).]

4. Punishing students who stray outside the bounds of academic ethics does not teach students very efficiently. [no citation]

5. Ideally, a case study helps students “see the issues in a vivid, memorable way” (Andersen and Dethier 1) [On its Works Cited page, this paper lists: Andersen, Susan and Brock Dethier. “Teaching Academic Integrity.” *Integrity* 1.1 (2004).]
Our Answers

1. After “Dethier,” the entire sentence is taken directly from the source, so without quotation marks, it’s plagiarism.

2. This could be considered “common knowledge” or just opinion and doesn’t need any citation, but quoting from the source might give the opinion more weight.

3. Because the source is credited, this would not be considered plagiarism, but the citation is incomplete. It needs a page number.

4. Although only a word or two was taken directly from the source, this paraphrase is so close to the original in structure that most people would consider it plagiarism.

5. The entire sentence, not just the second half, should be in quotation marks.

BIBLIOGRAPHY ON ACADEMIC INTEGRITY


