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Academic dishonesty is prevalent in institutions of higher education. Faculty are at the forefront of this issue as they are in the classroom with the students. However, faculty may be hesitant to address academic dishonesty for a myriad of reasons. The purpose of this qualitative exploratory case study was to explore how faculty members viewed their roles in addressing academic dishonesty. Study participants were 11 full-time faculty from a Southern University who had taught for at least two years and had experienced academic dishonesty in the classroom. Artifacts were also gathered from three documentary sources. Four major themes emerged from the data: (a) faculty investment in academic integrity, (b) faculty-student relationship impact on interaction, (c) personal values guiding faculty response, and (d) deterrents preventing faculty action. Several implications included the need for: (i) ongoing professional development opportunities for faculty, (ii) the creation of shared ownership and governance of academic integrity between faculty and university leadership; (iii) consistent prevention and enforcement of academic dishonesty according to university guidelines, and (iv) the creation of a partnership between the conduct office and the various faculty departments.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Academic dishonesty has existed since the beginning of higher education (Parr, 1936), but it began to grow in the era of the research university beginning around 1860 (Bertram Gallant & Drinan, 2008b). When students cheat, they engage in academic dishonesty with their coursework, professors, and even peers. Interest in the topic has been overwhelming and the sheer volume of articles indicate academic dishonesty is an issue that merits further review for faculty and administrators.

Significant research has been conducted about students’ behaviors of academic dishonesty. Researchers have studied student attitudes (Yu, Glanzer, Sriram, Johnson, & Moore, 2017), perceptions (Kukukepe, 2014), demographics (Vail, Coleman, Johannsson, & Wright, 2015), course enrollment (Hensley, Kirkpatrick, & Burgoon, 2013), major (Tabsh, Abdelfatah, & Kadi, 2017), and a variety of other characteristics related to students in an effort to learn more about cheating, and how and why it occurs. In comparison, relatively little research has been done on the role of faculty in addressing the cheating and academic dishonesty that occurs among students in classrooms (Eifert, 2014).

Academic dishonesty is primarily a classroom issue, and faculty have significant impact on classroom issues. Faculty response can influence the amount of dishonesty in the classroom. Lack of action by faculty reinforces dishonest behavior in students (Roig & Ballew, 1994). Therefore, both students and faculty bear some responsibility for the prevalence of academic dishonesty.

It is unlikely for students to regulate academic integrity among themselves if they do not observe faculty and institutions upholding academic integrity and addressing incidents of
academic dishonesty. If students believe no one will act, they will seize the opportunity to cheat (Parr, 1936). Historically, 70% of students have admitted to engaging in academically dishonest behaviors (Bowers, 1964; McCabe, Trevino, & Butterfield, 2001). McCabe of the International Center for Academic Integrity (2013) and surveyed more than 71,000 undergraduate students from 2002 to 2015 and found, on average, 68% of respondents admitted to engaging in academically dishonest behavior. These findings have been supported by other researchers with varying rates of prevalence.

Klein, Levenburg, McKendall, and Mothersell (2007) found that up to 86% of undergraduate students engaged in cheating behaviors, even though Simkin and McCleod (2010) and Levy & Rakovski (2006) found that undergraduate students cheated at a lower rate ranging from 62% to 70%, respectively. In a study examining the frequency of academic dishonesty and the student characteristics associated with dishonesty, Hensley et al. (2013) determined 57.2% of students had cheated in the most recent six months. Stiles, Chun Wai Wong, and LeBeff (2018) conducted a 30-year follow-up study on understanding undergraduate cheating in which 46.8% of students self-reported engaging in cheating behaviors. Although the percentage of students cheating has fluctuated over the years, academic dishonesty remains a consistent issue that needs attention in higher education.

Given the high rates of academic dishonesty suggesting at least 50% of undergraduate students cheat, it would be reasonable to expect faculty must address academic dishonesty behaviors among students regularly each semester. However, in 1989, only 20% of faculty reported following their institutions’ procedures for addressing dishonesty (Jendrek, 1989). By 2018, the number of faculty reporting incidences of academic dishonesty increased only by 15% to 35% (Blau, Szewczuk, Fitzgerald, Paris, & Guglielmo, 2018). These figures cause researchers
to seek out why many faculty members do not report dishonesty at all. Faculty find the process of addressing academic dishonesty as time consuming (Prescott, Buttrick, & Skinner, 2014; Raynor, 2015; Schneider, 1999), and confusing (Lane, 2013; Singhal, 1982), finding evidence to prove misconduct difficult (Coalter, Lim, & Wanorie, 2007), or lacking support from their institutions (Burrus, Jones, Sackley, & Walker, 2015). Instead, faculty may strongly prefer to handle incidents one-on-one with their students rather than going through formal institutional processes (Eifert, 2014; McCabe, 1993; Nadelson, 2007).

Faculty preferences may also be influenced by their need to allocate time to other responsibilities that have evolved over the years and may influence their choices for inaction against the students who cheat in their classes. According to Kezar and Eckel (2002), universities are increasingly driven to meet economic goals and achieve market-driven visions. The original mission and vision of colleges and universities has transitioned away from focusing on educating the citizenry. The values of knowledge, academic freedom, and equality have been replaced for seeking out monetary gain and a competitive place in the increasingly competitive higher education marketplace (Kezar & Eckel, 2002) as well as for anti-intellectualism (Eigenberger & Sealander, 2001).

Lieber (2012) stated that “salary and tenure are externally awarded benefits but efforts to deter cheating is not a factor for these awards” (p. 331). In the same light, Bertram Gallant and Drinan (2006b) found that “faculty and administrator careers advance not by confronting cheating but by celebrating success” (p. 846). This success is often measured by publishing research in prestigious peer-reviewed journals and earning high-dollar grants (Bertram Gallant & Drinan, 2006b). Teaching is often only 20% of a faculty members’ responsibility, so faculty have little professional motivation to report cheating (Bertram Gallant & Drinan, 2006b). In research
institutions, faculty advancement is more tightly coupled with research productivity rather than teaching outcomes (Burrus et al., 2015). Addressing academic dishonesty is considered an unpopular faculty responsibility (Prescott et al., 2014). Despite the lack of reward for addressing academic dishonesty, faculty bear the responsibility for setting a standard of and creating an environment that promotes academic integrity among students (Hulsart & McCarthy, 2008).

Over a 20-year period, faculty from a sample of 1,000 universities representing different Carnegie classifications reported that the time spent teaching and preparing to teach, the time spent on research and scholarly writing, and the time spent with students outside the classroom in activities that included academic advising and counseling changed considerably (Milem, Berger, & Dey, 2000). Faculty at research institutions spend less time teaching than faculty at other types of institutions. Across most bachelorette degree granting institutions, research productivity rather than teaching ability and outcomes benefit faculty with the coveted rewards of higher pay, tenure, and promotion (Hesli & Lee, 2011; Milem et al., 2000; Schneider, 1999). These faculty reward structures do not influence faculty toward addressing instances of academic dishonesty, whereas the newer generation of faculty value community engagement as well as publications in digital formats as critical components of their scholarship, the faculty reward structure does not reflect this change in values by newer faculty (Cavallaro, 2016). As the focus of higher education as an industry has shifted, the values of students have changed. Students view postsecondary education as a means to an end, as a requirement for employment rather than an opportunity for learning (Abel & Deitz, 2014; Peirone & Maticka-Tyndale, 2017; White, 2013; Yoder, 2017). Therefore, when faculty do not respond to dishonesty in the classroom and fail to report it through proper procedures, students perceive cheating as acceptable behavior (Keith-Spiegel, Tabachnick, & Allen, 1993).
Problem Statement

Many higher education institutions market undergraduate degrees as vocational in nature. The baccalaureate degree leads to higher pay in a better job leading to a career (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Due to the values shift in the purpose of earning a higher education, faculty may be less likely to report cheating in their classroom and more likely to avoid having a negative impact on students’ opportunities for additional education or employment in the future (Nuss, 1984). However, the highly regarded values of faculty and higher education as a whole that include academic freedom, independent thinking, and original thought are at risk when academic dishonesty is prevalent (Bertram Gallant & Drinan, 2006a). Among the vital roles held by faculty are their responsibilities for encouraging and expecting ethical behavior in their classrooms (Nonis & Swift, 2001). According to the Statement of Professional Ethics by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP, 2009):

As teachers, professors encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students. They hold before them the best scholarly and ethical standards of their discipline. Professors demonstrate respect for students as individuals and adhere to their proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors. Professors make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to ensure that their evaluations of students reflect each student’s true merit. (para. 2)

Despite this guidance from the AAUP and based on findings from previous researchers, faculty may not value the duty to foster appropriate academic conduct as a main aspect of their role in the classroom (Schneider, 1999). Qualitative research into faculty views about their roles in addressing academic dishonesty may enrich understanding about the process of addressing academic dishonesty in higher education (Prescott et al., 2014; Raynor, 2015; Schneider, 1999), confusing (Lane, 2013; Singhal, 1982), finding evidence to prove misconduct difficult (Coalter et al., 2007), or lacking support from their institutions (Burrus et al., 2015). Instead, faculty may
strongly prefer to handle incidents one-on-one with their students rather than going through formal institutional processes (Eifert, 2014; McCabe, 1993; Nadelson, 2007).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to explore how faculty members viewed their roles in addressing academic dishonesty. A second purpose was to determine the potential barriers, situational or contextual, faculty experienced when considering reporting and addressing academic dishonesty. Thirdly, this study aimed to identify the support faculty need to create a culture of integrity in their classroom.

Research Questions

Two research questions guided this study:

1. How do faculty respond to instances of academic dishonesty among students?
2. What influences their response?

Significance of Study

Determining factors related to faculty response to cheating and diminishing the prevalence of academic dishonesty would ensure integrity in higher education. Having a greater understanding of the faculty’s response to academic dishonesty could provide administrators of institutions of higher education with the information that could enable systemic changes that support a decrease in cheating and an increase in integrity. The study is significant because learning about factors related to faculty response to cheating not only positively contributes to higher education but also the world of work that baccalaureate degree holders enter. Researchers showed the link between students’ unethical behavior in college and their attitudes toward unethical behavior in the workplace (Lawson, 2004; Nonis & Swift, 2001). A culture of integrity
at the college level could contribute positively to creating a culture of integrity in the workplace. Understanding how faculty supported this culture provided an opportunity to help future faculty needing to gain the skill sets for confronting academic dishonesty incidences. The study was also important because the faculty had the opportunity to reveal their attitudes and perceptions toward academic dishonesty in general and their role in maintaining an environment of academic integrity. Therefore, determining how and why faculty chose to respond to academic dishonesty in the classroom provided useful information to institutions of higher education seeking to combat cheating, train faculty on academic dishonesty policies and procedures, and to produce highly educated graduates of integrity.

**Conceptual Framework**

Two conceptual frameworks were chosen to guide the research. The first was a social control/social bond theory presented by Hirsch (2002) that was used for understanding faculty response rationale when academic dishonesty happens in their classrooms. The second framework was for understanding the institutional impact on a campus’ academic integrity culture through an organizational leadership framework presented by Bolman and Deal (2017).

In social control/social bond theory, Hirschi (2002) postulated that individuals’ ties to society diminish the likelihood for deviant behavior. While faculty not responding to dishonesty in the classroom may not be conceived as deviance, the lack of response can be considered deviant behavior for faculty who are not following institutional policies that represent a form of social norming. Further, the campus culture, as noted by Bolman and Deal (2017), can impact faculty behavior because how leaders set the norms for behavior affects the culture of the campus. Thus, the two conceptual frameworks were synthesized together as a framework for this study.
Social Control/Social Bond Theory

Social control/social bond theory was developed by Hirschi (2002). While this sociological theory was primarily associated with crime and deviance, there was a connection to academic dishonesty. Other researchers utilized deviance theories as their frameworks in studies involving academic dishonesty (Hard, Conway, & Moran, 2006; Michaels & Miethe, 1989; Smith, Ryan, & Diggins, 1972; Quaye, 2010). Additionally, faculty could be considered the victims of the crime of academic dishonesty perpetuated by students (Austin, 2007). Faculty failing to report academic dishonesty in the classroom could be viewed as deviating from the expectations of the society in which they work.

Hirschi (2002) suggested that all human beings are born with the propensity to act in deviant ways and pondered that in obeying the rules the society, “deviance is taken for granted; conformity must be explained” (p. 10). In other settings, social control/social bond theory is used to understand why individual do not become deviant and why individuals follow rules. Social control/social bond theory indicates deviant behavior is attributed to a weakened social bond to society. The social bond is comprised of four parts, labeled as attachment, commitment, involvement, and belief. In this study, the societal bond is the bond between faculty members and their institution and their peer faculty members. In other words, the bond is represented as the strength of the faculty’s attachment, commitment, involvement, and belief in their institution and tangentially in their peers at the institution.

Attachment is described as emotional closeness/connections to others. Relevant to attachment, Hirschi (2002) posited that social order is based on the consensus of those in society, meaning people generally disapprove of deviant behaviors. Individuals who respect and value the thoughts and opinions of others will consider the thoughts and opinions of those individuals
when making decisions. Because of respect for other individuals based on having connectedness with them, people avoid engaging in deviant behavior that would result in disapproval from others. Individuals with less attachment to others are freer to make decisions without considering the thoughts and opinions of others. Faculty with stronger and more stable attachment to the university are less likely to violate the social norms of the institution because they value their peers.

The second element in the social control/social bond theory is commitment. Commitment refers to personal resources an individual has invested in conventional activities and the institutional itself. A faculty member who has invested time, energy, and resources into adopting the social norms of the university would be less likely to deviate from institutional expectations than someone who has not made a similar investment. The more time spent in conventional activities, the less likely a faculty would be to not take action when academic dishonesty occurs in the classroom. Conventional activities for a faculty member could consist of committee work, student advising, teaching, and research. The final element is belief. Belief relates to an individuals’ belief in the shared moral values and norms of the society. Faculty who strongly believe in the norms and values of their university would be less likely to deviate from them. A norm or value of a university is integrity (Hirschi, 2002).

The basis of the theory supports the concept that the weaker the integration of an individual into society, the more likely individuals are to deviate from societal conventions. When the group of membership is weak, the individual depends less on its members for support and reinforcement. Subsequently, individuals rely on solely themselves and do not recognize rules of conduct beyond those that serve their individual interests. If individuals demonstrate a low or weak level of one of the pieces of the bond, their ties to their society weakens and the
likelihood of deviance increases (Hirschi, 2002). Faculty response to academic dishonesty in the classroom could be impacted by their relationship/attachment with faculty peers/other colleagues; how connected they are through activities such as teaching and research through the university; how much personal time, money, and effort they expend on their activities; and how much they believe in norms and values of their institution.

As noted by Kidd and Chayet (1984), fear, feelings of helplessness and perceived powerlessness of the police and threat of future victimization are the three main reasons victims do not report crimes against them. Additionally, victims who report the crime to other individuals may not view what happened to them as worthy of reporting, may not trust the process, or may be afraid and feel shame about being victimized. Langston, Berzofsky, Krebs, and Smiley-McDonald (2012) noted that the majority of crimes in the United States from 2006 to 2010 went unreported because the victims did not believe the police would or could help them. Only 47% of victims reported crimes to the police. At school, 76% of crimes went unreported to police. The majority of crimes were perpetrated by people familiar to the victims, so the victims chose to handle the outcomes of the crimes in other ways that did not involve the police because of beliefs that the crimes were not important enough to report or due to fear of the offender or of getting the offender in trouble (Langston et al., 2012).

In a similar vein, Coalter et al. (2007) identified faculty as having similar concerns as those of victims of crimes about reporting academic dishonesty violations. Faculty are more likely to deal with academic dishonesty themselves as opposed to reporting it through appropriate institutional channels because they believe the academic dishonesty is minor and not worth the time and processes necessary in reporting it through proper channels or they sense a lack of support or have distrust toward their administrators (Hardy, 1982; Simon et al.,
Students engaging in academically dishonest behavior is a crime of sorts. It is theft of words and ideas if plagiarizing someone else’s work. Although faculty are not considered victims in the classroom, their attitudes and behaviors are similar to those of crime victims when academic dishonesty occurs in their classrooms.

Four Frames of Organizational Leadership by Bolman and Deal

The second conceptual framework representing an organizational and leadership framework was developed by Bolman and Deal (1997, 2017) and regarded the culture of a university as an institution. They presented four frames that guide the functions of the organization and its leadership. Related to academic dishonesty and the response by faculty, the frames provided guidance for considering academic dishonesty as a systemic issue much more encompassing than each isolated incidence that might happen in the classroom. Bolman and Deal provided a four-frame lens through which to view the issue.

A main tenet of this organizational and leadership framework is to move from being reactionary to proactive and to view academic dishonesty systemically so that colleges and universities are strategic in creating cultures that value academic integrity (Bertram Gallant & Drinan, 2006b). The four frames are structural, human resources, political, and symbolic. The structural frame is focused on putting people in the right roles and relationships. Structural measures could include implementing academic integrity committees and policies, additional human resource support, and conduct procedures. Division of labor is a vital factor of structure. Universities can adopt a lateral or vertical structure. A vertical structure depends on employee willingness to follow directions from above. Vertical structure has potential to be efficient but not always effective (Bolman & Deal, 2008).
The university at which this study was conducted operates in a vertical structure similar to other large higher education institutions and was labeled as the Southern U.S. University (SUSU) for presenting this study. The provost was the highest-ranking faculty member and oversaw six faculty deans, with each dean overseeing their individual schools with several other layers of hierarchy that included associate deans, assistant deans, department heads, etc. If individual faculty members do not follow directions, then the structure is not working. The vertical structure is guided by the authority, rules, and policies of the institution. The structural frame connects to Hirschi’s theory of deviance in that the vertical structure represents the societal norms in which faculty should ascribe and believe. Notably, in both theories, if faculty are not committed to the structure or the belief system, then the system’s structure fails.

Although the structural lens focuses on putting people in the right places, the human resource lens focuses on the need for new behaviors and practices within the institution and the fit between the faculty member and the university. Bolman and Deal (2017) recognized the “sure route to long-term success is investing in employees and responding to their needs” (p. 140). If faculty do not believe their needs are being met, their motivation to abide by the policies surrounding academic dishonesty or other institutional matters may be low. Therefore, the human resources frame requires that the administration support faculty who address cheating behaviors. Best practices for human resources suggest integrating values and ethics into the curriculum and educating the community (faculty, staff, and students) on academic integrity (Whitley & Keith-Spiegel, 2001).

The third frame by Bolman and Deal (2017) is political. Because institutions of higher education are often political in nature, addressing the political issues and putting into place plans to counteract the potential for politically charged conflict is recommended. Strategies could
include incorporating all faculty, staff, and students in the development of policies and procedures relating to academic integrity. These strategies could empower individuals to remain loyal to the institution’s academic integrity norms over their subgroup of students, faculty, or staff (Bertram Gallant & Drinan, 2006b). Empowering faculty might lead to higher levels of attachment to the institution because unilateral decisions made regarding policies made by administrators without faculty input causes loyalty to subgroups to be greater than loyalty to the institution.

The last frame by Bolman and Deal (2017) is symbolic. Looking at academic integrity through this lens allows organizations to see problems in motivation, commitment, ambiguity, uncertainty, and conflict (Bertram Gallant & Drinan, 2006b). Symbols that support academic integrity include honor codes, dedicated space in university publications for academic integrity discussions, and a learner-centered curriculum can help to control cheating.

Summary of Conceptual Framework Guidance

From a review of the literature, I determined a need to better understand how faculty choose to respond to academic dishonesty from their perspective. What influences impacted their decisions was an understudied area that would add to the body of the literature surrounding faculty involvement in academic dishonesty. The conceptual framework discussed above provided me with guidance for exploring and developing my research and interview questions. With the guidance of the deviance and the organizational frameworks, I sought to explain the influences behind faculty decisions about addressing dishonesty. My research created faculty narratives to augment the literature on this topic. It was not my intent to prove anything can be explained by these frameworks nor was I testing the validity or reliability of the frameworks. I did not conduct data analysis utilizing only these frameworks. They merely served as a lens
from which to develop interview questions and view the resulting data.

Definition of Terms

• **Academic dishonesty.** The following four academically dishonest behaviors are listed in the SUSU (2020b) Student Code of Conduct: (a) plagiarism, (b) collaboration and/or collusion, (c) fabrication, and (d) cheating.

• **Academic integrity.** The moral code involving respect for the contributions of others and engagement of independent, honest thought and work by students (SUSU, 2020a).

• **Cheating.** This form of academic dishonesty includes, but is not limited to, the use or attempted use of unauthorized materials, information, or study aids that were not authorized by the instructor in completing any academic activity related to fulfilling the requirement of the course syllabus (SUSU, 2020b).

• **Collaboration and/or collusion.** This form of academic dishonesty involves seeking or providing aid to another student in the completion of any assignment submitted for academic credit without explicit authorization from the faculty member (SUSU, 2020b).

• **Fabrication.** This form of academic dishonesty involves the falsification or creation of any fictional information, data, or citation in submitted academic work (SUSU, 2020b).

• **Plagiarism.** This form of academic dishonesty involves the adoption or reproduction of ideas, words, statements, images or works of another’s work as one’s own work that is offered for credit without appropriate attribution (SUSU, 2020b).

Limitations, Delimitations, and Assumptions

Limitations involved the assumption that the faculty who participated would provide honest, sincere responses during their interviews. However, faculty might not have wanted to
admit they were not addressing academic dishonesty in the classroom. They could have been hesitant to speak about this issue with me, a non-faculty administrator at the university associated with the Dean of Students Office. The nature of the faculty participation might have limited the findings.

The study was delimited to the faculty who met the selection criteria and agreed to be interviewed. One delimitation was that the participants of the case study were all employed at SUSU in the Southern United States and were full-time faculty teaching undergraduate courses. Therefore, the faculty selected were not necessarily representative of the overall faculty population in terms of gender, age, years of teaching, subject matter taught, level of education, and faculty status. All faculty but one who participated were Caucasian. The one non-Caucasian faculty member identified as South Asian.

Organization of the Study

This chapter conveyed the need for the study, purpose, and significance. The purpose of this study was to explore how faculty members viewed their roles in addressing academic dishonesty. Chapters 2 through 5 are organized in the following manner. Chapter 2 contains a synthesis and analysis of the literature pertinent to academic dishonesty behaviors and faculty responses to dishonesty in the classroom. Chapter 3 represents the research design and procedures for this exploratory case study. Chapters 4 and 5, respectively, convey the findings and a discussion with implications and recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to explore how faculty members viewed their roles in addressing academic dishonesty. To develop this case study with faculty at a baccalaureate degree granting university, a review of the literature was conducted. This chapter consists of a review and analysis of the existing literature on college student dishonesty and the faculty role and response to academic dishonesty in the classroom. I begin with a review of the prevalence of academic dishonesty in higher education and how scholars define what is considered academic dishonesty. Addressing the topic of why students cheat as well as factors contributing to cheating follow. I further examine faculty roles within their institutions, their responsibilities, and their responses to academic dishonesty in the classroom.

Although much research has been dedicated to academic dishonesty, I intentionally chose only articles that could provide the most insight into the case study’s research questions. Articles older than 30 years are included and considered to be seminal works to provide a strong foundation the topic. Tens of thousands of articles have been written on academic dishonesty over the years, with the majority of the articles representing quantitative designs specifically about why students are dishonest, definitions of dishonesty, and characteristics of students who engage in academic dishonesty. There are substantially fewer studies examining faculty response to academic dishonesty. The majority of the studies focus on faculty attitudes and perceptions toward academic dishonesty (Bies, 1998; Bower, 1998; Carter, 2008; Lang, 2005; Marcoux, 2002; Seirup & Pincus, 1995). The prevalence of academic dishonesty appears next.
Prevalence of Academic Dishonesty in Higher Education

Bowers (1964) conducted the first large-scale study of academic dishonesty in higher education. His study found that of the 5000 students studied, three-fourths of the respondents indicated they had been dishonest at least once during college. Subsets of dishonest behavior were categorized by cheating on tests and on written assignments. This study was replicated by McCabe et al. (2001) 30 years later, and the results they found were very similar. The overall percentage of dishonesty had increased by 7%. However, cheating on tests increased by 25% whereas cheating on written assignments increased by 1%.

Overall, academic dishonesty rates have remained generally stable; the most significant increase has been category of cheating. Multiple other studies have attempted to better assess the prevalence of dishonesty and found that while the percentages of dishonesty vary by institution to institution, overall the percentage hovers around 75% of all students have been academically dishonest at least once during their academic career (Caldwell, 2010; McCabe et al., 2001; Volpe, Davidson, & Bell, 2008).

With the number of studies assessing why students cheat, how often they cheat, and in what ways students engage in cheating behavior, it is clear that academic dishonesty in institutions of higher education is problematic. Haines, Diekhoff, LaBeff, and Clark (1986) conducted a smaller study in 1984 of 380 students and found that 54.1% of those students cheated with only 1.3% caught cheating. Ten years later, Diekhoff et al. (1996) conducted a follow up study surveying 474 students at the same institution they conducted their previous study. They determined cheating had increased from 54.1% in 1984 to 61.2% in 1994. In 2007, a second follow-up was conducted by Vandehey, Diekhoff, and LaBeff (2007). Using the same survey instrument, they surveyed 401 students, 57.4% who admitted to engaging in cheating
behaviors at least once. Although there is an abundance of literature on academic dishonesty related to why students cheat, characteristics of these individuals, and conditions that contribute to this behavior, but a dearth of literature is available on faculty response to academic dishonesty.

It is distressing to consider that the percentage of students engaging in dishonest behavior has not decreased significantly since the 1960s. Although it is difficult to compare different studies for number of students cheating due to different methods used in the conducting research, it likely can be agreed upon that cheating is a concern to institutions of higher education as well as future employers of graduates. Faculty members are a prominent part of the institutional fabric and as such also have a vested interest in maintaining integrity in the classroom. More research is needed to understand their impact on academic dishonesty.

Cost of Ignoring Academic Dishonesty

There are several costs connected to ignoring academic dishonesty. By not addressing academically dishonest behaviors or by not following university policies regarding code of conduct issues, faculty allow students to continue behaving in dishonest ways. Coren (2011) noted that faculty are seen as the boss of the classroom and the face of the university by their students. A concerning cost of academic dishonesty is the likelihood that dishonest students will transition to student employees in the workplace. Students who cheat in college are more likely to cheat in the workplace (Whitley, 1998). Nonis and Swift (2001) conducted a quantitative study with more than 1,000 undergraduate business students and measured beliefs about dishonest work behaviors as well as about academically dishonest behavior. Their findings suggested that students who engaged in dishonest behaviors in college would be more likely to engage in dishonest acts in the workplace (Nonis & Swift, 2001). Therefore, creating a climate of
integrity in the classroom is important to ensuring honesty in the workplace following college.

Graves (2008) found slightly different results relating to dishonesty in college leading to dishonesty in the workplace. While Graves’ findings reinforced the relationship between academic dishonesty and unethical behavior in the workplace, high school cheating remained a stronger predictor of workplace dishonesty than academic dishonesty in college. Graves’ conclusions are concerning as the percentage of high school students engaging in academically dishonest behavior Students who cheat might doubt their actual abilities to do honest work and feel compelled to maintain their dishonest behavior to succeed (Keith-Spiegel et al., 1993). Additionally, highly regarded values of higher education such as academic freedom, independent thinking, and original thought are at risk when academic dishonesty is prevalent (Bertram Gallant & Drinan, 2006a).

Cheating devalues the diploma and the integrity and reputation of the institution of a whole. A degree symbolizes the culmination and acquisition of many things: critical thinking, the knowledge of how to learn, perseverance, accountability, an understanding of one’s self and our place in the world (Bertram Gallant & Drinan, 2006b; Bishop, 2011). If colleges and universities graduate ethically and morally defunct students, then there is little hope for integrity in the world of work and society as a whole. The implicit problem involves dishonest students receiving diplomas because institutions and faculty members do not create environments of academic integrity. Additionally, conferring degrees indicates that faculty believe knowledge has been obtained by their students (Keith-Spiegel, Tabachnick, Whitley, & Washburn, 1998). If degrees are conferred to students who cheated, the university cannot indicate that knowledge was transferred to the student.

Cheating also makes it unfair for honest students. How can honest students compete
against paper mills or past copies of exams? Believing they can never do as well as some of their peers, the sense of competitiveness could prompt honest students to begin cheating just to level the playing field. Ignoring cheating is not equitable to the honest students in the classroom as some students may be getting higher grades than they deserve which can negatively impact the grading (Keith-Spiegel et al., 1998).

Academic dishonesty hurts learning. Colleges and universities spend a significant amount of time developing learning outcomes and determining appropriate assessment measures. If widespread cheating is occurring, learning outcomes and measures become meaningless. The conferring of a degree should indicate a transfer of knowledge. If academic dishonesty is occurring, it is difficult to determine if knowledge was obtained (Keith-Spiegel et al., 1998). When dishonesty occurs, learning is impacted and an unfair advantage occurs (Bouville, 2010). Academic dishonesty is a problem because so many students assume everyone else is cheating, and that they must do it to level the playing field (McCabe, 2004). If academic dishonesty is so pervasive and no one is doing original work, then it undermines the entire point of going to school. Rather than valuing originality and critical thinking, students are valuing the means to an end, namely good grades and ultimately a diploma. Further, academic dishonesty tarnishes the reputation of the college or university. The coverage of widespread cheating scandals (Schmitt, 1994; Zeveloff & Galante, 2012) by the media provides unflattering press coverage and could lead to decreased public support and lowered confidence of the higher education institution by the local and national community.

Finally, cheating impacts student morale in the classroom. It could be assumed that students prefer to be in a classroom where cheating is ‘allowed’ and faculty members do not action to address cheating behavior. Multiple researchers have found this to be false. Beasley
(2014) surveyed students to find out what might have stopped them from cheating in the classroom. Students indicated that faculty action demonstrating the value of integrity would have stopped the behavior. Students also indicated faculty taking action to address dishonesty in the classroom as well as talking about what type of behaviors constituted cheating prior to taking a test or completing a homework assignment would have prevented them from cheating (Beasley, 2014). Several students reported they saw cheating occurring in their classrooms yet their faculty members did nothing to curb the behavior. Keith-Spiegel et al. (1998) reported that students felt ignoring cheating in the classroom is considered unethical. According to Burrus et al. (2015), students take their cues from faculty regarding academic integrity in the classroom. Faculty behavior in the classroom indicates how tolerant they and other students should be of dishonesty in the classroom. Behaviors students look for include faculty who include syllabus statements related to honor codes, codes of conduct, and/or academic integrity items, and faculty who spend classroom time discussing academic dishonesty (Broeckelman-Post, 2008; Burrus et al., 2015). These studies reiterate that spending time discussing the issue shows faculty value honesty, while also clarifying their definitions of what is defined as dishonesty in their classroom.

Actions that Constitute Academic Dishonesty

While most faculty and students agree that academic dishonesty is a problem, agreement regarding what constitutes academic dishonesty is widely varied. Faculty and students often have varied ideas of what types of behaviors are cheating (Brent & Atkisson, 2011; Burrus, McGoldrick, & Schuhmann, 2007; Megehee & Spake, 2008; Miller, Shoptaugh, & Woolbridge, 2011; Nuss, 1984; Papp & Wertz, 2009; Wright & Kelly, 1974). This disconnect often leads to confusion and frustration in the classroom. These researchers identified the main types of academic dishonesty as cheating, plagiarism, fabrication, and collusion. They are just a few of
the broad categories in which academically dishonest behaviors can be placed. Dishonesty can be intentional or unintentional and the severity of the offense differs between perceptions of students and perceptions of faculty (Burrus et al., 2007; Josien, Seeley, Csipak, & Rampal, 2015).

Activities that require little or no effort on the part of the student are generally agreed upon as dishonest. Examples include activities such as purchasing a paper, turning in someone else’s work as one’s own, and directly copy information from a book without citing (Colnerud & Rosander, 2009). Dishonesty on exams is considered much more serious than plagiarism or working with someone on homework (Brent & Atkisson, 2011). Using outside sources without providing a citation is considered dishonest by the majority of faculty but only about one-half of students (Wright & Kelly, 1974).

Academic dishonesty involves gaining an advantage at the expense of others. Activities regarded as requiring work and some effort are considered not cheating by some students, or as less severe violations. These activities include acquiring old examinations, working together with others to break up an assignment that was to be done independently, reusing a paper from a previous course in a different course, and referencing sources that were never actually used (Colnerud & Rosander, 2009; Robinson-Zanartu et al., 2005).

Disparity between what faculty consider cheating and what students consider academic dishonesty is to be expected. However, much of the literature suggests that oftentimes faculty do not agree amongst themselves on what are considered academically dishonest behaviors (Guyette, King, & Piortrowski, 2008). In a survey of business faculty members teaching online courses, ‘having another person take the online exam for the student’ was the only statement that 100% of faculty agreed was cheating. Ten other behaviors ranging from ‘using cell phone test
messaging to send or receive exam questions or answers to/from another student to retaining or copying the exam for future use’ were deemed at various levels of appropriateness (Guyette et al., 2008). Discrepancy among faculty members about what they consider to be appropriate or inappropriate further reinforces the idea it is critical for faculty members to spend time during the course to clearly explain class expectations and define various cheating behaviors to students (Pincus & Schmelkin, 2003).

Factors Contributing to Students’ Academic Dishonesty

To effectively respond to students who engage in dishonest behavior, faculty must first be familiar with the different factors that may contribute to their students engaging in dishonest behavior. As research has shown, students’ demographics, grade point averages (GPA), peers, attitudes, majors, and other variables have been shown to positively impact academically dishonest behaviors. Additionally, consequences for cheating can deter the behavior.

Demographics

The role of gender has had mixed results in the literature. Lau and Haug (2011) and Yu et al. (2017) found that female students were more ethical than males. While more males admit to cheating than females, both sexes indicated that boring coursework, bad teachers and meaningless assessments in class increased the likelihood of cheating for both males and females (Smith, Ryan, & Diggins, 1972). Lawson (2004), found that when presented with statements regarding ethical behavior, females agreed with more of the statements and it was concluded they held more ethical beliefs than males. Nonis and Swift (2001) found that males were more dishonest than females and younger students were more dishonest than older students. Hensley et al. (2013) noted that men were more likely than women to plagiarize. Contrary to previous
findings, both Beasley (2016) and Stiles et al. (2018) found gender was not a significant predictor of academic dishonesty.

Grade Point Average (GPA) and Self-Efficacy

Students with lower GPAs are more likely to cheat than students with higher GPAs (Haines et al., 1986; Lau & Haug, 2011; Lawson, 2004; Kibler, 1993; McCabe & Trevino, 1997). This finding has many implications for higher education. Students who have less to lose grade wise are willing to take more risks to increase their grades. Klein et al. (2007) found the lower the GPA and the younger the student, the higher likelihood of cheating. Students with lower GPAs have incentive to cheat to raise their grades. Likewise, Burrus et al. (2007) and Olafson et al. (2013) found that students with higher GPAs were less likely to cheat. Additionally, students with higher GPAs tend to have higher self-efficacy (Elias, 2008a, 2008b), suggesting less inclination to cheat.

Self-efficacy refers to individuals’ beliefs about their ability to learn or their beliefs about their ability to get a desired outcome, but it is not related to actual ability. Murdock and Anderman (2006) assert that cheating behaviors vary according to levels of self-efficacy. If students possess low self-efficacy about their ability to perform well on a paper or exam, they may look for alternative ways to succeed such as cheating because they believe they cannot succeed otherwise. Therefore, if students possess high self-efficacy, the likelihood of cheating is reduced because it is deemed unnecessary. Students with high levels of self-efficacy are more likely to view all types of cheating as unethical (Elias, 2008b).

Academic Major

Across all disciplines, McCabe and Trevino (1997) found that 82% of all students had engaged in “serious” cheating either during an exam or on a written piece of work. Serious
cheating on an exam is defined as students who have copied on an exam, used a cheat sheet during an exam or helped someone cheat on an exam. Serious cheating on a written work is defined as students who plagiarized, fabricated a bibliography, turned in someone else’s work or did not include footnotes when copying material within the paper (McCabe & Trevino, 1997).

English and language students were found to be the most ethical students (Lau & Haug, 2011) while business students were found to be the least ethical students (Lau & Haug, 2011). Research shows that business students most often have the highest prevalence of cheating and/or lower ethical standards (Elias, 2008a; Lau & Haug, 2011; Chapman, Davis, Toy, & Wright, 2004; MacKewn & VanVuren, 2007). Student majoring in business areas also have a more relaxed attitude toward their definitions of cheating behaviors (Klein et al., 2007). Students of English and modern language majors are the most ethical (Lau & Haug, 2011). While McCabe and Trevino (1997) have done considerable work in exploring the benefits of an honor code and principles for faculty to employ, not much research has been done on what institutions can do to cultivate integrity.

Peers

Modeling offers people an opportunity to observe behavior and the possible consequences of their actions; based on the information, the observer acts accordingly. As individuals perceive levels of cheating among their peers, they model that behavior. O’Rourke et al. (2010) found that seeing other people cheat was the most significant influence on someone’s cheating behavior, even stronger than moral attitude or neutralizing behavior. Similarly, Broeckelman-Post (2008) established that the most influential factor in a students’ decision to engage in dishonest behavior is whether they believe their peers are engaging in the same behavior. Additionally, peer perception as to who is to blame for the cheating behavior,
situational factors, and faculty play significant roles in academic dishonesty. Megehee and Spake (2008) found that while smaller percentages of students, ranging from 2.5% to 3.8%, admitted to more significant acts of cheating, the same students believed their peers to be engaged in those acts at a much higher level, from 49.8% to 86.9%. Rettinger and Kramer (2009) found that direct knowledge of peers cheating was the most reliable predictor in a students’ future decision to engage in dishonest behavior.

Students notice other students engaging in dishonest behavior and are not made aware of any adverse consequences by the faculty member to address the behavior. Students in Greek organizations and athletics are more likely to cheat (Stiles et al., 2018; Yu et al., 2017). Similarly, O’Rourke et al. (2010) and Kibler (1993) found that students who saw their peers cheat or perceived cheating, were more likely to engage in similar behavior. O’Rourke et al. (2010) also found that students believe other students cheat more than they do. Megehee and Spake (2008) also determined that students did not perceive all types of cheating as equal. Some cheating behaviors are seen as more significant and should be punished accordingly.

Attitudes

Attitudes toward cheating and about educational performance and purposes have been investigated for understanding academic dishonesty. Haines et al. (1986) found that a lower level of commitment to the university was strongly correlated with cheating behaviors. Students who admitted to cheating were less likely to have invested as much financially in their education. Typically, their parents had been paying for their schooling rather than the students. Without a financial stake in their education, students display less of a commitment to their studies and could be more likely to cheat as a way to complete a degree rather than earn grades honestly. Ten years later, Diekhoff et al. (1996) discovered not much had changed. Students who engaged in
cheating were not financially invested in their education and did not experience guilt toward cheating.

Curasi (2013) established several neutralizing techniques students use to justify dishonesty in the classroom. The different types of neutralizations include the denial of responsibility, denial of injury, denial of the victim, condemnation of the condemners, and appeal to higher authorities (Sykes & Matza, 1957). Numerous studies have linked academically dishonest behaviors to neutralizations by students.

Condemning the condemnner was the most cited with student comments primarily blaming the instructor noting instructor does not care, the class is too hard, or the instructor left the room during the exam which was interpreted as a green light for cheating (Curasi, 2013). Denial of responsibility was the second most cited technique with examples such as it is other students’ fault for not covering their answer sheets during an exam. Appeal to higher loyalties was the third category and students cited money as a main reason for justifying their cheating behavior. Examples include statements such as it is okay if I might be in danger of losing a scholarship or if I have to work to pay for my education (Curasi, 2013).

Olafson et al. (2013) also concluded that students used neutralization to justify dishonest behaviors and generated findings similar to those by Curasi (2013). Olafson et al.’s students blamed faculty members citing unfair teaching techniques and assessment as examples of condemn the condemners and denial of responsibility if faculty were not effectively monitoring for cheating during exams. Additional techniques such as denial of victim were cited and students blamed the university for their behavior because they believed the class was a waste of time or the university should make it harder to cheat. Stiles et al.’s (2018) findings reinforced that neutralization remains a significant predictor of dishonest behavior in college.
Neutralization attitudes play an important role in understanding academic dishonesty and how faculty can address it in the classroom as there would be no reason for students to engage in neutralizing behaviors if they were not aware that being academically dishonest is wrong. Day, Hudson, Dobies, and Waris (2011) used vignettes with students and found that students higher in conscientiousness were less likely to justify cheating behaviors and more likely to find cheating immoral. Some students cheat because they are unable to see the connection between the assignment and their life (Papp & Wertz, 2009). Students who expressed anti-intellectualism as supporting their rationales for cheating held a “negative view of the value and importance of intellectual pursuits and critical thinking” (Elias, 2008b, p. 199). If students see academic work as recipe based with a focus on rote memorization and have a lack of interest in the work as well as lack of respect for values of higher education such as critical thinking and hypothetical inquiry, they are anti-intellectual (Elias, 2008a). Research has shown that students who see their education as a means to an end are more likely to engage in cheating behaviors (Bertram Gallant & Drinan, 2006b; Nuss, 1984).

In alignment with goal orientation theory, Dick et al. (2003) indicated that students were less likely to cheat if they understand the goal or purpose of assignment. If students find meaning in their work, they are motivated to complete assignments for mastery rather than performance. Similarly, Day et al. (2011) reported that business students in mastery-oriented classrooms in which learning is the goal are less likely to cheat than their peers who are in performance-oriented classrooms in which grades are the single, important measure of learning. Lang (2013) suggested that focusing on intrinsic rather than extrinsic motivation yields fewer occurrences of cheating. In other words, if the grade in the classroom is not the only goal for student, learning for mastery is more likely to occur and cheating less likely to occur. Rettinger and Kramer
(2009) determined that performance-oriented teaching lends itself to more cheating.

Consequences and Deterrents to Cheating

Gallant and Drinan (2006a) found that the majority of institutions with some type of academic integrity policy spend more energy and focus on the punitive aspects of the behavior rather than promoting and educating students about academic integrity. The policing of cheating and the threat of punishment for academic dishonesty does little to dissuade students from engaging in the behavior (Megehee & Spake, 2008; Miller et al., 2011; Stearns, 2001). Students perceive some types of cheating as less severe or as less important than other types of cheating (Megehee & Spake, 2008). Nonetheless, regardless of the cheating behaviors, students who decide not to do the work independently or enlist the help the others against the requirements of the task by the faculty break their social and institutional contracts (Colnerud & Rosander, 2009).

Much research has been conducted and several deterrents have been identified. The most effective deterrent is punishment for the action. For the deterrent of a punishment to be effective, students need a reasonable belief that the punishment will occur each and every time they engage in a dishonest behavior (Vandehey et al., 2007; Woessner, 2004). If dishonesty is not addressed every time it occurs, the threat of undergoing a punitive consequence is ineffective, and from a student perspective, cheating to obtain the desired grade is worth the risk (Woessner, 2004). The likely punitive sanctions include failing the course, being dropped from course by the instructor, or being referred for punitive action by the university (Diekhoff et al., 1996). However, deterrents are only successful if students believe the punishment to be feasible. Diekhoff et al. (1996) reported that only 2.5% of students had been caught for cheating while 61.2% were actually cheating.
Student Attitudes toward Faculty Action

Faculty action in the classroom specific to addressing academic dishonesty is noticed by students and may impact their attitudes toward engaging in academically dishonest behaviors. “Faculty members contribute to an environment that may not encourage, but do little to discourage, academic dishonesty” (Prescott et al., 2014, p. 186). Students notice and care when faculty members’ responses to dishonesty are inconsistent and vary from faculty member to member. Students interpret faculty members’ responses as failing to value academic integrity (Prescott et al., 2014).

Klein et al. (2007) as well as Nonis and Swift (2001) found that on campuses where students perceive faculty members are committed to the course and there is a community atmosphere, students are less likely to cheat. Wright and Kelly (1974) surveyed students and found 76% thought faculty supervision of testing situations was inadequate and only a small number of students had any knowledge of any student who was caught cheating. Students brought this issue to the faculty because they perceived an increase in cheating and wanted to do something to correct this problem. They did not want cheating to be occurring and wanted faculty to take steps to curb the cheating behavior. Nearly 20 years after Wright and Kelly had students requesting faculty to take action against dishonesty, Kibler (1993) made the same discovery. Students are upset when faculty do not take action.

Bertram Gallant, Van Den Einde, Ouellette, and Lee (2014) noted that students often blamed faculty members for their dishonest behavior because faculty inadequately defined what constitutes dishonest behavior and faculty considered a behavior dishonest when the student disagreed. These attitudes suggest the need for increased communication in the classroom between students and faculty specific to dishonesty in the classroom. Kucuktepe (2014) explored
reasons college students cheating on exams. Nearly 10% indicated they cheated because their faculty member overlooked cheating during the exam. Bluestein (2018) in her research interviewed students who provided advice to faculty on how to prevent plagiarism and other forms of cheating. Students indicated having interactions with faculty and perceiving that faculty cared was important. For many students, believing faculty care about the students and their class was a determinant whether or not they would cheat in the class. The less a faculty member cares, the more likely students are to engage in dishonest behaviors (Bluestein, 2015).

Faculty response to dishonesty in the classroom is critical. Student perception of how honest and credible their faculty are can have a significant impact on overall integrity in the classroom. Biernacki (2004) found that 62% of students indicated faculty ignoring suspected cheating strongly influenced student cheating and 87.2% of students indicated ignoring observed cheating strongly influenced student cheating. Student behavior is influenced by faculty response in the classroom. Students who perceive their faculty members as credible are less likely to engage in cheating behaviors (Anderman, Cupp, & Lane, 2010). Credibility was operationalized as perceived honesty, training, intelligence, and niceness. Other faculty behaviors that contribute to academic dishonesty in their classroom are students’ perceptions about the integrity of their faculty members. Namely, faculty who appear to be displaying dishonest behaviors in the classroom such as using other faculty members’ power-points or exams without appropriate attribution are seen as less credible and also seen as having a more relaxed view toward academic dishonesty (Beasley, 2014). Anderman et al. (2010) only assessed teacher credibility in high school health related courses. However, it seems logical the concept of teacher credibility could extend to other disciplines as well as to students in institutions of higher education. If students find faculty more credible, they may be more inclined to engage with the faculty,
develop a relationship with the faculty member and as a result be less inclined to break the trust and engage in cheating behaviors.

Similarly, Bertram Gallant and Drinan (2006b) asserted if students perceive their faculty members as not possessing integrity, they are more likely to engage in cheating behaviors. Faculty are the institution to the student. Students may not have a lot of contact with administrators or other aspects of the institution on a regular basis. Faculty are a regular point of contact and oftentimes a students’ main connection to the university (Pascarella & Terenzini 2005).

McCabe (1993) conducted a multi-campus study surveying faculty and students at 16 different institutions and a significant result indicated faculty prefer to address dishonesty one on one rather than reporting to their supervisor or a member of the administration. This phenomenon of addressing dishonesty in the classroom rather than reporting issues is concerning for many reasons. In general, if faculty are only addressing dishonesty in the classroom and not reporting to a central location, they may be allowing serial cheaters to progress throughout their degree because no one on campus would know if that particular student has been engaging in dishonest behaviors in other classes. This finding also indicates that not reporting is becoming a cultural norm and not an isolated event. Most faculty choose not to take action against cheating, and students recognize this lack of academic integrity enforcement by their professors. Less than 20% of students in McCabe’s study believed faculty would take any action if a student was suspected of a dishonesty behavior. Only 15% of faculty surveyed by Wright and Kelly (1974) stated they had reported dishonesty to the dean while 65% had confronted a student directly.

Graham, Monday, O’Brien, and Steffen (1994) reported 78% of faculty caught students cheating but only 9% of faculty took any action. McCabe’s (1993) findings indicated in schools
without an honor code less than 20% of students believe faculty would refer cheating to the administration or take action in their individual classrooms and that overall in schools with or without an honor, very few faculty report cases to campus administration. Forty three percent of the faculty reported they could do more in the classroom to address dishonesty indicating they possessed a sense of responsibility for any cheating happening in their classroom. Nadelson (2007) also found the majority of faculty preferred to handle dishonesty in the classroom. Only 12 out of 72 reported the incident to the administration with reasons including a discomfort with the formal process of addressing allegations of dishonesty. Additional reasons included fear of having insufficient evidence and a lack of trust of the administration (Nadelson, 2007). Jendrek (1989) also concluded that faculty prefer to handle dishonesty one on one rather than going through formal institutional process. Similarly, Haines et al. (1986) found 54% of students admitted to cheating during the current academic year, and only 1.3% of the same students reported ever being caught cheating. Duke University participated in a study conducted by The Center for Academic Integrity and the survey found 50% of Duke faculty members never reported student cheating and even more concerning, over 30% of the faculty were aware of cheating and did nothing (Ruderman, 2004).

Conversely, students perceive faculty inaction as unethical. Keith-Spiegel et al. (1993) surveyed students regarding the ethical conduct of their faculty members. The students were asked to rank 107 different ethical scenarios from “nothing wrong this” to “unethical under virtually all circumstances.” The scenario of “ignoring strong evidence” of student cheating ranked just below incidences of sexual inappropriateness and coming to class under the influence of alcohol and hard drugs that were regarded as always unethical. Clearly students were not comfortable with faculty members taking no action against dishonest behavior in this study.
Changing Perspectives on Faculty Roles in Higher Education

Faculty roles have changed significantly over time. During the emergence of the colonial universities in the 1600s, faculty were paid very little, taught many subjects with no specialization, and primarily served as a faculty member or tutor while waiting until they could become ministers (Cohen & Kisker, 2010). A career path for faculty members had not yet been identified.

Faculty served in an *in loco parentis* role. They were responsible for student behavior as well as instruction in the classroom. Their primary responsibility was teaching, both inside and outside of the classroom. As faculty often lived on site, they had ample opportunities to infuse moral values into students as well as to provide academic-focused instruction.

Between 1790 and 1869, the higher education faculty became recognized as a respected profession. Colleges began to offer higher level courses in advanced subjects which increased the need for professors. Professors maintained their role of instituting moral values and responsibility for behaviors and added the roles of “training for careers other than the pulpit; providing general education for an enlightened citizenry; and passing on a shared cultural heritage that centered on American, republican value” (Cohen & Kisker, 2010, p. 78). By the middle of the 19th century, faculty began to publish in their specialty eras.

By the 1990s, faculty roles in colleges and universities underwent vast change since the early years of American higher education. Faculty are assessed on the three tenets of research, service, and teaching. Faculty rewards are based primarily on research, rather than teaching. Service and teaching often are seen as less important while research has become the most important function by which faculty awarded tenure. As a result, faculty actively work to teach fewer classes and produce more research, and is often considered not worthwhile or meaningful,
but is research for the sake of research (Smith, 1990). The American Association of University
Professors was established in 1915. Edgerton (1993) noted that in the early 1990s several task
forces emerged examining the structure of the faculty reward system. Major universities
surveyed their faculty regarding the balance of teaching and research. Across all 46 research
institutions surveyed it was found that faculty leaned toward a more balanced structure of
teaching and research rather than all the focus on research (Edgerton, 1993).

Additionally, it was noted that while faculty desired more time and focus on teaching,
they believed they were alone in their beliefs and felt other faculty were more interested in
research. Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate, written by Ernest Boyer as a
member of the Carnegie Foundation was published. The report emphasized movement from
professor to scholar. A professor taught, did research, and service. A scholar represents their
knowledge to other. Teaching and service are not add-ons but valid and appropriate expressions
of their work (Boyer, 1991). The desire of faculty to evolve their roles continues. In more recent
years, promotion and tenure have been linked more closely to values placed on research rather
than teaching or service. As a result, faculty seeking promotion and tenure spend more time on
research and care less about their evaluations from students. Faculty believe they have autonomy
to deal with their students and classes and this belief affects their responses to academic
dishonesty by students (Kezar, Maxey, & Holcombe, 2015).

While hundreds of studies delved into understanding why students cheat, the types of
situational and personal characteristics might lend themselves to cheating behaviors and what
defines academic dishonesty, a dearth of literature pertaining to faculty response to academic
dishonesty is available. A majority of the available literature is quantitative in nature giving
insight into how faculty respond, but not providing an in-depth understanding of how faculty
perceive their role in the process. With the large numbers of studies conducted regarding academic dishonesty, many commonalities were found in the types of students who engage in dishonest behavior. In contrast, very few studies have been conducted analyzing faculty member contextual, situational, demographic characteristics.

Faculty Responsibility for Maintaining Academic Integrity

Academic integrity is created in higher education institutions that “establish clear and transparent expectations, standards, and practices to support fairness in the interactions of students, faculty, and administrators” (Center for Academic Integrity, 2013, p. 7). Faculty involvement in the academic integrity process has a significant impact on student behavior (McCabe, 2005). Faculty/student relationships are important in establishing a campus of integrity (Stearns, 2001). “Faculty members who explicitly discuss these issues and create an environment supportive of academic integrity in their classrooms and beyond earn increased respect from the majority of their students” (McCabe, Trevino, & Butterfield, 2012, p. 145). However, faculty have no uniformity in their responses to cheating (Kidwell, Wozniak, & Laurel, 2003; Robinson-Zanartu et al., 2005).

Some faculty may assess a more lenient punishment whereas others may assess something more severe for the same infraction (Robinson-Zanartu et al., 2005). This lack of uniformity is confusing to students and leads to lack of trust in faculty. Many faculty members do not recognize dishonesty is a significant issue on campus while others recognize dishonesty is very prevalent. If faculty are unaware dishonesty is occurring in their classrooms, they are unlikely to take action to prevent his behavior. Additionally, many faculty members are unaware of the university code of conduct and the role they play in addressing academic dishonesty (Stearns, 1997).
Faculty members who do nothing or assess overly lenient penalties are in effect promoting dishonesty (Woessner, 2004). A more positive relationship between the student and instructor makes student cheating less likely (Stearns, 2001). Lau and Haug (2011) reported faculty play a significant role in the ethical development of students. Students learn from faculty it is unethical to cheat on schoolwork and faculty should enforce ethical standards/codes of conduct on students. Poor pedagogy is more highly linked with cheating behaviors than students in classes with good pedagogy (Day et al., 2011; Rettinger & Kramer, 2009). Faculty members hold a vital role in the classroom. It is their responsibility to encourage and expect ethical behavior in the classroom (Lang, 2013; Nonis & Swift, 2001).

Bertram Gallant and Drinan (2006a) conducted a study and found faculty listed as the most prominent ‘catalyst’ to enact positive change and strengthen the integrity of the campus. However, faculty are not enforcing the policies and procedures at a high rate (Bertram Gallant & Drinan, 2006a). If students perceive faculty to be vital catalysts in the effort to increase academic integrity, but then see that faculty are not enforcing or valuing the policy, the message being sent to students is one of apathy.

Jendrek (1989) determined that only 20% of faculty members followed policy regarding reporting student dishonesty. Gender and tenure of the faculty members impacted reporting with faculty members of lower status being less likely to report allegations of dishonesty. Similarly, Singhal (1982) reported that 65% of faculty caught students cheating but only 21% reported the dishonesty to their administration.

While not many students report issues of dishonesty in the classroom (Lang, 2013; McCabe et al., 2012), research indicates students desire fairness in the classroom and want faculty to take action (Bluestein, 2018; Prescott et al., 2014; Rodabaugh & Kravitz, 1994; Wright
& Kelly, 1974). There seems to be a logical extension that fairness in the classroom could be extended to include addressing academic dishonesty. Rodabaugh and Kravitz (1994) conducted research regarding procedural fairness and the impact on student evaluations of their faculty members and discovered that fairness of instructors impacted course evaluations more so than the grades assigned, instructor warmth, lecturing ability or course difficulty. To this end, implications for faculty members include informing students of procedures related to academic dishonesty and then following the procedures they have outlined. Potential negative anticipated consequences of reporting students for academic dishonesty could be eliminated if students have a sense of fair treatment, even if the outcome results in the student receiving a low grade in a course.

Levy and Rakovski (2006) conducted a study regarding faculty who have a zero-tolerance policy for academic dishonesty and the impact of that policy on student’s decisions to register for a course with a professor holding a zero-tolerance position on academic dishonesty. They found all students avoided professors with a zero-tolerance policy which has both positive and negative consequences. Honest students avoided zero tolerance professors as well as students who had engaged in dishonest behaviors previously because they were afraid of a perceived lack of flexibility with policies in general as well as fear of being wrongfully accused.

Deterrents to Faculty Reporting

There are four main categories identified as deterrents to reporting academic dishonesty. Keith-Spiegel et al. (1998) identified emotions, difficulty, fear, and denial as the categories for deterrents. Much of the research on this topic falls into one of these four categories as well. Interesting to note is Simon et al.’s (2003) finding that faculty confidence in the administration impacts the likelihood of reporting. The more confident faculty are in the institution, the more
likely faculty are to follow institutional protocol regarding incidences of academic dishonesty. A unique finding among studies of faculty involves Simon et al. determining that male faculty members had significantly higher levels of confidence in their institutions than their female counterparts, regardless of rank, which affected their reporting behaviors for academic dishonesty.

Emotions

Emotions refers to the affective aspects of going through the reporting process. Affect can include stress and lack of courage, unsupportive administrators, fear of escalation from students, and trepidation of going to a hearing. Jendrek (1989) identified uncertainty meaning faculty being unsure about students cheating, and thus making a case became difficult to prove. Faculty are also hesitant to report students for dishonesty for fear it would damage student records and negatively impact their ability for future employment.

Nursing faculty expressed concerns surrounding the trust relationship between teacher and students. Too many strategies to mitigate dishonesty could devalue trust in the classroom, and if students engage in dishonest behaviors, faculty encounter a breach of trust. Faculty may also experience a loss of relationship if other peers do not agree with the pursuing students for dishonesty (Fontana, 2009). Additionally, administration may not support the pursuance of academic dishonesty as this could result in loss of revenue for the university. If academic dishonesty committees do not find in favor of the referring faculty member, faculty may believe it is a violation of their academic freedom (Stearns, 1997).

Difficulty

The category of difficult entails the perceived and actual extensive time, effort, tasks that must be expending to follow institutional policy and get involved in an academic dishonesty
incident as well as the general difficult nature of addressing the issue. Spending time on referrals takes away from other more meaningful and desirable work. Prescott et al. (2014) reported addressing one batch of academic integrity violations in their classroom took approximately 8 hours for them to appropriately follow university policy regarding the matter. This time included gathering relevant evidence, reviewing the policy, consultation with peers, meeting with students involved, deciding on appropriate sanctions, and preparing letter outlining the case. Aside from the time commitment associated with following university policy, a student cheating incident could reflect poorly on a faculty members’ competence in the eyes of tenured colleagues which can also result in a sense of isolation.

Finally, because of the necessity to maintain confidentiality faculty are unable to share their burdens with their colleagues. Faculty also cited a lack of institutional support, such as testing monitors, for minimizing dishonesty and reported having a belief that policing academic behavior is not part of the professor role (Burrus et al., 2015; Diekhoff et al., 1996; Keith-Spiegel et al., 1998; Schneider, 1999; Whitley & Keith-Spiegel, 2001). While Staats, Hupp, Wallace, and Gresley (2009) found faculty often attributed not reporting academic dishonesty to lack of institutional support, they noted that students see only faculty not reporting and do not connect the inaction to faculty perceiving a lack of institutional support. Alschuler and Blimling (1995) stated that upper level administrators do not always want to bring the issue of cheating out in the public when all other institutions of higher education have the same issue.

Producing evidence to bear the burden of proof proves challenging and a timely endeavor (Alschuler & Blimling, 1995; Coalter et al., 2007; Fendler & Godbey, 2016; McCabe et al., 2012; Schneider, 1999; Staats et al., 2009; Stearns, 1997). Airtight proof is often unrealistic and in the absence of such evidence, faculty may be wary about reporting cases when they must also
provide the evidence to support their claims against students who cheat. Complex judicial processes provide due process to students but often require too much time for faculty to participate in the process and pit accused students against faculty members in adversarial roles (Alschuler & Blimling, 1995). Additionally, Schneider (1999) reported punishments do not always fit the crime and/or students found responsible are not required to follow through with sanctions such as writing a paper on plagiarism.

Fear

Fear refers to concern about retaliation and or a legal challenge. Fontana (2009) identified the fear and risk of reputation loss experienced by faculty who believe they will be blamed for allowing dishonesty to occur in their classrooms. Faculty fear lawsuits and other acts of retaliation from the students whom they accuse. Keith-Spiegel et al. (1998) noted that litigation is extremely rare, and the courts are likely to side the professor. However, faculty fear about litigation is strong.

Schneider (1999) interviewed faculty who were harassed by students and vilified after they made allegations of dishonesty. One professor shared he filed judicial charges against students for having unauthorized materials in his exam. A week later he was confronted in his campus office by a dozen students who threatened to have him fired from the university as well as threatened him with bodily harm if he did not withdraw his judicial charges. The faculty member noted when he told administrators what happened, no action was taken against the students. However, action was taken in other ways as the faculty member noted his reputation suffered and his course enrollments shrank significantly. Students were afraid to take his classes for fear of being reported for dishonesty.

Avoiding confrontation with the student regarding the allegations continues to be a
deterrent (Burrus et al., 2015). Faculty fear students who may retaliate by submitting poor evaluations of faculty members (Sneider, 1999). Faculty course evaluations are closely tied to merit raises and promotion. Pincus and Schmelkin (2003) determined faculty view academic dishonesty on a sliding scale of egregiousness. Faculty surveyed indicated hesitation in reporting students for less egregious acts of dishonesty for fear they will be punished too severely due to a perceived lack of flexibility in sanctions (Pincus & Schmelkin, 2003).

Denial

Denial is the least common category and refers to the multiple faculty beliefs around academic dishonesty. These beliefs include cheating students will fail anyway without going through the process, the worst offenders do not get caught and academic dishonesty is not happening in their classes (Keith-Spiegel et al., 1998). Whitley and Keith-Spiegel (2002) noted that while there is little if any empirical data, anecdotal data suggest faculty prefer to deny the existence of academic dishonesty. The denial comes in three different forms in which faculty believe the following: (a) cheating is not occurring in my classroom; (b) cheating happens, but I do not want to know about it; and (c) cheating promotes learning.

Hard et al. (2006) postulated that faculty who deny academic dishonesty happens in their classrooms avoid needing to address the nature of dishonesty and forgo challenging students who do cheat. They also found that faculty who underestimate the amount of dishonesty in the classroom are unlikely to file judicial charges against a student caught cheating. Subsequently, professors’ rationales for the denial of cheating in the classroom operate similarly to students’ use of neutralization techniques to justify their academically dishonest behavior (Whitley & Keith-Spiegel, 2001).
Summary

The review of the literature suggests is a need to better understand how faculty respond to academic dishonesty in the classroom. Faculty perspectives on the influences surrounding their decisions has not been thoroughly researched. The two conceptual frameworks discussed provided me with guidance to address the research questions. Social control/social bond theory can be used to understand the rationales used by faculty for their responses to dishonesty in the classroom. Bolman and Deal’s (2017) four frames for organizational leadership has institutional implications for academic dishonesty as a systemic or institutional issue rather than an individual faculty issue. My study utilizes both of these frameworks and provided me with a lens for an explaining faculty behavior regarding academic dishonesty that has not appear to have been explored in existing literature.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

In the first two chapters, I presented the importance of my study as well as a literature review outlining the present knowledge in the area as well as the gaps in the literature. Presentations of the research design and researcher positionality open the chapter as part of supporting how the methods ensure the purpose of the study was achieved. The chapter also contains the details about participant selection, data collection, and data analysis.

Research Design

The purpose of this study was to explore how faculty members viewed their roles in addressing academic dishonesty. A second purpose was to determine the potential barriers, situational or contextual, faculty experienced when considering reporting and addressing academic dishonesty. Thirdly, this study aimed to identify the support faculty need to create a culture of integrity in their classroom. Thus, the study was guided by the following research questions:

1. How do faculty respond to instances of academic dishonesty among students?
2. What influences their response?

An exploratory case study method was appropriate because I sought to understand how faculty established causal links between incidences of academic dishonesty and the interventions they deemed appropriate. These data were considered too complex for forced-choice survey measures or experimental designs (Yin, 2018). This case study was focused on gaining an in-depth level of understanding about the faculty’s decisions about addressing student academic dishonesty at a single baccalaureate degree granting university located in the southern part of the nation with its identification masked as the pseudonym of Southern U.S. University (SUSU).
According to Yin (2018), a case study design is appropriate to use when the focus of the study is to answer “how” and “why” questions. For a case study to be effectively executed and not overly broad, the case must be bounded by time or place (Creswell, 2013). The case of study was bounded within a single baccalaureate degree granting university. Additionally, the bounded events involved selecting faculty who have taught for 2 or more years and have experienced academic dishonesty in their classrooms at least once during the past year. The faculty participants shared their experience of students engaging in academic dishonesty in their courses.

Positionality of the Researcher

Throughout my career in higher education, I was drawn to academic dishonesty. Prior to my current role, I previously worked as a judicial affairs officer for 4 years at the same university where this research was conducted. At the time of the study, my current position was Associate Dean of Students. During my time as a judicial affairs officer, I worked closely with many faculty members who referred academic dishonesty cases for adjudication. I consulted with faculty who were unsure if they should refer students. I educated faculty about the policies and procedures when they needed guidance about rights and responsibilities they had regarding academic honesty and integrity. The judicial affairs role enabled me to form relationships with several faculty who represent diverse disciplines, such as the sciences, human development, and humanities.

Working in the position piqued my interest in the topic in a multitude of ways. Initially my interest was focused on the students and why they chose to engage in dishonest behavior. As I met with the students to discuss the allegations, I was provided an opportunity to discuss with the students their reasons and rationales for engaging in actions operating at odds with the degree they sought to earn. As I continued to contemplate the topic, my interest moved to the faculty
who were the first to respond to dishonesty. I lacked understanding about why faculty responded the way they did to students’ academic dishonesty, why they chose to report or not to report suspicions of academic dishonesty to the conduct office. I was not in a role that would allow for exploring the faculty members’ rationales for their actions toward students who cheat.

I became interested in understanding why faculty would choose not to report in some cases and would choose to make a different decision at other times. I noticed some faculty responded to cheating incidences as a personal affront whereas others did not. Based on number and type of referrals for adjudication, I was very interested in learning more about the variety of responses that faculty had for addressing academic dishonesty in their classrooms. My interest continuously increased for understanding individual faculty’s responses to the complex issue of academic dishonesty. By exploring with them their decision making processes and giving them opportunities to tell their stories, I could answer the why and with rich, in-depth data from the faculty.

As my previous work as a judicial officer significantly influenced my decision to pursue this research topic, my personal values of integrity, fairness, authority, and education in addition to past experiences with dishonesty became essential to this case study research. I recognized and was aware of my potential biases surrounding academic dishonesty and acknowledged the possibility of my lived experience impacting the research. While conducting my research, I reflected upon my reactions during the process of interviewing participants and analyzing data to recognize and mitigate any bias that I might have brought to the data collection process. I conducted the interviews in a manner that allowed the faculty participants to lead me on the path they were sharing with me rather than following a path of understanding that was based on my preconceived assumptions and biases.
Data Collection

Case study research commonly contains multiple forms of data such as documentation, archival records, interviews, direct observations, and participant-observation (Baxter & Jack, 2008; Yin, 2018). Using multiple sources of data allows for the in-depth exploration of the phenomenon being studied (Yin, 2018). In a case study, each piece of data from the different sources serves as an additional piece of evidence that contributes to the overall understanding of the phenomenon (Baxter & Jack, 2008). The data collection process is much like gathering background information on a topic, and ultimately the written pieces that are read can be used as secondary data or additional reference points in the research (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). The data collection process involved recruiting participants (Appendixes A, B, and C) and using an instrument with semi-structured procedures (Appendix D) that ensured the data analysis led to trustworthy findings.

Participants

The university in this study, SUSU, was a public, baccalaureate degree granting university located in the South. The university held the research extensive status as a doctoral granting university of the highest level of research activity. The university had approximately 28,000 undergraduate students, and 1,300 faculty members. The were 140 academic degrees in disciplines including business, management, engineering, computer science, natural sciences, mathematics, economics, political sciences, neurosciences, psychology, communication, film studies, history, humanities, arts, and information technology. The target population was full-time faculty who taught undergraduate courses for 2 or more years at SUSU and had experienced at least one exposure to academic dishonesty in the classroom. Two years was determined to be a
sufficient time teaching to have experiences with academic dishonesty in the classroom. All
other faculty were excluded from this study.

Faculty members identified to participate in the interviews were selected by means of
purposeful sampling. Purposeful sampling is commonly used in qualitative research to identify
individuals who are knowledgeable about the topic at hand and considered information-rich
individuals (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2004). Another important distinction of purposeful sampling is
identifying individuals who are available and able to effectively articulate information on the
topic of interest (Palinkas et al., 2015). There are numerous types of purposeful sampling. Due to
the nature of the topic, a snowball sampling was utilized. Snowball sampling is a recruitment
strategy used to reach research subjects that may be difficult to identify or are part of a
vulnerable population (Edmonds, 2019). One of the main challenges to recruiting participants
who are members of a vulnerable or difficult to identify population is an atmosphere of fear or
distrust (Cohen & Arieli, 2011). While faculty are not vulnerable in the traditional sense, they
have a level of vulnerability in sharing their viewpoints about responding to academic
dishonesty. This sense of vulnerability could have been amplified as the researcher worked at
SUSU at the time the interviews were conducted with the SUSU faculty. The faculty participants
could have been hesitant to discuss their thoughts on academic dishonesty with a researcher with
whom they were unfamiliar.

Utilizing a snowball sampling method allowed for faculty members known to me to make
a referral to other, unknown-to-me faculty to allow for greater possibility of their participation.
Snowball sampling utilizes informants, who help to identify participants who might be relevant
to the study. The informants are typically known to the researcher and relevant to the study.
They serve to provide the researcher with a solid introduction to other potential participants (Griffith, Morris, & Thakkar, 2016).

Once I identified one person as willing to speak with me, I asked if this participant would direct to me additional participants who might be willing to be interviewed. The participants were willing to recommend additional faculty for participation, so this technique yielded “relevant, information rich data” (Gall et al., 2004, p. 183). When the same individuals were suggested by current participants repeatedly, these individuals had the opportunity to ensure I achieved a “highly credible sample” (Gall et al., 2004, p. 185). My informants assisted in the recruitment process by suggesting faculty they thought would be interested in participating and willing to share their thoughts on academic dishonesty. In addition to sharing the names with me, the participating faculty also provided introductions via email between myself and the recommended faculty member.

The informants utilized their social capital among fellow faculty members when making an introduction. When I followed up with the recommended faculty members, the faculty recruits for participation had expected my call and already had a general sense of what I was reaching out to discuss. My target sample size was 10 to 12 faculty members from different academic disciplines on the campus. I achieved a sample of 11 faculty whose characteristics appear in Chapter 4. A sample size of 11 faculty participants was determined to be sufficient. In accordance with qualitative sampling protocol, I continued to interview faculty participants until no new information was yielded and saturation was reached (Gall et al., 2004). During the process, two faculty members were excluded from the study for not being able to recall specific information about academic dishonesty in their classrooms and were generally unwilling to discuss the topic at hand. Three additional faculty members were referred by informants, but
these faculty members were not recruited for participation because they taught in specific departments from which more than one faculty member had provided informed consent.

In addition to the interviews, I examined several artifacts and pieces of documentary evidence. Multiple sources of data were used to triangulate the data to enhance the credibility and trustworthiness of the findings. By using multiple methods of data collection, the findings were corroborated (Gall et al., 2004). Using individual sources of evidence is not recommended for case studies that should be built on multiple sources of data (Yin, 2018). Additionally, multiple sources of evidence allowed for a much more in-depth study of the phenomenon of faculty experiences with academic dishonesty by undergraduate students (Yin, 2018). Examples of additional data sources examined were the Student Code of Conduct, faculty senate meeting minutes in which the faculty senate specifically discussed the topic of academic integrity, and the syllabi from the courses taught by the participating faculty members. The Student Code of Conduct, faculty senate meeting minutes, and faculty syllabi were publicly available and accessible through the university’s website.

Instrument

To address the research questions, I conducted semi-structured, open-ended interviews using an interview guide with multiple faculty members in different disciplines at the university. The guide allowed for engaging in-depth with the participants. I developed all the interview questions used to guide the interview process. The interview questions are open-ended and developed to yield the richest responses from the faculty members. Bolman and Deal’s (2017) conceptual framework as well as Hirschi’s (2002) social control/social bond theory provided the underlying foundation for the development of the questions. The questions were designed to better understand how the institutional structure may impact faculty response. I responded to
faculty participants with follow-up questions, as needed, for gaining clarity or further exploring topics and content shared by the faculty. These questions began the conversations with the participants. Based on their responses to the preplanned questions, additional questions were asked to facilitate further discussion. See Appendix D for complete interview protocol.

Prior to asking the interview questions, I started building rapport with the participants. Rapport building included indicating why I was personally interested in the topic and asking general demographic questions of the participants. Specifically, I asked the following open-ended questions:

1. How long have you been a professor?
2. What drew you to academia?
3. What are some of the best things about being a professor?
4. What are some of the more challenging things?

It was my hope that by my spending some time with rapport building the faculty participants would be more comfortable about engaging in the interview experience. Roulston, deMarrais, & Lewis, (2003) reported a multitude of challenges regarding interviewing others about sensitive issues that involve the phrasing of questions, asking interview questions in general, addressing unexpected participant behavior, and the impact of the researcher’s own thoughts and beliefs about the interview process. When any questions proved to be challenging or distressing to the participants in the study, I made adjustments to how I applied the interview guide by rewording questions and offering opportunities for faculty to discontinue their participation or to reschedule the remainder of the interview to a later date.

Procedures

At the time of the interviews, I worked at SUSU, a research extensive baccalaureate
degree granting university in the Southern United States. I interviewed faculty currently employed at this university. Permission to conduct the study was granted through the Institutional Research Boards SUSU. (Approval for IRB-20-521 was granted on November 5, 2020.)

I sought assistance for finding participants from key informants such as the faculty members who served on university discipline committee, faculty members I had formed relationships with based on professional interactions, as well as key campus partners to recruit faculty participants. Once I was in possession of the names of the eligible faculty members, I contacted them by email to briefly explain the study, determine their interest, and share the informed consent form. The informed consent was sent to all participants electronically. I requested they call or reply with their interest. Upon receipt of interest, I scheduled the interviews based on a mutually agreeable time.

All interviews were video recorded using Zoom. I utilized the interview guide to ask the semi-structured and open-ended questions. The interview guide began with questions developed from the previously stated research questions. Additional questions were asked for follow-up based on the participants’ responses. The average interview time for the faculty participants was 45 minutes. I took field notes during the interviews to collect observations that could not be captured on an audio recording and to identify thoughts and details about the participants’ data.

I also completed a contact summary immediately following each interview. The contact summary contained notes about what was learned from the interview, additional reflections, and thoughts about potential themes. The contact summary was not a substitution for interview notes and was used to enrich the notes as well as served as a guide for additional data collection (Gall et al., 2004).
The data collected in the context of this research was kept confidential. All names were removed from transcripts, and the participants were referenced by pseudonyms. The confidentialities of the participants and the institution were maintained by masking and the use of pseudonyms. I assigned the university with the pseudonym of Southern U.S. University (SUSU).

Perfecting an interview and getting quality information from the interview process was necessary to ensure the trustworthiness of the case study. Symonds (1939) studied issues in gathering reliable and valid data through the interview process 74 years ago, and many of the issues Symonds mentioned continued into the 21st century as issues with which researchers’ grapple. While 21st century technology was more advanced for ensuring accurate transcripts of the words spoken in an interview, reliability and validity of the interview was ensured (Roulston, deMarrais & Lewis, 2003). The reliability of an interview speaks to how similarly an interview would be if conducted a second time and validity refers to how much of the data corresponds to actual facts sought by the researcher (Symonds, 1939).

Reliability could have been affected by participants’ cognition, willingness, and ability to share experiences because too much variability can cause the sample to be biased (Kirkevold & Bergland, 2007). As necessary, I eliminated data from participants who could not articulate or effectively express themselves and only utilized data from participants who yielded cogent data. Also, communication difficulties such as ineffective communication because of generation, gender, or sociocultural status could have influenced the data and caused bias in the data analysis. To reduce communication difficulties, I was sure that the academic dishonesty definitions were clearly identified to avoid the possibility of misinterpretation because words might have different meanings or connotations between persons of different disciplines, cultures, and experiences. Roulston et al. (2003) identified other issues with communication more
specifically related to asking interviewing questions and ensuring the questions were adequately expressed to the participants. Thus, I made sure each question was enunciated with clarity and asked the participants if they needed any further information prior to answering the questions.

As threats to the interview could have occurred with all participants, strategies to mitigate threats were identified. One strategy was to get verification and feedback throughout the interview (Kirkevold & Bergland, 2007). I applied the feedback strategy when a participant responded to a question by paraphrasing the participant’s statement to check or verify understanding. It was at this point that the participant either verified that I was correct or indicated what they intended to convey in a different way to clarify their original response. This feedback loop represented an effective rapport building tool to show participants that I truly sought to understand the data being shared (Corey, 2000).

An additional strategy was to conduct the interviews in shorter time frames over a longer period of time. This strategy allowed for participants who might have stamina concerns to have more energy during the interview and allowed for transcribing data before the next interview. In doing so, researchers gain opportunities to ask clarifying questions and develop different questions depending on emerging themes (Kirkevold & Bergland, 2007). Another strategy for gaining the reliability of data involved providing a draft of the interview transcription to each faculty participant to allow for them providing additional clarifications or validating that the transcript contained the content they recollected providing.

Yin (2018) indicated the interview is a preferred method for qualitative research because of its potential to yield rich data. The strengths of an interview are the degree of control the researcher has including the potential to establish a positive rapport and the generally limited time commitment of the participants. Additionally, the control researchers have over the
interview process could also be seen as a negative when the participants do not think they have much control over the situation, think their participation is somewhat limiting or not important, or believe they need to say what the researcher wants (Kirkevold & Bergland, 2007). Shared control enabled participants to be empowered and increased the possibility of rapport building for obtaining in-depth, rich interview data. As I was interviewing faculty members who were willingly volunteering their time and knowledge, I was hopeful the interviews would generate in-depth, rich data from faculty invested in the academic integrity of their courses and students.

Data Analysis

All interviews were audio-recorded to ensure accuracy in transcribing the responses. The data were formed from the transcriptions. Prior to coding each interview, faculty participants were provided a copy of their respective transcripts to verify that the data reflected what they recollected saying. The researcher read the transcripts in their entirety multiple times to gain a familiarity with the material. After this, the interview transcripts were coded for themes, commonalities and distinctions utilizing the constant comparison technique created by Glaser and Strauss (1967). While this technique is most commonly associated with grounded theory, utilizing an inductive analysis procedure was applicable to the case study design (Yin, 2018).

Traditional coding techniques were designed to identify themes among human action and behavior (Licquirish & Seibold, 2011). Coding involved reviewing interview transcripts and field notes line by line to identify themes or categories with which to begin organizing data (Licquirish & Seibold, 2011). Coding allowed me to interact intimately with the data using specific analytic techniques, such as comparisons, asking questions of the data, and considering the multiple meanings of words (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). The constant comparison method was labor intensive and resulted in the researcher becoming incredibly immersed in the data. Constant
comparison refers to an ongoing data analysis technique where the researcher continually compares pieces of data for similarities and differences and codes the information to identify themes (Kolb, 2012).

Member checking was utilized to verify the credibility of the results. I employed transcript review to assure the accuracy of the findings. Transcripts were sent to the respective faculty participants for their review. Each participant checked their transcript for accuracy and determined if the transcript precisely captured the spirit of the information they have shared in the interview. Two faculty responded back with small corrections to their transcripts. I applied the corrections accordingly. All remaining nine faculty indicated the transcripts they received were accurate reflections of the data they shared in their interviews.

After the constant comparison coding and member checking were completed, the data were reviewed for overall findings and then categorized into different groups based on findings. The findings were saved as electronic files for each thematic area or category, and different statements or quotations from the faculty were connected to the appropriate categories. All data were categorized into subthemes to form the final thematic findings. I utilized analytic memos to help facilitate the analysis. The analytic memos served multiple purposes for helping to clarify the coding that occurred during the constant comparison process as well as for serving as a research journal filled with thoughts about the process and the emerging categories (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Summary

In this chapter I described the research design for exploring how faculty members viewed their roles in addressing academic dishonesty as an exploratory case study. This case study was focused on gaining an in-depth level of understanding about the faculty’s decisions about
addressing student academic dishonesty at a single baccalaureate degree granting university located in the southern part of the nation with its identification masked as the pseudonym of Southern U.S. University (SUSU). I provided information about me to demonstrate the positionality of the researcher, which included my past as a judicial affairs officer who addressed academic dishonesty cases, which caused me to be interested in understanding why faculty would choose not the report in some cases and would choose to make a different decision at other times. I detailed the data collection processes and established the plan for data analysis. The data collection occurred through interviews with faculty and acquiring artifacts from SUSU. The interview guide that contained open-ended questions founded on the conceptual frameworks. Data analysis followed the constant comparative method because all transcripts were checked by the participants and data analysis was ongoing. After the constant comparison coding and member checking were completed, the data were reviewed for overall findings and then categorized into different groups based on findings. Chapter 4 contains the findings that emerge from conducting the case study.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to explore how faculty members viewed their roles in addressing academic dishonesty. A second purpose was to determine the potential barriers, situational or contextual, faculty experienced when considering reporting and addressing academic dishonesty. Thirdly, this study aimed to identify the support faculty need to create a culture of integrity in their classroom. The exploratory case study was focused on addressing two main research questions designed to generate information regarding faculty response to academic dishonesty in the classroom and influences to their responses. Additionally, the two research questions were viewed from the lens of both Hirschi’s social bond theory (2002) as well as the conceptual framework of Bolman and Deal (2017).

1. How do faculty respond to instances of academic dishonesty among students?
2. What influences their response?

The research setting was Southern U.S. University (SUSU) that offered primarily face to face instruction. However, during the time of the interviews, the majority of courses were being conducted virtually format due to the Covid-19 pandemic. Purposeful snowball sampling of faculty was utilized. Faculty who taught for 2 or more years at SUSU and experienced at least one exposure to academic dishonesty in the classroom were the target population for recruiting participants. The full interview protocol is found in Appendix D. The faculty participants were asked some general rapport building questions. Those were followed by the five main interview questions that focused on their experiences with academic dishonesty, how they responded to dishonesty in their respective classrooms, discussions of the institutional structure as affecting their reporting, how faculty learned about the academic dishonesty process at SUSU, as well as their understanding of how the reporting process works.
The interviews were conducted over a period of three weeks during the fall semester. Faculty participants were encouraged to review their individual transcripts. All faculty participants indicated their transcripts accurately reflected their interviews. Some minor corrections were made based on their reviews. The faculty interviewed all had stories about experiences with addressing academic dishonesty to share that included information about “how it feels to catch someone cheating,” their role in addressing academic dishonesty, their personal values, their beliefs about institutional support, and their specific ways of responding. First the characteristics of the faculty are presented. Next, the collective responses from the interviews are synthesized. Finally, the emergent themes are presented in this chapter.

Participants

Eleven faculty members were interviewed for the study, represented as five women and six men. Faculty participants came from a variety of different disciplines including information systems \((n = 1)\), history \((n = 1)\), math \((n = 2)\), biology \((n = 2)\), computer science \((n = 1)\), management \((n = 1)\), marketing \((n = 1)\), interdisciplinary studies \((n = 1)\) and film studies \((n = 1)\). Their teaching experience ranged from a low of 3 years to a high of 21 years. Five of the faulty members held the Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) degree; one held the Juris Doctor (JD) degree, one had a Doctor of Dental Surgery (DDS) degree, and four had master’s degrees. Three participants taught both undergraduate and graduate courses, while the remaining eight participants taught undergraduates exclusively. All participants’ names have been replaced by pseudonyms. Each participant’s background appears next.

- **Anabelle** taught in the film discipline and has been teaching since 2012. She held the PhD in her discipline and the rank of Associate Professor.

- **Bonnie** was a master’s level faculty member in Interdisciplinary studies. She
taught at SUSU for 12 years and provided academic advising to the students in her department. Bonnie and I had known each other for several years, as our paths had crossed professionally on the campus. Her department was a smaller department with fewer students.

- *Catherine* was a non-tenure track associate professor in the math department. She had been teaching at SUSU for 5 years.

- *Donna* had been teaching for 20 years in the marketing department. She had a master’s degree and a significant amount of industry experience.

- *Edward* had been a master’s level faculty member in information sciences for 3 years. Like others, he had industry experience that he applied in the classroom.

- *Frank* was a tenure track faculty member in the mathematics department who had been teaching as SUSU for 4 years.

- *George* was a tenured faculty member in the history department. He had been at SUSU for 14 years and had served on the university’s discipline committee in the past.

- *Hannah* had been a non-tenure track professor in the biology department at SUSU for 12 years. She was very passionate about academic integrity. Her students were often pre-medicine or pre-dental.

- *Ian* had been teaching in the biology department for 10 years as a non-tenure track faculty member with a terminal degree in his field. Similar to Bonnie, he provided academic advising to the students in his department. He taught primarily students in honors courses and those with an interest in pre-medicine.

- *John* was a master’s level faculty member who had been teaching in the computer science department since 2002. Similar to Donna, he had years of experience in the industry that he applied to the classroom. He taught several large undergraduate courses to a total of about
350 students each semester.

- **Karl** was an attorney who had been teaching at SUSU since 2006. His courses were focused primarily on business law and communications. Karl was not a tenure track faculty member.

**Presentation of Data**

Five main questions guided the semi-structured interviews with the 11 faculty. Those questions appear in Appendix D and were framed according to Bolman and Deal’s (2008, 2017) conceptual framework that regarded the culture of a university as an institution. The four frames are structural, human resources, political, and symbolic. The structural frame is focused on putting people in the right roles and relationships. Structural measures could include implementing academic integrity committees and policies, additional human resource support, and conduct procedures. Division of labor is a vital factor of structure. Universities can adopt a lateral or vertical structure. A vertical structure depends on employee willingness to follow directions from above. Vertical structure has potential to be efficient but not always effective (Bolman & Deal, 2008). Faculty represent the human resources frame, and faculty operate with students according to the university’s political frame that involves policies, expectations, and culture. Therefore, the human resources frame requires the administration support faculty who address cheating behaviors. Because institutions of higher education are so often political in nature, faculty’s understanding of the university’s political issues and plans to counteract the potential for any politically charged conflicts that could emerge from academic dishonesty cases were needed. The interview questions were holistic applications of the four frames and designed to better understand how the institutional structures, politics, human resources, and symbols impacted faculty responses to academic dishonesty.
The faculty participants’ responses to the five main interview questions appear in this section. Each heading reflects the content addressed in the respective interview question. Responses were viewed through a lens looking at faculty attachment, commitment, involvement, and belief in SUSU.

Knowledge of the Academic Dishonesty Reporting Process

Faculty were asked to describe the process for addressing academic dishonesty and how they learned of the process. Social control/social bond theory by Hirschi (2002) provided the basis for this question. The social bond elements of attachment and involvement that Hirschi theorized to operate within the social bond between faculty and institution were applied in developing this question.

All participants knew that there was a process for addressing academic dishonesty with a conduct office within the student affairs division that assisted with academic dishonesty case adjudication. They all listed the different things they knew about the office and the process as they understood it for reporting academic dishonesty. They named things such as knowing the office could handle these types of things as well as the amount of autonomy available to faculty regarding the ability to refer cases. The consistency ended with faculty knowing about the conduct office. The responses ranged from faculty having a general idea to what the process looks like to those who knew the exact process from reading the faculty handbook.

Most of the faculty understood there was a process required of them for handling academic dishonesty. Karl, Anabelle, John, Catherine, and Hannah provided explicit data regarding how they believed they had no autonomy to address things independently in the classroom. Hannah commented, “Basically, faculty are told that is our responsibility to report academic dishonesty when we find it, that we are not permitted to adjudicate.” Likewise,
Catherine reported filling out a form to “provide my evidence. And then I step back and let them be the people that run it from there.” Similar to Catherine, John filled “out the form [to] provide all the supporting documentation and then basically I was hands off for the most part unless they needed to contact me.”

George started with the basics. He was knowledgeable of the process and said the first step is simply identifying when dishonesty was a factor in the work provided by the student. Once dishonesty was identified, George knew he should fill out a report, supply his documentation, and “then sort of sit back and let the process go.”

Anabelle framed her understanding more in the idea of what she was not supposed to do as opposed to what she is supposed to do: “I’m not supposed to confront the student or ask the student directly if they were or weren’t cheating or anything like that.” Likewise, Karl stated what he should not do in remarking that “it’s not really the faculty’s role to make a final decision or any decision. It’s really important that faculty involved the conduct office, get that independent assessment of the situation.”

Ian also cited due process and fairness in explaining his understanding of the process. He explained, “there’s actually a form that goes to this office. And from there, the student has due process, and it's the same innocent until proven guilty.” Overall, most faculty members, Karl, Anabelle, John, Catherine, Bonnie, Ian, and Hannah, understood the reporting process as disallowing them from having any autonomy in addressing academic dishonesty independently. Rather, they believed their only option if they chose to respond was to send the information to the conduct office and await further guidance.

Frank and Edward faculty believed they had the autonomy to choose between handling the dishonesty themselves and referring to the conduct office. They thought they could choose to
address dishonesty directly in the classroom with the students and considered referring cases to
the conduct office to be an option. Frank thought “a lot of the process is left open at the faculty
member’s discretion.” Frank also understood that faculty members could opt to work directly
with a student to try and resolve the matter.

Edward provided a perspective similar to Frank’s thoughts in that he understood both a
formal process and an informal process existed for addressing academic dishonesty incidents. He
described the formal reporting to the conduct office a “recommendation that we give to
[faculty].” Edward identified the informal process as his preference where “instructors do not
always go the [conduct office] immediately [because] they try to have a discussion first with the
student and then kind of come to a resolution about it.” Edward also reported letting students
know that he maintained an awareness of what they do in the classroom, on their homework, and
during tests as an important part of his informal process. He was generally familiar with the
formal process and shared he had never reported a student to the conduct office. Rather, it was
important to him if he saw anything out of the ordinary, Edward discussed that observation with
the student and let them know “this was noticed.” He indicated it is important that students are
aware their faculty know they may have done something dishonest because it shows the faculty
member is paying attention by saying:

That’s where it’s important that the student looks at the instructor and feels like the
instructor is invested. If we, as instructors, don’t give them that feel, that we are not
invested in their success in class, and we are not working with them, then they don’t feel
like listening to you.

When asked about her knowledge of the process, Bonnie was able to provide me with the
official university process. As a follow up, I inquired if she felt she had any leniency in the
process. She became hesitant and said, “this is being recorded!” After re-affirming her
comments would not be attributed to her in that she would have a pseudonym, she remarked:
We’re educated individuals and I think we have to determine how egregious the academic dishonesty was…In my mind, running to the Dean of Students is not being a good role model for that, but that having a conversation with the student, really doing my homework on did this really happen, how did it happen, and what would reasonable consequences for it.

The remaining faculty held the understanding they either referred the case or did nothing. They did not believe they had autonomy to pick and choose how they responded. Karl noted there was danger in picking and choosing. He stated,

I don't feel like I have any autonomy to call a student in and say, “Hey, you seem like a really nice, hardworking student. You made a bad judgment. I saw you looking at the person's paper next to you. I'm just going to take 10 points off. Don't do it next time.” I don't have any autonomy, in my view, to be able to do that. That would raise due process concerns and fairness issues, all kinds of things that I wouldn't want to walk down that path.

In addition to discussing their knowledge of the academic dishonesty reporting process, the faculty discussed how they learned about the process for reporting academic dishonesty. The majority of the faculty struggled reported lacking clarity about how they learned about the procedures and process for reporting academic dishonesty to the conduct office. A variety of responses were provided. Ian said, “I think it’s in a bulletin” and might have been part of new faculty orientation. Several faculty including Edward, Frank, Anabelle, and Karl indicated they learned about it by asking a more seasoned, senior colleague. Anabelle elaborated that she would have initially asked a more senior colleague for guidance but as she became familiar with SUSU, she learned to ask her assistant dean or “advisors this question and any people I think I would have gotten a good answer from.” Bonnie initially responded with shaking her head and saying, “that is a really, really, really good question.” After giving how he learned about the process some thought, Bonnie was “pretty sure” she learned about it in her department’s faculty meetings as “a normal topic of discussion at those faculty meetings.”

George and Karl both served on the SUSU discipline committee and shared it was not
until their time on the committee that they learned fully about the process. George shared that initially “I think somebody had told me that there was an office…but I don’t think I really learned about it until I got on the committee.” George recalled members of the Dean of Students office had come in and spoken to department about the process. Karl initially learned the process in the same way as Anabelle by asking a colleague but could not recall exactly. Karl reminisced:

I imagine that something happened in one of my classes and that I reached out to somebody who’d been around for a little bit longer than I had at the time and asked what the process was. I probably went online and looked into it a little bit more and probably actually reached out to somebody in the Dean of Students office and asked for help walking through the process.

After that, Karl joined the discipline committee and became more versed in the process. Notably, Hannah was the only faculty member who “read the faculty handbook” to learn about the process. John’s memory was unclear, and he thought he learned about the creation of the conduct office by a departmental memo.

Faculty Role Regarding Academic Dishonesty

Faculty were asked to describe their role regarding academic dishonesty in the classroom and within the institution. This question was designed to collect information about the commitment, attachment, and belief elements of the social bond faculty had with the institution as part of applying Hirschi’s (2002) social control/social bond theory. Additionally, the structural and political frames of Bolman and Deal (2017) organizational and leadership framework provided a lens for this question.

All faculty interviewed indicated they held a role with regard to upholding academic dishonesty. How each of their roles look in the classroom are different as part of their academic freedom. Bonnie noted “it’s a faculty role…I think it’s all of our responsibility to promote academic integrity and talk about it.” By the same token, Ian stated, “It’s probably more my role
than anybody else’s.” Edward indicated that while the institution has a responsibility for addressing dishonesty, “the real foot soldiers are your faculty, who are there in the class.”

Others noted their role was more about making the environment safe and creating a space where students do not need to be dishonest. Catherine stated, “I try to create an environment where they can feel prepared for their exams and they can feel comfortable in what they’re doing.” Correspondingly, Karl indicated his faculty role in the classroom is “to build as much trust and respect I can with my students, and I try to give them as many resources as possible so that they don’t feel the need to go down the path of academic dishonesty.”

Some faculty connected their role in academic dishonesty more closely to their academic discipline. Anabelle, an arts and humanities professor, said, “Professors should teach students what their role in academic discourse is, which is to participate in it, to hear, to understand it, and then to contribute to it.” Similarly, George, who taught in the same department, shared his role is to “educate students on what constitutes academic dishonesty [because attribution is how] you say thank you to a scholar who’s gone before you and has created knowledge that you have benefitted from.” Both Hannah and John shared the perspective that their role is to report academic dishonesty if they suspect it happened. They both noted reporting many students each semester which added value to the system for addressing academic dishonesty. Hannah said, “The only way repeat offenders will be uncovered is if everybody is participating in the system.” Likewise, John stated, “every teacher should be diligently looking for cases of academic dishonesty and handling those.”

One faculty member, Donna, had a different take on her role in the classroom. While she agreed she had a role, she saw her role more as an intermediary between faculty members in her department. She asserted her role was “to convey back to my, to our faculty or adjuncts or
whoever it may be.” And to “keep her ears and eyes out to see if I’m hearing of some unusual
tings that are taking place.” This perspective was in keeping with the issues that the faculty
reported as influencing how they chose to respond to incidences. Those issues that affected their
reporting decisions were fear, time, harm to the student, level of evidence, and overwhelming
nature of the problem.

Fear

Fear of retaliation was mentioned by some faculty. While only one faculty member had
had any student retaliate, some shared just the idea of it happening was enough to give them
pause. Karl noted, “It’s easy to become afraid of what student might do…Is this the battle you
want to fight? And then have them trash you online, send you inappropriate messages, threaten
you?” Donna shared similar beliefs and had never had a student retaliate but wondered “what if
they would get violent for something about it. Never had that issue, but I’m like, I think I would
just document it.”

Unlike his colleagues, John disclosed a real-life retaliation he experienced. He began as
follows: “You’re taking a risk, every time you turn someone in, that there’s going to be a
backlash of some kind.” He went on to report a specific incident that happened to him: “One
student made all kinds of false claims about me to my department head, to I guess the Dean of
Students, to the Undergraduate Dean. Everyone he copied was seeing every false claim made and
no refutation of it.” John noted it was not fear that influenced his choices to pursue cases, but his
specific department’s view about the negativity associated with it. John’s distinct impression was
that his department was not supportive, but rather, the opposite happened because they said,
“Why did you go down this road, or why are you turning so many in?”
**Time**

Karl explained while the conduct process at SUSU is not burdensome, it is “one more thing.” He explained:

You just finished the exam, and all you want to do is you want to grade the exams…. You want to talk to the students about it, and then you’ve got this one that’s just hanging out there, and who knows how long it’s going to take to go through the process.

John shared concerns similar to Karl’s about the time it takes to report the incident and deal with the process. John elaborated that “it requires a lot of time on our parts. I may have to participate in a hearing or go over and add detail to a case. It takes time to prepare all the documentation to send over.” By the same token, Bonnie explained that “the only frustrating part perhaps could be sometimes the time lag.”

Hannah took a different perspective on time. For her, the time necessary to put the case together and submit it was not the problem. The problem was the time delay in getting a response and receiving word of a resolution, which could take about six months as follows: “I had things that were reported the second week of the summer semester that didn’t get resolved until October.” Additionally, she mentioned that submitting the case can be a waste of her time because of cases she submitted and believed were solid that were dismissed by the conduct office. That experience “has moved the threshold of what I submit and what I don’t.”

**Harm to the Student**

Most faculty revealed not wanting to harm their students and concern that pursuing academic dishonesty would cause students harm. Donna shared she “wouldn’t want to ever embarrass the students” and added, “I don’t want to just assume they’re at fault. I don’t want to get that wrong.” Similarly, Karl indicated, “I don’t want to be wrong because that’s putting a 17, 18, 19, 20-year old, 35, 45, 50 year old, whoever it is, that puts them in a really difficult
situation…and it’s easy to be wrong.” John shared his colleagues’ concern about the students. He remarked, “it’s somewhat traumatic for the student, especially if it’s not copied. Even for those that it is copied, it’s traumatic, but I think even more so if you’re wrongly accused and sent over to defend yourself.” Correspondingly, Frank believed “you’re really harming the students’ future if it starts going on their permanent record or they’re having to withdraw from a class or fail a class.”

Level of Evidence

Unlike his other colleagues, George only noted one main influence on whether or not he pursued a case: “My decision to pursue it is simply, do I think I have a case?” When George believed he lacked a strong enough case, he used his autonomy as a faculty member to not refer. Catherine shared George’s philosophy on evidence as follows, “I don’t file that many complaints, and I make sure that I have evidence when there is one.” In the same way, Frank said, “if I just suspected it but couldn’t prove it, then I don’t see how I could in good conscience escalate. I would have to know…. I don’t want to screw up someone’s college career over just a hunch.”

Overwhelming Nature of the Problem

Karl shared in addition to other deterrents, one issue remains with academic dishonesty: “It’s just too overwhelming of a problem to solve, and people try all different things.” He continued, “You can put an honor code or the common creed in your syllabus, or make sure you have somebody [from the conduct office] come and talk at [entry level] classes. But, in the end, it is unclear what works.”

Edward expressed the concern as a question, “Have we fixed the root cause of the problem?” Edward further agreed with Karl when he noted that professors have tried “all sorts of
things” that have not “fixed it” such as applying “a medium of fear … ‘if you do this, we will report you.’ There are some people who take a different approach…blah, blah, blah, it’s on your record.” Edward’s tone suggested a level of frustration with the difficulties of preventing academic dishonesty as well.

Institutional Structure and Policy

Faculty were asked how the structure and policies of the university influenced their decisions to respond. This question was designed to align with the Bolman and Deal (2017) organizational and leadership framework’s structural, political, and symbolic frames. The participants expressed a wide variety of responses. Some faculty members interpreted the question to mean institutional structure and policies involved the conduct office. As a result of this interpretation, faculty shared about their experiences with the conduct office. Anabelle expressed frustration in the office and shared a negative experience she had as follows:

I’m only going to do it [refer a case] if I really I’m not invested in the outcome at this point, based on, and the case that I had, I complained, I appealed, I met with people, I talked more, I showed more evidence, and nothing. Nothing! And, frankly, I just felt like people in that office did not have a strong grasp of what academic dishonesty was when it came to my field and the significant of it. So, I was left very jaded.

Annabelle also asserted a strong disconnect between her department and the conduct office regarding student responsibility for knowingly doing something wrong versus accidental dishonesty. She observed “a real disrespect actually for what academic writing is and the significance and difficulty, frankly, of producing original ideas.” She remarked sharing a kinship “in her own community and my own school with other professors who do what I do.” However, Anabelle found the conduct office “paternalistic” and “flippant” in their handling of her academic dishonesty referrals. She believed the conduct office “takes the position students do not know any better.”
Other faculty noted their own frustrations with the conduct office but for different reasons. Hannah expressed a lack of confidence and frustration with the staff in the conduct office because “the person who has handled most of my cases in the past six months was being very much on the student’s side of things.” Hannah noted significant frustration with cases she submitted being dismissed even though she strongly believed “there was wrongdoing.” For example, Hannah said, “I’ve turned in cases where a student submitted answers to an online exam that were incorrect for their test, but correct for another version of the test and was told, ‘Oh well, those could have been coincidental typos.’”

Hannah mentioned that part of her lack of confidence in the conduct office stemmed from a “turnover in leadership [that] was not necessarily beneficial.” Hannah also noted that most of her cases have “been handled by someone whose official title is director of the student union building.” She attributed this shift to the student affairs division being “understaffed and because Covid-19 changed a lot of people’s job descriptions.” Ultimately, Hannah admitted that her view of the conduct office impacted her responses to academic dishonesty in the classroom: “What I let go versus what I submit is really strongly influenced by how the current administration with the [conduct office] is handling cases.”

Likewise, George expressed strong opinions about the current leadership in the conduct office when he said, “In the last couple of years that I was on the disciplinary committee, I felt like the way the office was running, it was getting worse and worse and worse.” He remarked his experiences impacted his confidence levels in those working for the conduct office:

My sense is the quality of hearing officers, from when I first started to when I got off the committee, has declined greatly. That the people who were involved in this when I first got on that committee seemed to know much more what they were doing and seemed a lot more competent.

John did not lack confidence in the office, but stated the office has “put me in an uncomfortable
John had observed the staff in the conduct office would tell students after a case was resolved about the sanction, “it’s your professors’ job to decide. This is just our outcome.” John described this type of statement as “sort of a finger pointing thing, it felt to me.”

Bonnie noted the university process with the conduct office is very clear and “easy to use.” However, after submitting a case, the “time lag” was a problem because “we want to tie a bow on it as quickly as possible, and sometimes you have to have that time for the investigation.” Hannah remarked the conduct office had a “turnover in leadership that was not necessarily beneficial.” She believed that “five years ago, I would’ve said, “Oh yes, [conduct office personnel] were efficient, they were effective. They were great to work with.’ That has changed.” Hannah also noted, similarly to Bonnie, that timeliness of case adjudication was an issue. Hannah reported submitting reports early in the summer semester which usually starts in May but not receiving resolution until halfway through the fall semester in October.

On the contrary, other faculty cited the existence of the conduct office being a positive part of the university structure. Catherine remarked it helped her by “being able to fill out the form and let it go means that I don’t get eaten up by it emotionally.” Catherine also shared an appreciation for the office staff with whom she could consult when not sure how to proceed with a case that might lack evidence. She noted the consultation in one case meant “we both agreed that it was going to be unfounded, but we also agreed that it needed to be reported to show evidence of future things, to kind of show a pattern of behavior.”

Karl also acknowledged the importance of the consultation opportunities presented by the conduct office because it “makes the most sense is to reach out to the people who are going to be handling the process and get their view.” George saw value in the conduct office for a different reason. He cited the institutional memory and centralized location for adjudicating cases
important because “then it becomes fair to students because you don’t have me being a softie, versus somebody else being really hard on them.” Karl agreed with George about the institutional memory, noting “it’s consistent as opposed to me failing somebody in my class” but “another faculty taking five points off on a paper for the same thing.”

Four of the faculty had never referred a case to the conduct office because they chose to address the dishonesty on their own or did not see value in referring the incident beyond the boundaries of the class. Frank did not think it made “sense for any of the parties involved to ‘escalate’ the issue” and considered the three parties to be the university, the faculty member, and the student. He justified his view as follows:

From the point of view of the student, you’re really harming the students’ future if it starts going on their permanent record or they’re having to withdraw from a class or fail a class…from the point of view of the professor without tenure, it probably doesn’t look very good to be causing harm to students in this way…and from the point of view from the university, well they want to have students.

For different reasons, Edward opted not to refer students for academic dishonesty to the conduct office. Edward believed “there is definitely a mental stigma about it.” He continued, “the mental connotation of you being reported to an official office that looks into academic dishonesty, it plays into the minds of the students very differently.” In contrast, Ian appreciated the idea of the conduct office because “it works well to have a separate office…they can be an ombudsman in cases where somebody needs an advocate, as opposed to always coming down on the institution’s side.”

Frank declared his faculty status influenced his decisions to report incidences of academic dishonesty. He explained, “I’m pre-tenure, and so certainly I don’t really want to make waves…that said, I’m sure I would be supported 100% by my department and by the university, it’s just that I don’t need any additional complications.”
On the contrary, Edward interpreted the institutional structure and policies that affected his decisions about responding to academic dishonesty as referring to the hierarchy of SUSU. He noted the university structure could be challenging for faculty who “don’t know what’s the hierarchy of reaching out for help.” After working at SUSU for 4 years, he became “able to see the structures unfold, and see how we get that support from different types of people.” He elaborated for some of his issues he sought out his dean, and for others, he consulted with his department chair. By understanding the complex structure, he could succeed and be an effective professor because “effectiveness is something that you only know through experience.”

Institutional Support

Faculty were asked about the support they receive from their dean, academic department, and the university as a whole for addressing academic dishonesty. The human resources, political, and symbolic frames of the Bolman and Deal (2017) organizational framework were utilized when creating this question. The attachment element of Hirschi’s (2002) social control/social bond theory also provided a lens for this question. In responding to this question, nearly all faculty said they felt supported, but very few could provide tangible ways that demonstrated the support. For instance, Edward noted, as seen above, “support is very strong” but added that “knowledge of those hierarchies” is critical in getting to the right person for support. He said, “There may be instances where I need to be talking directly to the dean of graduate school or other times where I just need to talk to my department chair. Edward concluded experiences helped him successfully navigate the hierarchy and gain needed information.

Ian was only able to describe the support from a theoretical perspective as he noted he has never gone through the process of reporting a case of academic dishonesty. However, he said
he appreciated SUSU’s prescribed process for addressing academic dishonesty. Similar to Ian, Frank never referred a case to “escalate” things to the conduct office and added, “no one would take any issue with me if I were to escalate it.” Frank said, “I feel supported by the provost and the university. No problem. I don’t think there would be any issue.” However, Frank did not believe “anyone’s benefitting from it” if he were to choose to pursue an academic dishonesty case.

George approached answering the question by giving several examples of things within his department and beyond that to him, were signs of implicit support. He remarked the interim dean gave the director of the conduct office time to speak about the process during the faculty meeting and noted, “the fact that she was given the platform says that our dean is supportive of this” process. For George, “the fact there is a conduct office on campus would indicate to me that this is, again, something that the institution has interest in and takes seriously.” While George indicated implicit support in pursuing cases, he noted there is a lack of explicit messaging for support when noting “we have a program coordinator that oversees the history and philosophy program. We get no guidance or instruction there. We have our dean. We’re in the second year of an interim dean and really haven’t gotten a lot there.” Anabelle, a colleague of George’s in the same department, expressed having the support of the department: “I feel real kind of kinship in my own community and my own school with other professors who do what I do. And then from our dean who is usually one of us.”

Catherine said she has found everyone to be “very supportive.” She qualified this statement by saying, “I also don’t file that many complaints, and I make sure that I have evidence when there is one.” She said she had the autonomy to do what she believed need to be
done: “I don’t really ask permission for things…but I don’t make a big deal about it when I do it either.”

Karl stated the dean and department chair were supportive about doing “something about” incidences of academic dishonesty. He described the support as knowing there was somebody “I can talk to and ask questions and they’ll help me through the process.” However, Karl said he would most likely consult with the conduct office for support given that “it’s just harder for me to go the dean because he hasn’t been in the classroom.” Karl believed he was supported in cases of academic dishonesty because his reporting of cases did not have “an impact on my evaluations or promotions or salary or benefits,” and no one had said to him, “You really need to back off; you’re making students uncomfortable.”

Bonnie reported having support because of a specific internal document utilized in her particular academic area. She said her department used the document to help facilitate conversations with students about academic dishonesty as well as any other issue that could arise. As a result of the shared value her department has about this document, “I know within the office, colleagues would support one another, and I know [the dean] would support us because students are made aware of the policies in the [document].”

John experienced a loss of support for pursuing academic dishonesty that occurred after a shift in leadership. He recalled that under his previous department leader, a teaching assistant (TA) worked with the faculty to assist with identifying academic dishonesty. However, under the new department leader, no TA had been made available to help the faculty with rooting out academic dishonesty. He stated the leadership’s comments in support of identifying academic dishonesty have become more “lip service.” He noted lack of support coming in the form of lack of public recognition saying:
There’s no award for us that being diligent in that area of academic dishonesty. And in fact, it seemed to me like it was sort of frowned up actually. Like, why are you turning in so many cases? It didn’t seem to be like something they wanted to see.

John noticed the lack of support based how few of his colleagues reported academic dishonesty cases. He stated, “You need leadership from above to push it so that more faculty participate, or all faculty participate. We didn’t have that. And haven’t for a long time.” John went on to tell a story about a time when a student got an attorney in regard to a case he had submitted to the conduct office, and his superior made a comment to the effect of “it was bound to happen sooner or later.” When the case was finally resolved, John continued to “feel unsupported” as his superior did not offer any words of support to him during this stressful time of having to engage with an attorney. He explained his conclusion as follows:

What would your takeaway be from that? They support it and want it, or that they really just want the appearance of it, but don’t really want to mess with it. And that’s the conclusion I’ve kind of come to.

In the same vein as John, Hannah remarked, “There’s not any visible support at the department or dean level. She said that since Covid-19 and classes went primarily virtual, there were some statements that were told to faculty about academic dishonesty. She said, in this specific case of moving to online teaching during Covid-19 protocols, “I felt like we had more guidance than we have ever received at the department or dean level.” When considering support from the university level, she connected university-level support as coming from the conduct office and concluded that “there’s been a decline in support.”

More than half of the faculty responded that in the absence of explicit support from their academic administrators, their guidance came by way of their personal value systems. For example, during a follow up question inquiring about whether he thought his personal values influenced him in the classroom with regards to academic integrity, Ian responded with “A
hundred percent personal.” Ian shared he was in the military where “integrity was part of our core values, and so it’s personal. It coincides, and I think it marries well with the institution’s desire for academic integrity.” He concluded by saying, “That’s just who I am. So, I would say it’s more personal than the academic institution.”

Likewise, Karl’s background was as an attorney, which influenced how he viewed academic dishonesty in the classroom and in general. He noted, “I think it’s important for everybody to have a certain level of integrity.” Engaging in academic dishonesty or not in the classroom is “another example of that level of integrity that you have or don’t have.” He said that his education as an attorney impacted how he interacted with students around this subject as he considered the implications of following due process, having adequate levels of evidence, and anticipating “what’s this going to look like in a courtroom.”

Anabelle noted her value system came from “just being a professor for longer and longer…and learning that what we do is produce ideas.” She explained that ideas are “what we’re given credit for. That’s what we build our careers on.” George had similar ideas about where his decisions to respond originated. He shared, “it stems partly from my other role as a researcher…there’s a whole vast array of unpaid labor that goes into the creation of knowledge, and I want credit for it.” George explained attributions for ideas as a “matter of common courtesy” and “in an academic context, you say thank you to a scholar who’s gone before you and has created knowledge that you have benefitted from by citing it.”

Edward talked extensively about his philosophy of teaching and partnering with his students to meet the objectives of his courses. He shared about telling his students, “If you fail this class, this is not your failure only. It’s my failure, that I couldn’t teach you enough that you could pass this class.” But the more significant failure comes for the students in the job market
because, as Edward said, “You go out and you’re not able to answer simple questions about this class at a job interview?” He stated that his decision to invest so much in his students with his time and energy was due to his passion surrounding being a faculty member and his empathy for his students.

Hannah noted a lack of guidance from her dean and department about addressing academic dishonesty. Nonetheless, Hannah said, “I feel like I have a responsibility to report it when it occurs.” She said her personal values guided her as “there’s not really a lot of push at the university level to be reporting at the level I report.” John communicated his decisions about reporting academic dishonesty results from a combination of his personal values and his belief that “any teacher or school would want to pursue academic dishonesty.” He summed up his thoughts, “I feel this way personally, and I feel it should be the role of the teacher or school to address it.”

Addressing and Responding to Academic Dishonesty

Faculty participants were asked how they address academic dishonesty in the classroom, why they used that approach, and what influenced their response. The elements of attachment, commitment, involvement, and belief in Hirschi’s (2002) social control/social bond theory were applied to understand the rationales used by faculty in their response to dishonesty in the classroom when asking this question. Four participants stated they had never referred any cases to the conduct office with the explanations that they were always able to address the incidents themselves or they believed what they saw in the classroom did not rise to a level of egregiousness that merited using the referral process. An example was presented by Frank who said, “It’s not even clear to me, maybe, when I would go to the university. I haven’t seen it yet, let me put it that way.” Frank also noted he responded by letting his students know he was
paying attention but in a different way than reporting them through the formal process. He said he sometimes “let it slide.” He described another time when he wrote a “snarky comment on the [assignment], like, ‘oh, well, gosh, this looks like…I can also use the internet.” Frank also shared he sometimes made “students retake an exam in front of me in my office.” He described students who received this option as “perfectly happy to do that.” Primarily though, Frank’s philosophy on responding could be described as “I’d rather not lift up the tent flap and see what’s underneath.”

Hannah also used the option of writing notes on student exams when she did not see the offense as egregious enough for referral or she lacked significant evidence to send the case to the conduct office. She utilized her TAs to help her in sharing her concerns with her students when she “noticed something was not quite right.” She said, “Generally, the TAs will put in some note that indicates to the student that was a red flag.” She offered this rationale for her methods:

As for me, we never outright discuss potential academic dishonesty if it’s not being referred [to the conduct office] because there are implications in that students could perceive future interactions as being more harsh toward them because you accused them of academic dishonesty, even though there was no penalty at the time.

Similarly, Bonnie tried “to take care of things in my own house without running to the principal.” Bonnie chose to “definitely spend some time with the student or students and drill down what happened and ask why did it happen?” After her conversation with the student or students, Bonnie usually offered “an opportunity to redo whatever it was for a lesser grade.”

On the contrary, John said, “in every case, if I think it’s copied, I [send] it over. No hesitancy at all.” He relayed he takes this stance because “every teacher should be diligently looking for cases of academic dishonesty and handling them.” Similarly, Catherine regularly reported dishonesty cases to the conduct office by simply filling out the form and providing “my evidence, and then I step back and let them be the people that run it from there.” Further proving
her point, Catherine shared her decision to refer a case to the conduct office that she knew the student would not be found responsible was purely to show the student, “I’m paying attention.”

Similar to other faculty interviewed, George did not always find it necessary to follow the formal process and provided an example. He approached two students during an exam who appeared to looking at each other’s papers and told them, “Keep your eyes on your own papers. I’ve seen you do it twice now.” He described the students as “shocked they had been seen.” While he did not end up referring the cases to the conduct office, he said the students behaved themselves the remainder of the course and failed that particular exam “miserably, with different scores in the 30s.”

Donna described utilizing similar tactics. She opted to make comments to her students while they were taking a test. She said she would “go over there and walk close by, and I might physically move people, and just say something…or move somebody to the front row…or just sit there and just kind of look and keep my eyes out.”

Ian chose to take a similar approach to George in that he would approach students during a test and tell them “keep your eyes on your own paper.” He stated by doing that he was “giving them the benefit of the doubt” as he did not think they had “gone through the entire cheating process.” Ian chose this strategy because “they are still forming appropriate morals and behaviors…but it’s my responsibility to maintain that for equality and academic integrity.”

Notably, all faculty responded they engaged in some proactive measures for promoting academic integrity. Bonnie “makes it very clear in my syllabus what my expectations are…and talk about it openly with the students.” Likewise, John expressed his expectations by talking “about this in class, usually at the beginning of the semester. I try to make it clear what’s expected.” Ian described how he talked to his students:
I present it very early on in my lecture. I tell them that if they don’t want to be on time…they’re welcome to disenroll after the first class, because they’re going to need to follow my rules and that includes academic integrity. I think I’m proactive.

When Hannah talked to her students early in the semester, she explicitly defined what academic dishonesty is for them and “straight up” told “the students how many I submitted last year and what the percentage of convictions were.”

Anabelle used a different tactic by only assigning papers on topics with which she was very familiar to “make sure that I know it really well whatever they’re writing about. I also know it.” She also changed how she managed assignments, such as “increasingly doing like writing exercises in class.” She also created “assignments that are not plagiarizable as well as communicating directly to the students by writing to them” using language like “I’m concerned about this work. Can you please verify your sources and make sure that all of this is original?” Anabelle emphasized she never would make a “direct accusation” if she did not already have solid evidence. She shared what happened when she had them come to her office to discuss the assignment: “I bring them into my office, and usually they cave right there.”

Karl saw his work as primarily proactive. He said, “it’s in the syllabus. I talk about it during class on this first day.” He added, “I will refer to [the conduct office] any suspected dishonesty. And then on the exam, there’s a note like, ‘here are the penalties.’”

All 11 faculty made some mention of academic integrity on their course syllabi. Seven of the faculty reported including in their syllabi the SUSU honor code and a general link to multiple university policies, which includes a link to the code of conduct as well as other links related to FERPA, email use, student grievances, incompletes, and numerous other policies, as the only mention of academic dishonesty. One faculty member included a section specifically on academic integrity in addition to presenting the honor code. However, in his syllabus for his
honors section, he did not include the specific section on academic integrity. One faculty member included a section entitled academic dishonesty on all of his syllabi. One faculty member did not include anything about academic dishonesty or integrity on any syllabus. One faculty member included the [SUSU] creed and a highlighted section on academic dishonesty in addition to providing the standard link to the SUSU code of student conduct.

How faculty reported cases was influenced by their departments. Bonnie’s department catered to future educators. She described role modeling for her students “that in our area, ‘taking care of things in your own house’ versus ‘running to the principal’ is an important consideration for future teachers.” Frank, a math professor believed the department mattered for different reasons because mathematics “requires them solve problems and stuff” which he notes is different than “if they have to submit a final paper and the entire thing is plagiarized.”

In a similar vein, Donna commented that in her courses, she used “mostly application based or project-based assignments and as a result did not observe as much dishonesty in her classroom. Donna thought other faculty teaching different types of classes might see more incidences of academic dishonesty where “there were high stakes exams, or if they, the students were doing dissertations, or more thesis stuff.”

Hannah stated her department is an influence in her reporting but for a different reason. Hannah said, “A lot of the students we’re training are pre-medical or pre-dental and we don’t want cheaters going on to med school.” Likewise, Ian stated that major matters when it comes to academic dishonesty and valued the importance of instilling it in his students because “they’re either going to be dentists or they’re going to be physicians…And so, I challenge them that they’re going into a profession that really requires integrity and honesty, and so your reputation means everything.” Anabelle remarked that her department regarded “misappropriation or lack
of citation, very seriously because it’s everything we do, academic writing.”

Faculty responses to academic dishonesty were dictated by their relationships with their students. Seven out of the 11 faculty noted that their faculty-student interactions or relationships with their students had an impact on how they chose to respond to dishonesty and their beliefs about the levels of dishonesty in their classrooms. For example, Frank shared, “A lot of this has to just do with your relationship with the students and your own personality, how you choose to deal with it.” To him, the university created the conduct office to standardize the process “for the people who really can’t deal with it, I would assume. And you want to give them some way to do it, but I haven’t found that necessary.”

Similar to Frank, Edward believed “the level of comfort a faculty member has with their students and the training a faculty member possesses impact their response.” Edward recommended to “the faculty that we hire in the department that if you’re not trained to have those conversations, you don’t have to train yourself for academic dishonesty. Go and let somebody who’s trained to do that take care of it.” Edward indicated the faculty-student relationship is of the upmost importance because “the relationship of a student and a teacher is a lifelong relationship” that has an impact on academic dishonesty in the classroom. He concluded, “Academic dishonesty just doesn’t happen overnight. Academic dishonesty is the discomfort that somebody feels in the environment provided to them.”

Bonnie shared that the size of her department has positively impacted her ability to build relationships with her students because “our classes are small and so we know all our students really well.” The small class size meant “we have a little bit more intimacy with our students. I think they would be mortified if they got caught doing something.” She explained that as her department was training future teachers so “you’ve got to build those relationships. That’s part
of that modeling of being a K-12 teacher someday.”

Hannah disclosed that the discovery of academic dishonesty can result in a variety of opinions about students who engage in the dishonesty because of the type of investment in the student:

Most of the time, it’s just like students are going to cheat, but in some cases, … I felt hurt because it was a student who had been coming to me about various things all semester …. and I was just like, all that time, all that time I spent helping you, all the concessions I made to help get you to this point where you could have passed the class, and then you turn in a 96% plagiarized report.

Catherine noted “it comes down to respect in the classroom and wanting to remain objective” so she included “a statement in my syllabus that says that respect is a two-way street.” She added that she made “a point of saying that I have to respect them and that nobody in my classroom will be treated differently based on, and I have a whole myriad of reasons, like being a parent, mathematical baggage.” Catherine shared it was important to her always be respectful and follow the policies. Based on her own personal experiences in graduate school, she concluded that she never wanted “to be in that situation where I both have to be judge and jury” because first, she understood the student would “give me a review at the end of the semester,” and second, the student would have “to sit in my class and continue to take it, knowing I was your judge and jury.” Likewise, Hannah also noted wanting to follow the rules surrounding academic dishonesty, “which are the faculty do not serve as judge and jury.”

Anabelle also used legal jargon to sum up her feelings about her interactions. She said she offered students “a chance to be heard, not be treated criminally, but be treated like a person.” Karl reported respect is an important factor in his classroom as well: “The way I try to do it in my classes is I try to build as much trust and respect I can with my students.” Karl used “more of the carrot than the stick approach” and reported telling students, “I’ll give you
everything that I possibly can, so you have no reason to need to commit an act of academic dishonesty.” Sometimes the impact on the relationship occurs once it is over. Karl described a situation where he had referred a student and saw them walking down the hallway a few days after it happened. “I know they saw me and then they just put their head down and ghosted me, which I get it.” He continued on saying, “it makes you think twice” and reflect on questions such as, “Do I want to put somebody in that position? Do I want to be in that position?”

Another issue that affected how the faculty responded to academic dishonesty was the value of the degree students were attempting to earn. Hannah specifically remarked, “doing this is important because the students who play by the rules can be at a disadvantage if there’s rampant cheating amongst others, and there is no penalty for that.” She shared she wanted the grades she assigned to mean something and be appropriate for the courses she taught. John echoed Hannah’s thoughts by noting that academic dishonesty hurt the honest students. John said, “If dishonest students are graduating and getting jobs, they are not competent to succeed in because of engaging in dishonest work rather than learning, employers will stop hiring our graduates.” He wanted to ensure “the ones that really deserve to be hired are the ones” do not end up “paying the price for” the students who engage in academic dishonesty.

Edward indicated “it is not just about helping honest students in individual classes but protecting their degree” because faculty members who do not take action diminish “the value of the education we are giving.” Edward added, “We want students to come to [SUSU] and feel that this is an institution where they have to really work through it to get their degree and diploma.” For Catherine, the degree’s value derives from the combination of the degree and the skill sets graduates should have. She concluded, “We’re signing off on degrees that students have completed certain things and demonstrated certain skills. And to me, in order to keep those
diplomas worth something, it’s my responsibility. I need to be involved in keeping integrity there.”

Artifacts

I collected artifacts for this exploratory case study research according to Yin’s (2018) recommendations. I acquired the data for the number of for academic dishonesty referrals received by the conduct office for 2019-2020. Also, I reviewed meeting minutes from the SUSU academic senate and academic council for the 2020 calendar year. Finally, I reviewed the findings for the October of 2020 SUSU faculty survey addressing retention and morale. The three types of artifact data are provided in turn in this section.

Referrals for Academic Dishonesty

The conduct office reported 652 referrals for academic dishonesty during the 2019-2020 academic year. SUSU employed 1,342 teaching faculty; however, current record keeping procedures did not allow for determining how many unique faculty referred cases to the conduct office. Anecdotally, faculty and conduct office personnel offered that a few faculty make the majority of the referrals. Two of the faculty who participated in interviews supported this notion of a few faculty doing the majority of the referring. John disclosed “not all of us are [reporting] equally. So if one of us is doing it and another of us is not doing it, that’s a big problem.” Karl also shared hearing “from faculty that they do not feel supported, so they don’t bother” with reporting cases to the conduct office.

Table 1 represents the academic dishonesty charges referred by faculty members to the conduct office during 2019-2020. Some referrals made may have included multiple charges and referrals include both graduate and undergraduate dishonesty referrals. The referrals are broken down by college within SUSU, and the table shows the enrollment for each college for the 2019-
2020 year. The conduct office received the most referrals from Computer Science, Engineering, and Information Systems (CSEIS), which is the largest college at the university, followed by the second largest college at the university, which was Business. Therefore, these total reports of academic dishonest referrals were not necessarily surprising. However, the Business college referrals were just 43% the amount of the CSEIS referrals. CSEIS accounted for 49% of all academic dishonesty referrals while Business represented 21% of all referrals. All other colleges in SUSU combined account for 30% of all academic dishonesty charges referred to the conduct office.

Table 1

*Misconduct Charge Count by Referring College for 2019-2020*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Misconduct ((n))</th>
<th>Total Student ((n))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art, Film, History, and Humanities (AFHH)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>8,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science, Engineering, and Information Systems (CSEIS)</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>8,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary Studies</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics and Sciences</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>3,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>4,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,107</strong></td>
<td><strong>28,932</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The raw totals of referrals for academic dishonesty indicates that faculty do not refer cases at the same rates based on enrollment and the college in which they teach, which supports the data provided by the faculty in their interviews. While total numbers suggest CSEIS has the biggest issue with academic dishonesty, data from the interviews suggest many faculty do not refer cases to the conduct office for many reasons including lack of confidence, timeliness, efficiency, and change in leadership. Consistent with Anabelle and George’s comments, the number of referrals proportionate to the enrollment in AFHH is very small, suggesting other
SUSU Academic Senate Meetings

During my research, I reviewed meeting minutes from the SUSU academic senate and academic council for the 2020 calendar year. These meetings each occurred monthly and were representative of the faculty at SUSU. Minutes were specifically reviewed for references to academic dishonesty, academic misconduct, academic integrity, and cheating. For the 12 total meetings, I found eight mentions of the academic dishonesty keywords.

The topic first appeared in May of 2020 in response to concerns of remote exams. SUSU, like many universities, altered their course operations to offer virtual coursework in reacting to the Covid-19 pandemic. The faculty discussed creating a new or revised syllabus statement to address concerns about the integrity of exams. In August of 2020, the faculty noted that software was available to faculty to assist in remote, online proctoring. In September of 2020, the Dean of Students and conduct offices used meeting time to make a presentation on revisions to the Academic Misconduct Policy. They shared the policy was revised so that the conduct process is educational and not punitive for maintaining the integrity of SUSU. The Dean of Students said that one of the most critical roles of the conduct office involved ensuring that SUSU students receive their right to due process that is grounded in the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution to ensure no student is “denied or deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of Law.” The code presented said SUSU students have rights under “due process,” and the most significant ones included the “right to notice” and a “fair hearing prior to any kind of administration of discipline.” The Dean of Students presenters clarified the definitions of sanctions, the academic dishonesty process, including the role of faculty. Faculty were told their role was to make a referral using the online referral form, provide any evidence...
collected, participate in hearings as witnesses if necessary, and implement the sanctions recommended by the conduct office. The minutes showed that faculty provided feedback to the Dean of Students and conduct offices presenters about their frustration at the lack of communication from the conduct office, namely not being informed of the outcomes of cases referred to them about their students. Another faculty member was on the record in the minutes stating that any breach of academic misconduct must be addressed.

SUSU 2020 Faculty Survey

In October of 2020, results from a faculty survey were shared at the faculty academic senate meeting. The committee studying faculty retention and morale reported 500 faculty responded to their survey and they provided a brief report highlighting concerns of faculty. Of interest in the minutes, surveyed faculty noted having issues with academic dishonesty as one of their top six concerns. Specifically, faculty reported a perception of changes to the academic dishonesty reporting process requiring them to gather additional evidence of dishonesty in order to have their referrals accepted by the conduct office. Faculty shared some of them had been told by the conduct office they had to do their own investigations because the conduct office could not, and as a result, students were found not responsible due to lack of evidence provided.

Additionally, the survey findings indicated faculty were very concerned about cheating on exams due to the sudden shift to remote teaching. Most faculty did not want to change their usual ways of assessing learning and were worried grades would become meaningless if exams could not be proctored. This concern was not entirely based on a conviction that students are dishonest or that given a chance to use unauthorized resources, most or all students would do so. However, the faculty expressed a need to verify to external stakeholders that SUSU students learned what SUSU faculty claimed they learned via course grades. Specifically, some open-
ended responses to the survey said, “faculty report enhanced concern with cheating on remotely administered exams and assignments, and the challenges of promoting a culture of academic integrity. There are also complaints about [the conduct office] now putting additional investigation burdens on instructors.” Finally, the academic senate tasked the faculty retention and morale subcommittee to work with the academic integrity committee to formulate a plan prior to the spring 2021 semester to address faculty concerns about dishonesty.

The collection of artifact data ended with the 2020 calendar year. Spring 2021 artifacts were not collected. There was not an opportunity to follow up with academic senate to determine what, if any, action was taken with regard to the recommendation for a plan for the faculty retention and morale committee to connect with the academic integrity committee. Overall, the artifact data supported the findings that emerged from the interview data. The referral data from the conduct office supports the finding that not all academic disciplines are reporting at the same level. Data from the academic senate meetings supported the finding that faculty did not receive consistent messaging about academic integrity. The first mention of academic integrity issues did not occur in the minutes until the fifth month of 2020 and was specifically connected to concerns about remote learning. While classes were delivered by in-person traditional modes of instruction, there was no mention or discussion of integrity. The mention occurred after the COVID-19 pandemic caused the university to move all instruction to online platforms. Additionally, the presentation by the Dean of Students office about the faculty role in academic dishonesty cases confirmed the need for ongoing education and development as there were questions and comments generated from the presentation. Finally, the faculty survey also provided support to the thematic findings. Specifically, the survey provided corroboration for the participating faculty’s reports of assessing the several deterrents to the reporting process.
as well as general concern about the prevalence of academic dishonesty before referring cases to the conduct office.

Summary of the Chapter and Findings

The exploratory case study was focused on addressing two main research questions designed to generate information regarding faculty response to academic dishonesty in the classroom and influences to their responses. Additionally, the data were collected and analyzed from the lens of both Hirschi’s social bond theory (1969) as well as the four organizational frames by Bolman and Deal (2017). This chapter presented the data collected in the 11 faculty interviews as well as the artifacts retrieved from SUSU. Four major themes emerged from the data as seen in the following:

1. Faculty investment in academic integrity,
2. Faculty-student relationship impact on interaction,
3. Personal values guiding faculty response, and
4. Deterrents preventing faculty action.

The four themes revealed how faculty respond to instances of academic dishonesty among their students and what influences their responses. The themes are discussed in Chapter 5.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to explore how faculty members viewed their roles in addressing academic dishonesty. A second purpose was to determine the potential barriers, situational or contextual, faculty experience when considering reporting and addressing academic dishonesty. Thirdly, this study aimed to identify the support faculty need to create a culture of integrity in their classroom. The qualitative case study was focused on addressing two main research questions.

1. How do faculty respond to instances of academic dishonesty among students?
2. What influences their response?

Chapter 4 contained the detailed presentation of the findings. Chapter 5 contains the summary of the findings with evidence that the research questions were answered, discussions of the themes in relation to the literature reviewed, implications for practice, and the recommendations for future research. The discussion is founded on the literature from Chapter 2 as well as other relevant studies. Four major themes were identified during the analysis of the data. The themes were: (a) faculty investment in academic integrity, (b) faculty-student relationship impact on interaction, (c) personal values guiding faculty response, (d) deterrents preventing faculty action. Each of those themes are discussed in the following paragraphs.

Discussion of the Themes

In the following paragraphs, the themes from my study are compared and contrasted with current literature to confirm understanding of the findings. Each of the four themes is discussed independently. The literary discussions follow beginning with Theme 1.
Theme 1: Faculty are Invested in Academic Integrity

Theme 1 reflected that faculty show their students their investment in academic integrity through action. These investment actions can be subtle or explicit and include simply paying attention in the classroom in regard to identifying and addressing academic dishonesty. Theme 1 also reflects that faculty do deem themselves as having a role in addressing academic dishonesty.

The literature supports the finding that faculty have a role in investing in and maintaining integrity and that students want faculty to demonstrate the value of academic integrity. Dyer, Pettyjohn, and Saladin (2020) determined students’ attitudes and behaviors toward academic dishonesty change between taking a test in an unproctored testing environment and a proctored testing environment. Dyer et al.’s student participants found cheating in a proctored environment was unacceptable but allowable in an unproctored environment. Similarly, Robinson and Glanzer (2017) noted faculty silence on the subject of academic integrity signals to students cheating is acceptable. Beasley’s (2014) survey data from students showed that faculty action toward academic integrity prevents students from cheating in the classroom. Students citing lack of faculty action as implicit permission to be dishonest supports the need for faculty to invest in educating students about academic dishonesty and showing students they are paying attention to students’ academic behaviors and performance.

Faculty interviewed showed their investment by discussing dishonesty in the classroom and doing other proactive activities in the classroom to diminish dishonesty opportunities. The faculty’s data are supported by Dyer et al. (2020) also found students believe the responsibility of mitigating academic dishonesty is the faculty responsibility. More specifically, if academic dishonesty is not being actively prevented and discussed, the university climate effectively encourages dishonest behavior. It was determined that all SUSU faculty believed they had a
responsibility to address dishonesty in some fashion.

In similar findings, Burrus et al. (2015) students will model faculty behavior. If faculty model they value honesty by responding to dishonesty, students are less likely to engage in dishonest behavior. Students value faculty paying attention and expressing their value for academic integrity. Luke (2019) established that faculty should report academic dishonesty and clearly articulate they expect a certain level of integrity from their students. Likewise, Ballentine, Burke, Devanport, Davis, Henderson, Irons, & Sink (2019) noted student decisions to commit academic fraud or dishonesty is primarily influenced by the chance of being caught, opportunities to engage in cheating behaviors, the likelihood of sanctions if caught, and instructor acceptance or lack thereof regarding dishonesty. Faculty were identified as the critical influencer of all of the students’ reasons for academic dishonesty.

Faculty may believe they have a role in maintaining integrity but do not want to find themselves having to police student behavior (Burrus et al., 2015; Diekhoff et al., 1996; Keith-Spiegel et al., 1998; Schneider, 1999; Whitley & Keith-Spiegel, 2001). Bertram Gallant (2017) suggested “instructors reframe their perception that responding to cheating is policing their students rather educating them” (p. 91). Having a policing mindset rather than an educational mindset also impacts the student-faculty relationship (Keith-Spiegel et al., 1998). Faculty at SUSU did not want to have to refer students for formal adjudication, but they spoke plainly about communicating that academic dishonesty was not acceptable and what it was to students.

The theme of faculty investment is contrasted in the literature with studies noting faculty demonstrate actions inconsistent with pursuing dishonesty. Past research studies have reported faculty do not regard policing academic dishonesty as part of their faculty-related duties. In multiple studies, faculty were found to be unlikely to act when confronted with dishonesty
(Burrus et al., 2015; Diekhoff et al., 1996; Keith-Spiegel et al., 1998; Schneider, 1999; Whitley & Keith-Spiegel, 2001). Interestingly, Robinson and Glanzer (2017) found students perceive university administrators as the academic honesty police and faculty as promoters of academic integrity. Even when faculty do not perceive themselves as responsible for maintaining integrity, students see faculty as having that role of stopping academic dishonesty. While choosing to not respond to academic dishonesty does not mean faculty are not invested in integrity, students may perceive it that way, suggesting the SUSU faculty’s efforts to informally address students’ dishonesty were important to ensuring academic integrity.

Faculty socialization with their colleagues impacted how they responded. While all the faculty reported having an investment in their students, they used several determining factors when deciding how to respond to academic dishonesty. An important factor was how their peers in their departments responded. Faculty tended to respond similarly to their colleagues in their respective academic departments. This finding is in alignment with Hirschi’s (2002) social control/social bond theory. Faculty attachment refers to their emotional closeness to their colleagues (Hirschi, 2002). The more attached the faculty are to their colleagues, the more likely the collection of faculty are to have shared belief systems. If multiple faculty in the same department value academic integrity, then all the department’s faculty are likely to invest more time and energy in spending class time discussing dishonesty, including information in the syllabi, as well as ensuring students are aware they are paying attention to what their students do.

Theme 2: Faculty-Student Relationship Impact on Interaction

Most faculty participants commented on how their relationships with their students impact the level of cheating in their classrooms and inform how they choose to respond. Faculty desire not to be seen as judge and jury in an academic dishonesty situation and want to maintain
an objective relationship. The SUSU faculty support Bertram Gallant’s (2017) recommendation that faculty do not consider their roles as police in the classroom but rather as educators promoting academic integrity. When students view their faculty as policing their behavior, resentment and stress build within students (Keith-Spiegel et al., 1998). Correspondingly, Sutherland-Smith (2008) and Eifert (2014) reported that faculty hesitancy to respond to cases of dishonesty involve wanting to maintain their focus on their teaching and learning relationships with students. This emphasis on relationships is supported by Austin (2007) who investigated faculty experiences with graduate student academic dishonesty. While Austin’s research was focused more on how faculty experienced or felt when dishonesty occurred rather than how they would respond, she determined faculty felt victimized by students who cheated. Because faculty can become remarkably close with graduate students, almost like a mentoring relationship, academic dishonesty causes trust to be stolen from faculty who previously held the offending graduate student in high regard.

Additionally, the SUSU faculty participants indicated that smaller class sizes reduce academic dishonesty cases. As noted by participants Bonnie and Ian, smaller class sizes allow for more intimate relationships with students. That finding is consistent with Garner and Hubbell (2013) who noted “smaller class sizes allow students to interact more closely with professors” (p. 81). The impact of class size can be viewed through the lens of social control or social bond (Hirschi, 2002). In larger classes, faculty are more challenged to build relationships with individual students because of having fewer opportunities for student-faculty interactions in the courses. When classes are smaller, faculty have more opportunities for forming relationships and bonds with students and showing their investment in maintaining academic integrity. Thus, attachments between students and faculty serve as a deterrent to dishonest behavior.
A significant amount of the literature has been focused on how students perceive their relationships with faculty and the impact these relationships have on the likelihood of the student engaging in dishonest behavior as opposed to how the relationships influence faculty’s responses to academic dishonesty. Stearns (2001) reported a more positive relationship between the student and instructor makes cheating less likely. Likewise, MacGregor and Stubbs (2011) found building relationships with students can limit dishonest behavior by students. Students can justify cheating in class when they believe the instructor does not care about them (MacGregor & Stuebs, 2012; Pulvers & Diekhoff, 1999). Quaye (2010) concluded the faculty-student relationship is a key component to the student’s decision to engage in dishonest behavior. The relationship represents the presence of trust between the faculty member and the student. When a student trusts and respects a teacher, they are less likely to be dishonest in the class.

On the other hand, if students do not have a relationship with the faculty member or have a negative relationship, then the student is more likely to engage in dishonest behavior. Faculty involvement in the academic integrity process has a significant impact on student behavior (McCabe, 2005). Faculty-student relationships are important in establishing a campus of integrity. “Faculty members who explicitly discuss these issues and create an environment supportive of academic integrity in their classrooms and beyond earn increased respect from the majority of their students” (McCabe et al., 2012, p. 145). Likewise, faculty who spend time building relationships with their students can positively impact dishonest behaviors in their classrooms (Beasley, 2014; Burke & Sanney, 2018; Hulsart & McCarthy, 2008). Several SUSU faculty participants noted they cared about their relationships with students and did not want to harm them, suggesting they value having relationships with students so that students are likely to choose honesty over cheating.
Theme 3: Personal Values Guiding Faculty Response

Current literature contains minimal evidence for faculty’s personal values impacting their academic dishonesty responses. Eifert (2014) suggested a faculty member’s personal value system could impact whether they would or would not report an incident of academic dishonesty. Austin (2017) found faculty define their identities and determine their academic values in graduate school. This finding was confirmed by SUSU faculty participant Catherine, who shared a story about an incident in her graduate studies that determined how she responds to dishonesty as a faculty member.

The SUSU faculty reported not receiving clear directives or support from their deans and academic departments about how to address academic dishonesty in the classroom. Given the lack of specificity, these faculty participants opted to follow their own moral compasses and act in ways consistent with their personal value systems. While all faculty participants agreed SUSU, as a general rule, supported academic integrity, they could not identify many explicit ways this value was communicated to faculty. As a result, the participating faculty shared mixed beliefs about SUSU institutional-level support. The finding supports previous findings in which lack of support from the institution leads to faculty not reporting incidences of cheating (Burrus et al., 2015; Hardy, 1982; Simon et al., 2003; Whitley & Keith-Spiegel, 2001).

These findings are consistent with social control/social bond theory by Hirshi (2002). For faculty to believe they are supported in their decisions, they must possess all four pieces of the social bond. Institutional support can take on many facets such as providing testing monitors or proctors as well as clear messages to all stakeholders about academic integrity (Burrus et al., 2015; Diekhoff et al., 1996; Keith-Spiegel et al., 1998; Schneider, 1999; Whitley & Keith-Spiegel, 2001). However, lack of visible support from the institution challenges the belief that
academic integrity is a social norm on campus. While Staats et al. (2009) and Coren (2011) both found faculty often attribute not reporting academic dishonesty to lack of institutional support, these authors noted that what students see is faculty not reporting academic dishonesty rather than faculty perceiving a lack of institutional support for reporting cheating. Alschuler and Blimling (1995) stated that upper-level administrators do not always want to bring the issue of cheating out in the public when all other institutions of higher education have the same issue.

The results regarding lack of institutional support can also be viewed through the four frames of Bolman and Deals’ (2017) framework. Faculty members’ desire to attend to dishonesty in the classroom can conflict with the politics of addressing dishonesty on campus. The structural and human resources frames speak to the efficiency and effectiveness of the reporting and adjudicating process. For example, if the conduct office is viewed as ineffective, then faculty may not buy into having the administrative support to aid the reporting process and maintain integrity. Finally, the lack of symbols promoting academic integrity on SUSU’s campus represented lack of clear messaging and support, which promoted faculty’s rationale for acting according to their personal values. The identified symbols in the data and artifacts were the SUSU code of conduct and creed. However, these symbols on their own are not enough to ensure a culture of academic integrity across the campus (Jendrek, 1989; Whitley & Spiegel, 2001).

Theme 4: Several Deterrents Prevent Faculty Action

Theme 4 developed from a number of deterrents that precluded faculty from choosing to refer suspected academic dishonesty to the conduct office. Theme 4 supports the literature in which many different deterrents to faculty reporting academic dishonesty have also been identified. Similar to the deterrents identified by the SUSU faculty participants, Fontana (2009)
reported loss of relationship with a student as a possible deterrent to reporting. Jendrek (1989) found faculty might not report academic dishonesty for fear of harming a students’ future employment or causing damage to students’ records or transcripts.

Just as with the current participants’ experiences, the amount of evidence has previously been reported as a factor affecting whether faculty report cheating because identifying and collecting sufficient evidence to prove an allegation represents a burden and deterrent to faculty (Alschuler & Blimling, 1995; Coalter et al., 2007; McCabe et al., 2012; Schneider, 1999; Staats et al., 2009; Stearns, 1997). Time is a deterrent because of how much time is needed to collect the evidence and create a presentation to support the case. Prescott et al. (2014) noted referrals can take upwards of multiple hours to prepare for submission. Spending time on referrals takes away from other more meaningful and desirable work related to teaching and learning.

Fear of retaliation from a student serves as a deterrent illustrated in Theme 4. This deterrent identified by the SUSU faculty supports Keith-Spiegel et al. (1998) who established that faculty fear possible litigation with students surrounding dishonesty allegations. The SUSU faculty participants did not mention repudiation or being generally vilified by students as impacting course enrollment, which was noted as a deterrent in Schneider (1999). However, because course and instructor evaluations are typically anonymous, students could retaliate by submitting poor evaluations of faculty members (Schneider, 1999). Even though they are anonymous, faculty course evaluations are closely tied to merit raises and promotion. Pincus and Schmelkin (2003) determined faculty view academic dishonesty on a sliding scale of egregiousness. The SUSU faculty indicated hesitation in reporting students for less egregious acts of dishonesty because the students could be punished too severely if the conduct office lacked flexibility in sanctions (Pincus & Schmelkin, 2003).
Denial that academic dishonesty happens was a deterrent for one study participant. Ian noted the students in his honors classes were exceptional students and would not engage in dishonest activities. Hard et al. (2006) proposed faculty who deny dishonesty occurs in their classroom are less likely to refer, which was observed with the honors faculty in this study. Ian shared he has never made a referral to the conduct office.

One finding unique to the existing literature involves how faculty may not report incidences due the sheer overwhelming nature of the problem. At least three SUSU faculty shared an attitude of “what is the point of reporting as the problem is bigger than all of us.” Bertram Gallant and Drinan (2006a, 2006b) affirmed the problem is complex and that the ongoing, pervasive nature of the problem can make addressing it and affecting change unachievable. The themes identified support implications for practice.

Discussion Conclusion

Four major themes identified were consistent with and addressed both research questions. Theme 1: Faculty Investment in Academic Integrity, Theme 2: Faculty-Student Relationship Impact on Interaction, and Theme 3: Personal Values Guiding Faculty Response spoke directly to my first research question regarding how faculty responded to instances of academic dishonesty among students. The first three themes and Theme 4: deterrents preventing faculty action addressed the second research question about what influences their responses to academic dishonesty. The level of faculty investment, type of relationship with the student, personal values, as well as deterrents all influenced how and when faculty responded to academic dishonesty in their classrooms. Faculty’s ways of responding varied as informal to formal, supporting findings by Robinson-Zanartu et al. (2005). The informal methods included discussing the matter privately, writing a note on the exam or assignment, and finding some way
to make it known to the student they are aware of the infraction. The formal method meant following the university’s conduct office referral process.

The themes suggest the more faculty are invested in the idea of academic integrity in their classroom, the greater the chance they will respond in some way to dishonesty. The types of relationships faculty members have with their students influenced how the faculty responded to students’ academic dishonesty. In this study, faculty with smaller classes had closer, more personal relationships with their students and were more likely to address academic dishonesty with their students one on one in lieu of utilizing the formal process of a referral to the university’s conduct office. Conversely, faculty with larger classes and more students, tended to not have close relationships with their students and were more likely to address dishonesty through the formal process.

The personal values of the individual faculty members greatly influenced how they responded to dishonesty in the classroom. Nearly all the faculty cited a lack of specific instruction or direction from their academic departments about whether they should or should not actively pursue academic dishonesty. Faculty shared they were guided by their own values. Depending on the individual faculty members’ thoughts on the importance of integrity in their classroom, different courses of action were taken. Some faculty who felt very strongly about personal integrity and the integrity of the institution followed formal processes. Other faculty decided it was more in alignment with their values and their own personalities to address dishonesty behaviors informally. Nearly all faculty shared neither the structure of the university, nor structure or guidance from their individual departments influenced how they chose to respond to dishonesty. They reported making individual decisions on the matter based on their own value systems.
Finally, a myriad of potential deterrents influenced how faculty responded to academic dishonesty. For the 11 faculty interviewed, the two most listed deterrents were harm to student and lack of confidence in the conduct office. Of the many deterrents listed, only these two were strong enough to influence faculty not to pursue any formal action at all. Other deterrents caused faculty to pause before making their decisions but ultimately did not deter faculty from responding either formally or informally to acts of dishonesty in their classrooms. Only one faculty who identified as being on the tenure track indicated that this faculty status influenced the choice not to escalate cases by referring them to the conduct office.

Implications for Practice

Several implications emerge from the findings that affect SUSU and higher education. Four implications are related to professional development, systemic adjustments affecting shared ownership and governance of academic integrity, prevention and enforcement of academic dishonesty, and changes to the relationship between faculty and the conduct office. They are discussed in the following subsections.

Professional Development

Faculty need ongoing professional development in area of academic integrity. As the findings suggest, faculty would benefit from additional professional development regarding academic integrity. It would be wise for SUSU to create ongoing professional development programming and support for faculty. Faculty knowledge and understanding of the academic dishonesty process was not consistent among the 11 faculty participants. Likewise, most faculty participants were unaware of or could not be sure how they learned of the academic dishonesty referral process. This lack of knowledge could be attributed to inconsistencies in how faculty are exposed to the process not only when they are first hired but also throughout the academic year.
All but one faculty member noted they learned of the referral process from colleagues, an internet search, or from calling the conduct office directly.

Theme 1 highlighted faculty as invested in doing something to maintain integrity in the classroom. However, it was clear not all faculty possessed similar levels of knowledge about academic dishonesty or the competencies to handle incidents when they occurred. Faculty knowledge of the referral process is critical for faculty seeking to ensure academic dishonesty can be addressed.

An optional professional development module could be created for conveying SUSU’s policies and procedures for academic dishonesty cases as well as the roles of the different stakeholders, including faculty and administrators, the conduct office, and students. This module could be made easily accessible to faculty within their electronic SUSU faculty-learning portal. Online accessibility would improve faculty opportunities for learning on an ongoing basis, instead of only sharing information during new hire orientation or at annual faculty meetings that may include many topics on the agenda. Several faculty participants thought they probably learned in orientation but they admitted they experienced information overload at orientation. Some of the participants had been teaching at SUSU a long time and found updates about the process to be challenging to find.

In addition to the professional development module, ongoing professional development meetings could be offered to address topics such as best practices in limiting students’ opportunities for academic dishonesty, test question writing techniques, and effective use of plagiarism software such as Turnitin or SafeAssign. Professional development could allow faculty to share their own best practices for addressing academic dishonesty. Faculty would have an opportunity to share pedagogical techniques they have used with success and share with
colleagues at a multidisciplinary level. Established, veteran, and tenured faculty could also benefit from keeping current on trends in academic dishonesty as well as from news about any updates to the university’s policies or procedures.

Professional development represents an opportunity for faculty to affirm their commitment to maintaining academic integrity (Burke & Sanney, 2018). As part of the professional development, faculty could identify other avenues to talk about dishonesty with their peers to continue the conversation. The SUSU faculty members noted that no one was talking openly about academic dishonesty in public settings, so clear messages were missing from their academic leaders.

Shared Ownership and Governance of Academic Integrity

To achieve the goal of ensuring faculty efforts to address academic dishonesty are supported, an explicit message from university leadership stating faculty have the university’s support in addressing academic dishonesty is needed. Academic integrity should be a shared ownership with a pervasive campus culture supporting it. The faculty and university leadership need to ensure that “the university itself profess[es] and promot[es] academic integrity as a major value of the university” and to observe the ways in which it is “demonstrated and evidenced in provision of services to staff and students” (Sutherland-Smith, 2008, p. 195). The creation of the shared ownership for academic integrity would be most effective with a directive coming from the top down. If the provost were to gather the faculty and affirm their support for and commitment to academic integrity, the faculty could clearly understand they have support for addressing cases of academic dishonesty.

Additionally, through explicit ongoing communication about academic dishonesty as a feature of shared ownership, faculty would have the opportunity to see the results and the levels
of administrator support when other faculty take action. Shared governance would reduce the burden undertaken by current SUSU faculty who make individual determinations about academic dishonesty primarily based on their own value systems. Currently, there is an absence of specific directives and guidance from the provost, deans, and department heads, so faculty follow personal value systems when confronted with a potential case of academic dishonesty. The faculty believe their values align in general with the university but receive no specific messaging or guidance.

Taking into account the faculty’s desire for directives and engagement regarding institutional academic integrity, leadership should engage in conversations to determine how the value of academic integrity shall be expressly communicated to the campus community, and more specifically, to the university’s faculty. Bertram Gallant (2017) suggested shifting the focus for faculty from reducing cheating to ensuring learning is taking place. By shifting focus and providing shared governance with academic leadership support, the deterrent of the problem as too overwhelming could be ameliorated by allowing faculty to have supportive teams to consult when cases emerge. Nannerl Keohane as President of Duke University provided an example of how higher education leaders can symbolically demonstrate their value for integrity, provide explicit messaging, and create a shared ownership among the campus community by housing an academic integrity center. Additionally, Keohane prefaced, on behalf of the International Center for Academic Integrity, that “all of us – faculty, administrators, students, trustees, and concerned alumni – have a responsibility to get involved. Raising the level of student academic integrity should be amount our highest priorities on college and university campuses” (Fishman, 2018, p. 6). Currently, the overwhelming nature of the problem speaks to the isolation some faculty undergo when addressing dishonesty as individuals in charge of independent course sections.
rather than as a team member of an academic department or an institution that operates under shared values about academic integrity.

In the same vein, the findings suggest it would help to create a culture of integrity if faculty were rewarded for maintaining integrity in the classroom by their peers and academic leadership. The SUSU faculty responses and the literature supported a lack of incentives and support for faculty to pursue academic dishonesty cases (Bertram Gallant & Drinan, 2006a; Burrus et al., 2015; Liebler, 2012). In an effort to continue to shift the culture of openly valuing integrity, connecting faculty reappointment, promotion, and tenure review processes would act as an incentive to increase faculty interest in attending to academic integrity (Burke & Sanney, 2018).

Prevention and Enforcement

The findings of this study indicate that not all faculty address dishonesty consistently in their classrooms by following the guidelines outlined in the university’s code of conduct. For students to believe that consequences for dishonesty exist and are likely to happen, faculty must address it every time they observe it (Tatum & Schwartz, 2017; Bertram Gallant, 2017; Atkinson, Nau, & Symonds, 2016). This finding implies a need for SUSU to provide guidance to their faculty members to follow the code of conduct. Per the guidelines established in the SUSU code of conduct, a centralized office with consistent personnel that addresses all academic dishonesty infractions, doles out uniform sanctions and findings for cases with similar characteristics, and provides an opportunity for educating and sanctioning repeat offenders differently needs to be identified. In this way, SUSU can show its institutional support for integrity, protect the value of the degrees earned, and show a united front to students regarding the unacceptable nature of dishonest behavior. Many faculty including Hannah, John, Ian, and
Catherine recognized the value in having a separate office to adjudicate cases and appreciated the due process offered to students simply by taking the responsibility away from faculty and placing it with the university. Having and effectively utilizing a centralized office is considered a best practice (Atkinson et al., 2016; Ballentine et al., 2019; Sutherland-Smith, 2007). However, the office must have the power and force for addressing dishonesty in a unified fashion that sends a message to students that no matter what class they take, or in what discipline, their faculty are invested in integrity and will act every time. While strengthening the use of a central office that handles academic dishonesty will not eliminate dishonesty, its consistency with cases would ensure students understand the university’s expectations for academic integrity.

Partnership between Conduct Office and Faculty Departments

The findings suggest that the university conduct office needs to receive the feedback provided by the SUSU faculty during their interviews. The feedback appeared in Theme 4 that revealed 55% of faculty were dissatisfied with the office’s adjudication of cases, and these faculty noted the office had been through staffing changes and a shift in philosophy that caused faculty to believe the conduct office sided with students about whom the evidence showed there had been dishonesty. By providing the feedback, the conduct office can determine how they would like to best utilize the information moving forward. Because of budgetary concerns impacting staffing levels, academic departments sending over the largest referrals could consider providing monetary compensation to support the office as the office is providing a service to faculty. Thus, a partnership between the university’s colleges and the conduct office is warranted.

This study suggests a partnership between the student conduct office and faculty from each of academic departments on campus would aid in communication between student affairs
and faculty and decrease the potential for deterrents to affect the reporting of academic dishonesty. The conduct office is currently staffed by higher education professionals working within the division of student affairs. Anabelle specifically noted that all her cases had been handled by a title she referred to as the “director of the student union building,” so she lacked confidence that the student affairs personnel had a viable understanding of plagiarism in the classroom. A partnership would allow for conduct office professionals to consult with faculty representatives who would offer insight about the nuanced types of dishonesty cases being referred from their colleges or departments. For example, a case referred by a computer science professor regarding student work with computer coding that may have been copied could be very different than a case referred by an English professor regarding an essay that was plagiarized. Additionally, the evidence for both of those cases could look very different from dishonesty related to lab reports in science or work on a problem in a mathematics exam.

Faculty spoke about their frustration that the conduct officers assigned to their cases did not really understand the nature of academic dishonesty or how something they referred could occur. A partnership would allow for having an objective faculty member in each discipline to serve in a consultative role between academic and student affairs for producing, ideally, more consistent academic dishonesty findings. Ideally, these departmental liaisons could also serve to provide professional development to keep faculty apprised of new situations and types of academic dishonesty being observed across campus and disciplines. Below, I detail several future research opportunities.

Recommendations for Future Research

The purpose of my research was to gain a better understanding of how faculty respond to academic dishonesty and what influences their response. Based on my findings, I generated
results to aid in answering those questions. The present study should be expanded as this study only interviewed faculty from multiple colleges at the same university.

The first recommendation for future research is to conduct similar interviews with a larger sample of faculty within targeted, specific academic departments. An increased sample size within departments would allow for developing a greater depth of understanding about how and why faculty responses vary from department to department and could help to explain differences in the percentages of referrals observed between colleges within a university. There are observable differences between referral numbers based on school size, suggesting not all faculty report cases in similar ways. The second recommendation involves in-depth data collection about the specific types of support, education, ongoing development, and so on that faculty want or need to respond consistently to dishonesty every time it occurs. This type of research could help with shaping policies, improving faculty governance, and addressing how to educate students about what is dishonest work.

Third, based on the findings of faculty not lacking a belief in being explicitly supported by the institution, I recommend a study exploring how previous experiences with dishonesty reporting deter or impact future decisions and actions related to academic dishonesty. Coren (2011) conducted a similar study but was focused on bad experiences specifically with student interactions during the process. Indeed, Hannah noted that her experiences with the conduct office impacted her threshold for reporting. However, John’s negative experiences with academic leaders did not prevent him from continuing to pursue reporting dishonesty cases. Given these two examples and the small number of faculty interviewed, it is unknown how past negative experiences may influence future behavior. Generating such knowledge about faculty could improve efforts to increase the promotion of academic integrity by faculty.
Additionally, after speaking with faculty and hearing their perspectives on their deans and department heads, the fourth recommendation for further research is replicating the study by asking questions of deans as well as the provost to gain a better understanding of how they guide their faculty who respond to academic dishonesty, to explore how their explicit or implicit messaging may impact faculty responses to academic dishonesty in the classroom, and to understand how they view their role and the faculty’s role in responding to dishonesty. It would be interesting to use this study to ascertain the alignment between their roles in responding to academic dishonesty as well as faculty’s views of administrators’ roles in regard to academic dishonesty.

Fifth, the findings suggest further research needs to be conducted on the personal value systems of faculty. More specifically, a qualitative study investigating how personal values impact faculty response. Austin (2007) found faculty members build their identity and values in graduate school by identifying “with the values of the intellectual community in which they apprenticed for the faculty role (p. 275). Future research would be useful for understanding how the personal value systems impact faculty response to dishonesty and how campus culture impacts a faculty members’ personal value systems.

It is also recommended that a quantitative study be conducted to widely reach all faculty on campus. The study could be used to gather large-scale data on how many faculty are actively utilizing the academic misconduct referral process, how they learned about it, and the level of support they experience in regard to pursuing academic dishonesty, whether it is from their academic leaders or the student conduct office. Identifying the needs and understanding of faculty on larger scale would help inform how to address the issue of academic dishonesty at a systemic level.
An additional recommendation is to replicate the current study with faculty exclusively teaching graduate students. There are minimal studies addressing faculty response and graduate student academic dishonesty (Bennett, Behrendt, Boothby 2011; Eifert, 2014). Graduate-level curriculum and assignment structures are very different from those in undergraduate-level courses. Graduate-level class sizes tend to be smaller and more often taught by seasoned faculty, suggesting the potential for increased research. Differences in how faculty respond to dishonesty in graduate or doctoral level courses versus undergraduate courses could be identified.

Finally, SUSU was known to have a remarkably diverse student body. Given the need for increased attention to diversity, equity, and inclusion, it is recommended all future research on academic dishonesty include a specific equity and diversity lens to understand how the races or ethnicities of students in their classes affect their responses. Similarly, such research could include the conduct office to determine if sanctions were assessed consistently among students regardless of nonacademic characteristics like race or ethnicity, especially regarding the type and severity of the sanctions students receive if found responsible for academic dishonesty.

Conclusion

I explored how faculty members viewed their role in addressing academic dishonesty. I identified the potential barriers, situational or contextual, faculty experience when they consider whether to address or refer a case of academic dishonesty. I answered the primary research questions asking how faculty respond to instances of academic dishonesty among students and what influences their response. Throughout my research, I focused on gaining a better understanding of faculty decisions regarding addressing academic dishonesty. In doing so, I established specific conclusions.
First, faculty members value academic integrity regardless of whether or not they are explicitly told it is an institutional value and expectation for them to uphold. Faculty are aware not all departments or disciplines operate in a similar manner when deciding how to respond to dishonesty, and it was clear among the 11 participants that there is not an understanding of why it may be beneficial to have university-wide consistency in utilizing the formal conduct adjudication process. Additionally, while faculty appreciated having autonomy in their classrooms, not all faculty expressed being equipped adequately to address dishonesty without support. Specific support is lacking. Finally, a main support system for faculty is the student conduct office. However, based on feedback by faculty, the conduct office is more of a deterrent to referring cases than a support. By addressing issues regarding explicit messaging surrounding academic integrity, educating faculty on available resources and support available regarding the conduct office, reviewing relevant university policies, as well as providing meaningful incentives to consistently address academic dishonesty, movement toward a consistent culture of academic integrity at SUSU can be made.
APPENDIX A

INVITATION LETTER
Dear ____,

My name is Laura Smith, and I am a doctoral candidate in the Department of Counseling and Higher Education at the University of North Texas. I am conducting a research study as part of the dissertation requirement for my doctoral degree in Higher Education Administration, and I invite you to participate.

My study explores faculty response to academic dishonesty in the classroom. If you decide to participate, you will be asked to meet with me for an interview about your experiences with academic dishonesty. The meeting will take place virtually via Zoom at a mutually agreed upon time and place, and should last about 45 minutes to an hour.

If you have questions about the study, you may contact me at XXX-XXX-XXXX or via email at USERID@my.unt.edu, or my faculty advisor, Dr. V. Barbara Bush at USERID@unt.edu. If you are interested in participating, please reply to me, and I will be in touch to schedule an interview time. Thank you for your consideration.

Best,
Laura Smith
APPENDIX B

CRITERIA FOR FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN STUDY
Faculty must meet the following criteria to participate:

1. Be a full time faculty member
2. Have taught for a minimum of 2 years
3. Have encountered academic misconduct in your classroom.

Faculty Information:

Contacted by: Phone_____ Email:_____  
Name:___________________________________________________________  
Title:________________________________________________________________ 
Academic Area:________________________________________________________________ 
Tenured/Tenure-Track:_____ Non-tenured:_____  
Total Years Teaching:________________________________________________________________ 
Gender: M_____ F_____  
Meet Criteria: Y_____ N_____  
If No, reason for exclusion:__________________________________________________________ 

Contact Information:  
Office phone:______________________________________________________  
Cell phone:________________________________________________________  
Email:____________________________________________________________  
Address:________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX C
INFORMED CONSENT LETTER
Informed Consent for Studies with Adults

TITLE OF RESEARCH STUDY: Faculty Response to Academic Dishonesty in the Classroom at a Four-Year Public Institution.

RESEARCH TEAM: V. Barbara Bush, Counseling and Higher Education, Barbara.bush@unt.edu. Laura Trahan Smith, PhD candidate in Counseling and Higher Education, conducting research under Dr. Bush as part of my dissertation.

You are being asked to participate in a research study. Taking part in this study is voluntary. The investigators will explain the study to you and will answer any questions you might have. It is your choice whether or not you take part in this study. If you agree to participate and then choose to withdraw from the study, that is your right, and your decision will not be held against you.

You are being asked to take part in a research study about how faculty members respond to academic dishonesty. The main purpose of the study is to explore how faculty members respond to academic dishonesty. A second purpose is to determine the potential barriers, situational or contextual, faculty experience when considering reporting and addressing academic dishonesty. Thirdly, this study aims to identify the support faculty need to create a culture of integrity in their classroom.

Your participation in this research study involves a semistructured interview with questions related to your thoughts and perceptions regarding academic dishonesty. More details will be provided in the next section.

You might want to participate in this study if you would like to enhance further understanding of faculty response to academic dishonesty. However, you might not want to participate in this study if you do not have the time to participate in an interview approximately one hour in length or if you are not comfortable discussing your response to academic dishonesty.

You may choose to participate in this research study if you are a full-time faculty member who has been teaching for at least two years and have experienced academic dishonesty in the classroom. Faculty who are not full-time, have been teaching for fewer than two years, or faculty who have not experienced academic dishonesty in their classroom are excluded from the study. The reasonable foreseeable risks or discomfort to you if you choose to take part is that you may feel uncomfortable answering some of the questions and the potential for loss of confidentiality. You may refuse to answer any questions. While there is not a benefit from directly participating in this study, I hope others in the academic community in general may benefit by further understanding faculty response to academic dishonesty.
You will not receive compensation for participation.

**DETAILED INFORMATION ABOUT THIS RESEARCH STUDY:** The following is more detailed information about this study, in addition to the information listed above.

**PURPOSE OF THE STUDY:**
The purpose of this study is to explore how faculty members view their roles in addressing academic dishonesty. A second purpose is to determine potential barriers, situational or contextual, faculty experience when considering reporting and addressing academic dishonesty. Thirdly, this study aims to identify the support faculty need to create a culture of integrity in their classroom.

**TIME COMMITMENT:**
The overall time commitment will be no longer than 1 hour. During this time, you will be asked to meet with me for an interview about your views on academic dishonesty and your experiences with it.

**STUDY PROCEDURES:**
As a participant, you will be asked to meet with me virtually for an interview exploring your views on and experiences with academic dishonesty. The meeting will take place via Zoom at a mutually agreed upon time and place, and should last about 45-60 minutes. This interview will be audio-recorded to ensure an accurate record of our discussion. The interview will be transcribed and sent it to you once the transcription is completed. No one other than me will listen to or have access to the recording.

**AUDIO/VIDEO/PHOTOGRAPHY:**

- [ ] I agree to be audio recorded during the research study.
  - [ ] I agree that the audio recording can be used in publications or presentations.
  - [ ] I do not agree that the audio recording can be used in publications or presentations.
- [ ] I do not agree to be audio recorded during the research study.

The recordings will be transcribed by Rev.com. The recording will be immediately destroyed after transcription

**POSSIBLE BENEFITS:**
There is no direct benefit to you for participating in this study. Although you may not benefit directly from participating in this study, I hope others in the academic community in general may benefit by further understanding faculty response to academic dishonesty.

**POSSIBLE RISKS/DISCOMFORTS:**
This research study is not expected to pose any additional risks beyond what you would normally experience in your regular everyday life. However, you may feel uncomfortable answering some of the questions. You may refuse to answer any questions. If you do experience any discomfort, please inform the research team.

Participating in research may involve a loss of privacy and the potential for a breach in confidentiality. Study data will be physically and electronically secured by the research team. As with any use of electronic means to store data, there is a risk of breach of data security.

If you experience excessive discomfort when completing the research activity, you may choose to stop participating at any time without penalty. The researchers will try to prevent any problem that could happen, but the study may involve risks to the participant, which are currently unforeseeable. UNT does not provide medical services, or financial assistance for emotional distress or injuries that might happen from participating in this research. If you need to discuss your discomfort further, please contact a mental health provider, or you may contact the researcher who will refer you to appropriate services.

**COMPENSATION:**
There is no compensation offered for participating in this study.

**CONFIDENTIALITY:** Efforts will be made by the research team, to keep your personal information private, including research study and disclosure will be limited to people who have a need to review this information. All paper and electronic data collected from this study will be stored in a secure location on the shared drive of the UNT higher education program to which the PI has access.

Research records will be labeled with a code and the master key linking names with codes will be maintained in a separate and secure location on the shared drive of the UNT higher education program to which the PI has access.

The results of this study may be published and/or presented without naming you as a participant. The data collected about you for this study may be used for future research studies that are not described in this consent form. If that occurs, an IRB would first evaluate the use of any information that is identifiable to you, and confidentiality protection would be maintained.

While absolute confidentiality cannot be guaranteed, the research team will make every effort to protect the confidentiality of your records, as described here and to the extent permitted by law. In addition to the research team, the following entities may have access to your records, but only on a need-to-know basis: the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, the FDA (federal regulating agencies), the reviewing IRB, and sponsors of the study.

This research uses third party software called Rev.com and Zoom and is subject to the privacy policies of these software noted here: https://www.rev.com/about/terms, https://www.zoom.us/privacy as well as REDCap, privacy policies noted here: https://projectredcap.org/software/mobile-app/privacypolicy/

**CONTACT INFORMATION FOR QUESTIONS ABOUT THE STUDY:**
If you have any questions about the study you may contact Laura Smith, laura.smith4@my.unt.edu or V. Barbara Bush, Barbara.bush@unt.edu. Any questions you have regarding your rights as a research subject, or complaints about the research may be directed to
the Office of Research Integrity and Compliance at 940-565-4643, or by email at untirb@unt.edu.

CONSENT:
- Your signature below indicates that you have read, or have had read to you all of the above.
- You confirm that you have been told the possible benefits, risks, and/or discomforts of the study.
- You understand that you do not have to take part in this study and your refusal to participate or your decision to withdraw will involve no penalty or loss of rights or benefits.
- You understand your rights as a research participant and you voluntarily consent to participate in this study; you also understand that the study personnel may choose to stop your participation at any time.
- By signing, you are not waiving any of your legal rights.

Please sign below if you are at least 18 years of age and voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

SIGNATURE OF PARTICIPANT        DATE

*If you agree to participate, please provide a signed copy of this form to the researcher team. They will provide you with a copy to keep for your records.

University of North Texas IRB-20-521 Approved on 11-5-2020
Informed Consent - Adults Version: January 2020
APPENDIX D

SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW PROTOCOL
**Researcher** will begin with introductions and review of the consent letter, answering any questions from the participant. Participant will keep letter for his/her records. Researcher will then gain consent for video recording the interview.

I am interested in faculty response to academic dishonesty in the classroom. To help me understand faculty response, I am interested in your understanding of your role as a faculty member in regards to academic dishonesty. In sharing experiences, please keep the information of any other person involved in the experience/incident anonymous.

I have questions to ask, but please feel free to offer additional information that you think will help me better understand your thoughts and perceptions.

Prior to asking the planned interview questions listed below, I will begin by building rapport with the participants. Rapport building would include indicating why I am personally interested in the topic and asked general demographic questions of the participants. It is my hope that by spending some time with rapport building that the faculty participants will feel more comfortable to fully engage in the experience.

The following questions will assist in rapport building.

1. How long have you been a professor?
2. What drew you to academia?
3. What are some of the best things about being a professor?
4. What are some of the more challenging things?

And then transition into the remaining interview questions.

1. Please describe the process for addressing academic dishonesty as you know it.
2. Describe your role regarding academic dishonesty in the classroom and within the institution.
3. How do you address academic dishonesty in your classroom?
   a. Why do you use this approach?
   b. What influences your decision on what action to take?
4. How would you describe the support you receive from the dean, academic department, and university as a whole for addressing matters of academic dishonesty?
5. How does the structure and the policies of the university influence your decisions about responding to academic dishonesty?

Based on responses to the pre-planned questions, follow-up questions will be asked.
REFERENCES


Carter, B. A. (2008). Faculty beliefs, level of understanding, and reported actions regarding academic integrity (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3307321)


Kirkevold, M., & Bergland, A. (2007). The quality of qualitative data: Issues to consider when interviewing participants who have difficulties providing detailed accounts of their experiences. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and Well-being, 2,* 68-75.


Lang, D. J. (2005). *Faculty perceptions, attitudes, and experiences with academic integrity at a small, private, technological university* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3194172)


Marcoux, H. E. (2002). *Kansas State University faculty perspective, opinions, and practices concerning undergraduate student academic dishonesty and moral development*.


SUSU. (2020b). *Student code of conduct*. Retrieved from [URL redacted for confidentiality]


