The Emotional Labour of Academic Integrity: How Does it Feel?

Rick Robinson, Medicine Hat College

Jason Aaron Openo, Medicine Hat College

Correspondence to Jason Aaron Openo: jopeno@mhc.ab.ca

Abstract

Academic integrity is valued in all Canadian educational systems, yet no real accounting of academic integrity violations (AIVs) exists primarily because faculty under-report them. Numerous disincentives dissuade faculty from reporting AIVs, and voluntarily reporting violations increases emotional labour. Still, some faculty feel duty-bound to do so. This paper explores the neglected emotional experience when reporting AIVs using a phenomenological approach. Interviews with a purposive, homogenous sample of faculty at a small Canadian community college who reported AIVs reveal that reporting AIVs disturbed relationships with students, and that navigating bureaucratic processes, when other faculty choose not to, caused frustration. After reporting, faculty in this study felt alienated from the outcomes of their decisions. Still, they remained committed to reporting AIVs because it was part of their self-definition as educators to defend the innocent and protect the future. This small sample of faculty identify personal experiences and institutional barriers that may discourage faculty from reporting AIVs. Finally, the findings reveal a gap between faculty and international students' understanding of academic integrity. Bridging this gap is important because of the intensified emotional and relational challenges arising from the more serious consequences of reporting AIVs involving international students. The findings reveal a need to develop faculty development opportunities to build intercultural competence and a developmental approach to handling AIVs so that the values of academic integrity are promoted in a way that respects diverse worldviews.

Keywords: academic integrity violations, Canada, emotional labour, faculty, international students

The Emotional Labour of Academic Integrity: How Does it Feel?

Academic integrity is a major concern in Canadian postsecondary environments. Estimates suggest that 50% of undergraduate students commit some form of academic misconduct during their studies, and possibly as many as 70,000 postsecondary students in Canada may engage in contract cheating (Eaton, 2020). The problem is likely greater because some students who commit academic integrity violations (AIVs) will not get caught, and even when they do, faculty overwhelmingly choose not to report them. It is likely that less than 1% of AIVs are reported (Bertram Gallant & Stephens, 2020). When undetected and unreported violations are factored together, it becomes easy to see that no real accounting of AIVs exists.

Academic integrity also remains under-researched (Eaton, 2020), and a major gap in the academic integrity research exists around how to prepare and support faculty through this emotionally-rich experience (Biswas, 2015). This study fills in a small part of this research gap by exploring the lived experience of five faculty at a small Canadian comprehensive community college who chose to formally report AIVs. Investigating the faculty experience of reporting AIVs may identify personal values that encourage (and institutional barriers that dissuade) reporting AIVs. It may also supply guidance for how to attenuate these charged emotional experiences, inform meaningful faculty development opportunities, and shape policies so that AIVs are reported in a more fair and consistent manner (Biswas, 2015).

A Lack of Concerted Action

Faculty are best situated to identify, report, and address AIVs, but there appears to be "a lack of concerted action" (Thomas & De Bruin, 2012, p. 13) on the part of faculty to address AIVs. In their comprehensive literature review, Thomas and De Bruin (2012) catalogue why faculty might be reluctant to report AIVs. Disincentives include:

- A denial of the problem and/or a denial of the harmful consequences of academic integrity;
- The significant effort involved in enforcement;
- A lack of buy-in to formal policies and procedures;
- Procedures are too cumbersome and may take away time from research or publications;
- Inconsistent enforcement of academic misconduct policies;
- Application of inappropriate penalties. (Thomas & De Bruin, 2012).

In addition to this formidable list of disincentives, the act of formally reporting and addressing AIVs increases the emotional labour of faculty.

Emotional Labour

Emotional labour has been the victim of concept creep (Beck, 2018), but its original meaning, in Hochschild's exploration of the work-life of flight attendants, was the regulation of feelings and emotional displays in order to conform to employer expectations and job requirements (Barry et al., 2019). Emotional labour is a "process that employees undergo to control their emotions when dealing with customers and to react in ways that are defined by their employers" (Law, 2017, p. 9). Emotional labour is the labour of controlling one's true emotions, which may be disguised according to specific "feeling rules" present in the workplace (Biswas, 2015, p. 130). A useful way to view reporting AIVs, then, is as an employer expectation that increases the demand to regulate feelings and emotional displays in the fulfillment of job requirements. This original conception of emotional labour is useful because it explains why "most institutions have a reporting rate of under 1%" (Bertram Gallant & Stephens, 2020, p. 60). The process of reporting is both

emotionally difficult and requires faculty to conform to employer requirements, whereas many faculty resist identifying as employees (Perry, 2014). In two important aspects, then, reporting AIVs touches a nerve that strikes at the very heart of the faculty identity (Biswas, 2015).

Those who report AIVs may suffer personal costs when confronting students, and faculty may feel that tables have turned and they have become defendants who must engage in student confrontations with shaky or insufficient evidence (Thomas & De Bruin, 2012). Additionally, some faculty may resist employer expectations to report because they are uncomfortable with having to do the "cop shit" (Watters & Prinsloo, 2020) of policing student behaviour. This may be especially true for probationary or part-time faculty who jeopardize positive teacher ratings and risk their future economic well-being by pursuing cases of academic dishonesty (Thomas & De Bruin, 2012). Formally reporting AIVs increases the emotional labour required of faculty by adding a dose of must-be-controlled misery to their lives as they confront the violation, the offending students, their non-reporting peers, and the institution's imperfect policies.

Beyond the experience of anger (Robillard, 2007), there has been little research into the emotional experience of faculty who report academic integrity violations (Biswas, 2015). After consideration of the numerous disincentives and the increased emotional labour, the following research questions crystallized: *Why do some faculty still choose to report AIVs? And when they do report AIVs, what does the reporting process involve? How do faculty experience the reporting process?* Answering these questions may illuminate how faculty make meaning of this situation, how reporting AIVs affects their web of relationships, and provide insight to what supports and faculty development opportunities need to be in place to decrease stress levels when reporting AIVs.

Context of the Study

The research site is a small Canadian comprehensive community college, and both authors were asked to join a newly formed Academic Integrity Advisory Committee in early 2018. The creation of the committee arose from a perceived need, by faculty and college administration, that AIVs were on the rise and the institution needed to develop strategies to strengthen the culture of academic integrity to ensure the reputational quality of its credentials. The Academic Integrity Advisory Committee was comprised of representatives from the student association, faculty, deans, the Office for International Education, and student supports such as the writing specialist and academic strategist. Almost immediately, the committee recognized a need for better data regarding AIVs.

The institutional narrative about academic integrity at the time of the committee's formation was that violations were on the rise, and when faculty took the issue seriously, college administration did not. Faculty expressed a lack of institutional support when they sought disciplinary action against academic misconduct, and this narrative had intensified with an increase of international students. An undercurrent of the main institutional narrative involved the perception that

international students committed AIVs more frequently and more egregiously than domestic students. Without systematic data collection, however, it was simply unknown how many AIVs were committed or if international students committed more violations compared to domestic students. The consequences of reported violations were also unknown.

One of the first actions of the committee was to approve a formal reporting process for AIVs, and data collection began in Fall 2018 using the Academic Integrity Incident Reporting form, adapted from other institutions. The form allowed for the reasonable discretion of faculty to assign penalties and/or to refer students to developmental supports such as an academic integrity learning module and the writing specialist. By the end of the 2018-2019 academic school year, 106 academic integrity violation reports had been filed. Plagiarism was by far the most common violation reported, followed by exam cheating. Most of these AIVs resulted in students receiving a mark of zero for their assignment (89/106 incidents), a pattern that holds consistent with the literature suggesting that reducing marks/lowering grades is the most defensible and widely endorsed approach (Bertram Gallant & Stephens, 2020). Only 13 students received a failing grade for the course with an automatic referral to the dean.

One-hundred and six reported AIVs represents 4.7% of the 2,250 full-time learning equivalents in approximately 30 different academic programs. If the best estimates suggest 50% of students violate academic integrity at some point during their studies, the committee felt it fair to conclude that many faculty (even if they took academic integrity seriously) were not willing to report AIVs. This is also consistent with the literature that indicates that most institutions have a reporting rate of less than 1%, and that "the odds of getting caught are incredibly low and the deterrent effect vanishingly small" (Bertram Gallant & Stephens, 2020, p. 60). What also became obvious was that those few faculty who chose to report AIVs had caused a "disturbance in the force." Formally reporting AIVs sent shockwaves through the relatively small academic community, leading to an increased number of grade appeals, investigations of student groups harassing the faculty who had reported them, and testimonials that the decision to report AIVs had positively transformed academic programs by clearly communicating a higher level of expectations to students. Through hallway conversations, the authors also became aware that reporting AIVs had been an emotionally charged experience for the few faculty who pursued this course of action.

The authors were inspired to ask Bob Dylan's (1965) famous question, "How does it feel?" Phenomenology, specifically interpretive phenomenological analysis (IPA), provided a suitable research method to surface why faculty chose to report AIVs and what they experienced after doing so. By focusing on the faculty experience, we sought to gain insight for how to best support new and experienced instructors through this emotionally labourious process.

Methodology

The study protocol was approved by Medicine Hat College's Research Ethics Board in January

2020. The researchers' proximity to the research participants suggested a phenomenological approach. Phenomenology explores the everyday lives of human involvements by seeking to reveal overlooked, unexpected, and taken-for-granted dimensions of human experience (Adams & Yin, 2014). van Manen (1984) described phenomenology both as a carefully cultivated thoughtfulness and as a method without techniques (van Manen, 1984). IPA is a qualitative research method that draws on the broad principles of phenomenology and enables a subjective exploration of experience from the participants' perspective (Roberts, 2014). IPA explores personal stories, "accepting that they are the product of individual acts of interpretation and that their retelling is itself an act of reconstruction" (Griffin & May, 2012, p. 449). In IPA, the researcher seeks to explore the participants' processes of meaning-making.

A Phenomenon that Seriously Interests Us: The Phenomenological Question

Even though van Manen (1984) suggests phenomenology is a method without techniques, he provides an elemental methodological structure that begins with a phenomenon that interests us and commits us to the world, the phenomenological question. *Considering the formidable list of disincentives and increased emotional labour involved in reporting AIVs*, *why do some faculty still choose to report them? And when they do, how do they experience the reporting process? What does reporting AIVs involve emotionally?*

Investigating the Experience as Lived, Not Conceptualized

To establish trustworthiness, researchers must be free, as much as possible, from their "theoretical, prejudicial and suppositional intoxications" (van Manen, 2007, p. 12). To be free from these intoxications and show fidelity to the analysis, IPA researchers are called to provide a written confessional declaring assumptions and forethoughts in order to guard against these biases determining the analysis (Griffin & May, 2012). Before commencing our interviews, we discussed our shared belief and strong commitment that "Canada must take a stronger stance on ensuring academic quality standards" (Eaton, 2020). The faculty we were interviewing acted in a way that aligned with our beliefs that faculty reporting AIVs were a crucial part of this stronger stance. In explicating this belief, we came to recognize that our desire for increased faculty reporting needed to be set aside because we did not fully understand the human toll involved in advocating our position. This realization prohibited our orientation from overwhelming our analysis.

Data collection in a phenomenological study commences with silence (Gudmannsdottir & Hallsdorsdottir, 2007), and silent reflection prepared us to be open to the existential investigation, conducted through semi-structured interviews with five to six faculty who had formally reported AIVs within the 2018-2019 academic calendar. Phenomenology is the study of the lifeworld where participants are viewed as co-researchers who are experts in their own experience (Gudmannsdottir & Halldorsdottir, 2009), and a founding assumption of phenomenology is that only those who have experienced phenomena can communicate that

experience to the outside world (van Manen, 1984). Small sample sizes are recommended in phenomenological studies because a large sample can easily overwhelm the researcher with data (Roberts, 2013). A purposive, homogenous sample is necessary so that themes can be realized from certain groups of people who have shared particular experiences. In this study, *purposive* and *homogenous* means faculty who reported AIVs using the newly developed process within the 2018-2019 academic year at this Canadian community college. The faculty participants came from different divisions and/or academic programs, including business, information technology, and English. There were three men and two women; three were program coordinators, and all would be considered white.

Data was generated through in-depth, hour-long, semi-structured interviews, the preferred method for this research approach (Roberts, 2013). The one-on-one interviews were recorded in a private setting with only one of the researchers and a participant. The researchers individually transcribed the recorded interviews for Lived Experience Descriptions (LEDs), a specific moment or event that a faculty recollects from the process of reporting AIVs (Adams & Yin, 2014). Prior relationships in phenomenological studies are recommended as the research dialogue results in a mutual construction (co-constitutionality) of reality (Tuohy et al., 2013). Prior relationships are also positive because faculty have ample time to develop comfort to express themselves in an open way (Gudmannsdottir & Halldorsdottir, 2009), providing rich and thick descriptions of the events. The interviews provided a disciplined, formal way to collect data from people who had confided their experiences with us, in conversations we had already been engaged in, where both parties were seeking to interpret events.

Reflecting and Describing the Phenomena

The interviews were separately analyzed by each researcher using open codes to generate broad, emerging themes (Cohen et al., 2011). Analysis commenced using the highlighting approach, where the researchers listened to the interviews several times with the transcript and asked, "What statements or phrases seem particularly essential or revealing about the experience being described?" (van Manen, 1984, p. 61). The highlighting approach was complemented by the line-by-line approach, which considered every sentence and asked, "What does this statement reveal about the experience being described?" (van Manen, 1984, p. 61). The researchers then independently applied axial codes (Cohen, et al., 2011) to create larger categories of common meaning shared by the interview participants.

After individual coding, the researchers shared their codes and structures. Through dialogue and discussion, the researchers jointly synthesized the two coding constructions into an essential structure using selective codes. Selective codes, or super-ordinate themes, are used to create a deep understanding of the main storyline (Cohen et al., 2011). Phenomenology asks researchers to explore "beyond the details of everyday life to the essences underlying them" (Cohen et al., 2011, p. 18). In describing the findings, the researchers kept alive van Manen's (1984) suggestion that every phenomenological description is only an icon that points at the 'thing' attempting to be

described, that "a phenomenological description is an example composed of examples" (p. 64). If the composite example is powerful enough, one sees the deeper significance of the lived experience it describes (van Manen, 1984). The Vancouver School of Phenomenology outlines 12 basic steps followed in this study. Steps 1-6 were completed individually; steps 7-12 were completed jointly.

Table 1. *The Vancouver School's 12 basic steps of doing phenomenological studies followed in this study*

Steps	Action	Researcher's Approach and Activity
Step 1	Select dialogue partners	5-6 faculty who have formally reported academic integrity violations within the 2018-2019 academic year.
Step 2	Silence	Reflection on preconceived ideas; beyond our beliefs, what is important about what the participants are telling us?
Step 3	Participate in dialogue	One researcher conducted the interviews.
Step 4	Sharpened awareness of words	Listening and reading the interviews several times; highlighting, line-by-line analysis, reflecting.
Step 5	Beginning consideration of essences	Initial coding. Open coding, the earliest, initial coding.
Step 6	Construct the essential structure from each case	Each researcher constructed the essential structure of each case in isolation. Application of axial coding, connecting open codes into larger categories of meaning.
Step 7	Verifying case constructions with the co-researcher	The researchers shared their essential structures, exploring consistencies and divergent interpretations within their coding schemes.
Step 8	Constructing the essential structure of the phenomenon from all cases	Synthesis of the two coding constructions into an essential structure; selective coding applied to create deep understanding of the main story line.
Step 9	Comparing the essential structure of the phenomenon with the data	Re-listening to the original interviews and reading our interpretations. Reflect: have we been faithful to the data?
Step 10	Identifying overriding themes which describe the phenomenon	Review the primary elements, the selective codes, of faculty who reported AIVs. Reflect: does this honour what we were told?
Step 11	Verifying the essential	The researchers shared the essential structure with research

	structure with some research participants	participants and at an academic conference for feedback and verification.
Step 12	Writing up the findings.	The writing was multivoiced, including a blending of the voices of the two researchers with the participants, whose own words are included as much as possible.

Interpretation of Findings

IPA explores four universal themes of the lived experience; the lived experience of the body (corporeality), space (spatiality), time (temporality) and human relationships (relationality) (Adams & Yin, 2014). Of these, relationality dominated the interview transcripts. Relationality describes the sense of community, intimacy and closeness to others; it may also include one's relationship with oneself (Adams & Yin, 2014). For the interpretation of findings, relationality is broken down into the following relationships: instructor-student, instructor-colleagues, and instructor-institution. The analysis that follows provides a common narrative extricated from interviews with five instructors at a Canadian community college, starting from the filing of the Academic Integrity Incident Report Form through post-transgression dealings with students, and concludes with a special consideration of instructor-international student relationships.

Instructor-Student

Defenders of the Innocent and Protectors of the Future

Relationality surfaced as the overwhelmingly dominant theme in the experience of faculty reporting academic violations. The faculty interviewed felt a deep sense of connection to their students; a personal bond that lasts throughout the student's participation in an academic program and beyond. Students commonly pursue a professional relationship with instructors following their graduation. Deciding to report AIVs risked disrupting this connection, but the willingness to report AIVs originated from deeply held beliefs and values about education, and the faculty's self-perceived role in protecting and promoting these values. A responsibility for justice motivated reporting faculty to defend those students who could do nothing to stop the violations they saw happening around them:

> I felt cheated. For all the students who did the hard work and the other students just trying to sneak by. I needed to be part of the solution. It's not only bad for them, but for other students seeing that; everything about it just doesn't work … we don't want other students to think "that was unfair."

This concern for students who had done the hard work was connected to a deep-seated concern for the future.

> If we are graduating people who don't have the skills … even if this takes work, it's worth it because we want our graduates to have the skills.

Faculty perceived an interest in ensuring graduates had the skills they claimed to have upon graduation because they also had local connections in industry and wished to protect their personal reputations – another important relational dimension. These convictions led them to complete the Academic Integrity Incident Report Form.

The Form of a Form

The Academic Integrity Incident Report Form, implemented in the Fall 2018 semester, gave these incidents form through the completion of a form. *Form,* as a verb, means to give appearance and shape with a special reference to virtue, law, duty and character (Skeat, 1963), such as *religious formation.* In these instances, the interviewees expressed relief at the existence of the form because it provided a supportive container for AIVs with special reference to academic policies:

> I experienced a lot of relief with the form. It allowed me to make it clear that none of this was personal. This is not me being a cruel instructor. This is the policy. This is how academics work. This isn't just my idea of what a course should be.

The objectivity of the form made the incident less arbitrary and less subjective; it created distance within the intersubjective relationship that separated faculty from the perception that their actions were motivated by malice. The form became an externally visible thing that both parties could look at; the violation became a real substance with mass and weight.

> Students used to ask, "I'm still in the course right?" But the form resolves that because it is a larger scope with bigger implications. The message that's being sent is that this is being recorded across multiple classes and I am accountable for this for my entire degree. The magnitude becomes much more and they learn from it. The form gave a standard for the policy and a certain formality that this was not a contained issue; this was a wider issue that was being addressed.

The form, as a container, turned a private incident into a public one, and filling this container as a report meant the incident was no longer contained within a single course.

To Disappoint Through Deceit

Completing the Academic Integrity Incident Report Form provided relief at the same time it made faculty more attentive to the details of the deceits committed by students. Frustration is rooted in deceit (Skeat, 1963), and it is deceit that renders teaching vain through the inability to achieve teaching aims. Frustration ranged from simple annoyance to a change in relationships with students.

> I had students who plagiarized the first year come back and do it again, so I was frustrated. The next year, they handed in a Master's level writing dissertation from MIT in a 100 level writing class.

A state of disbelief and unfulfillment arose from the implication that students thought their instructors were not attentive enough to catch such egregious attempts at dishonesty.

Faculty frustration intensified when the AIVs spilled outside the classroom to include broader institutional players. After one instructor attempted to pursue AIVs with a group of students, he recounted:

> They figured a way around. They went to the coordinator and said they wouldn't get a fair shot with me. From their point of view, it's my fault that I caught them four times.

This inability to make progress by altering student behaviour was exacerbated when institutional processes allowed students committing AIVs to undermine faculty authority by going around them to coordinators and supervisors.

The Aftermath (or After the Form)

Robillard (2007), one of the few researchers to study the effects of plagiarism, notes widespread plagiarism anxiety leads to practices of pedagogical prevention and anger. Anger originates from "identity vulnerability as the primary source of violence" (p. 19); anger erupts when one has to worry about not being fooled and that authority and punishment has to be employed to maintain teacher identity. Unlike Robillard (2007), however, our interviewees were largely devoid of anger. Instead they were filled with a deep sense of hurt that inspired action.

Hurt

- I take it personally, even into the classroom.
- I have no further relationship with one student in particular.
- There are some students who have returned and there are hard feelings there; students who hold us responsible for what's happened.
- To be honest, it's nothing personal. It's not. And whatever…there's a few who won't look at me in the hallway, and that's fine, I'm a big boy. I can handle students not liking me.

During the individual coding phase, both researchers paused on the final quote above because the level of hurt was palpable. This statement held unmistakable evidence of serious emotional labour. The faculty member adapted their professional *persona* (mask) to control and hide their true emotions, including what they were willing to let their students see and what they allowed us to hear. One participant expressed their emotional labour in the following way:

> There is a cost to this. Student relationships are very important to us, and so we get caught up in

the emotion of our students. But if you had no feelings, it would mean you don't have any connection to your students. As a human being, that would be very unfortunate.

One of the consequences of our humanity is that having empathy for students comes with an emotional cost. However, that cost is less than the cost of being inhuman.

Transformations

Even though negative experiences dominated the interviews, most instructors also mentioned positive interactions with students that emerged from reporting AIVs, along with correspondingly positive emotional experiences.

> I think for the most part … it's worked out. One student in particular, that probably had the most difficult time with this, is back in our program and is doing well.

> There's a few I caught once, and they figured it out – the relationship is fine.

> I'm quite surprised at how good our relationship is after this.

Reporting AIVs held the surprising potential to transform negative interactions into stronger, positive relationships with students. And in some of these cases, the negative experiences between instructors and students created a stronger bond between colleagues.

Instructor-Colleagues

Reporting AIVs positively transformed relationships with colleagues, strengthening the connections between colleagues and deans. Sometimes the positive affective experience was a simple confirmation that the instructor had been on the right path, but these interactions also help promise to strengthen relations with leaders and foster creativity with colleagues:

> It solidified my relationship with my dean.

> This improved my relationship with the dean, who became more firm on academic integrity violations.

> Water-cooler conversations changed to discussions about our experiences with academic integrity. Colleagues came together and identified better practices.

> Any time you have a group of people going through crisis together it can have the effect of bringing them together; if there was anything positive about it, it was probably that.

The last comment in this grouping echoes Bob Dylan's observation in *Brownsville Girl,* "Strange how people who suffer together have stronger connections than people who are most content" (Dylan & Shepherd, 1986). The negative interactions of reporting AIVs with students forged a

stronger sense of belonging with other faculty and solidarity with academic leadership. Most encouragingly, when faculty congregated together over the common problem of academic misconduct, they tended to collaboratively generate creative solutions that improved their teaching practice.

> It took some thinking, we set up everything; even from the course outline on, like everything was done differently and explained things differently. Even if it took time, it was worth every second of the time.

Solidarity and teamwork expressed itself in innovative pedagogical strategies where the extra time required was felt to be valuable.

Instructor-Institution

Alienation from Other Faculty

After reporting, participants expressed a strong feeling of alienation from faculty in other academic programs, suggesting that their efforts could be undermined by a lack of consistency.

> I only know for our area, we're taking it seriously; I don't know about other areas.

> I don't know about other divisions, but I know that we take it seriously.

> I know what happens in my area, but not what happens elsewhere.

This feeling of alienation from other faculty and other academic programs intensified when considering the relationship with the institution.

Alienation from the Outcome

Even though faculty felt stronger solidarity with their immediate colleagues and deans, alienation defined their relationality with the institution. They longed to see how their individual actions contributed to the construction of a greater context.

> On the institutional level, what's being done? Instructors won't continue to fill out the forms if they don't see anything happen. Maybe it's happening. I don't know the end game of this.

> Knowing that people have gotten consequences, and that they are real; we are so quiet with dealing with all these. Maybe we could have some high-level, FOIP[1]-approved, reporting of

---

[1] The *Freedom of Information and Privacy Policy* (FOIP) requires extreme caution in dealing with student information.

consequences.

> There has to be some way for us [to] see across classes. I know those students are going to do it five times, and they are going to graduate, and that's wrong.

The feeling of alienation from the end game, the longing to be aware of *real* consequences, and the desire to connect their immediate actions with a larger institutional context express an unreality, displacement, and invisibility to their efforts. This alienation and uncertainty from the institution may further disincentivize reporting AIVs.

Woven through all of these experiences was the special relationship between instructors and international students.

Instructor-International Students

Over the past several years, our comprehensive community college has established an institutional target of 15% international students, and academic programs are capped at a 40% maximum of international students. Our college hosts students from every continent, but most international students come from collectivist cultures in South Asia. Individuals from collectivist cultures operate as a group, and individuals within the collective owe a strong allegiance to the group (Wideman, 2011). Wideman (2011) describes this allegiance by writing, "Students would complete each other's assignments if a fellow group member was unable to do so" (p. 36), and students commit AIVs to help the collective as much as oneself.

Canada is considered an individualist culture within Hofstede's controversial framework (Prowse & Goddard, 2010). Individualist cultures are characterized by the extent to which people function as individuals in pursuit of goals (Prowse & Goddard, 2010). Despite the numerous criticisms of Hofstede's framework, including questions about the widely known study's validity and reliability, its age and modern value (Piepenburg, 2011; Prowse & Goddard, 2010), Wideman (2011) found that students exhibited great loyalty to one another. In our study, it was apparent when analyzing the data that there was a gap in understanding between students from collective cultures and faculty from individualist ones, and a substantial amount of the frustration experienced by our participants stemmed from juxtaposed cultures.

Here too, however, faculty claimed a sense of responsibility and felt a duty to the international students, and the interviews revealed proactive changes in both communication and pedagogy. All our interviewees expressed awareness that international students had, for reasons that were not always their own fault, a misperception of the college's and the faculty's conception of academic integrity. Our interviewees were aware they were part of the acculturation process for international students; that students from different cultures learn to learn differently (Gunawardena, 2014), have different conceptions of textual ownership (Mundava & Chaudhuri, 2017), and that Western teaching approaches may not fit the learning models of students. Even

when equipped with this sensitivity, awareness, and willingness to bridge the divide, the gap remained or widened. A more surprising cultural divide seemed to be that some students properly understood the conception of academic integrity but felt that their actions were still within acceptable boundaries, telling one instructor that, "yes, we know but it's ok."

Bridging the Gap

Our participants described changing the way they taught current students to prepare for future years. These proactive changes spoke to the responsibility that the faculty felt for international students, and to their desire to avoid reporting AIVs if it was possible to do so.

> The one thing the form did, especially with the conversations I had with international students, is that it didn't change my approach, but it did change my pedagogy. I implemented different methods. [In the next semester, I used the first assignment as an opportunity for student to learn about using SafeAssign]. I think about new methods for how I can help students.

This pedagogical approach offered students a grace period and the ability to use tools to self-assess their work in a developmental approach. Developmental pedagogical strategies actively sought to bridge the gap instructors intuitively knew existed with international students.

> I thought it has to be a misunderstanding, there were a lot of misunderstandings so what we're trying to do in the program now is make everything clear up front so we don't have problems.

The "up front" approach included more specific conversations about expectations, especially in the context of collaborative assignments.

Dealing with Groups

The most traumatic experiences for our participants came immediately after the report had been filed and students were notified of the outcome. Depending on the severity of the violation and the penalty, ranging from a zero grade to expulsion from the program and/or college, participants felt that dealing with international students was noticeably different than dealing with domestic students. The apparent cultural gap between collectivist and individual cultures became most visible when international students acted in groups after a violation had been reported. One of our female participants experienced significant anxiety for her safety and for that of another female instructor.

> They wanted to come in groups. I was trying to get them to come one-on-one and there was a lot of … like, I can hold my own but I find them quite aggressive. They were quite forceful and I can hold my own. I've been here a long time. But for a new instructor when someone's in your face saying, "it's ok we do this all the time." I felt bad for the part-time faculty. They went to see another instructor [a part-time faculty] who had reported them, and when they were sent away from her area they came to see me as a group. Another instructor didn't want me to be

alone with them.

Clear evidence of suppressing one's true feelings was audible in the repeated statement, "I can hold my own." The desire to appear strong and experienced belied a fear of the group, expressed as a fear for other, less experienced instructors. Immediately after, she laughed it off:

> Oh … it was kind of cute [chuckling]… they think it's OK like you know, they would just keep arguing.

A Draining Persistence

The interactions with students after the violation had been reported carried intense emotions, and one faculty went so far as to play on the concept of post-traumatic stress disorder by calling it their "***p***ost-***t***ransgression ***s***tudent ***d***ealings". The most common experience of Post-Transgression-Student-Dealings was the incredible persistence of the international students' requests for reconsideration. In some cases, faculty felt they possessed incontrovertible evidence that violations had been committed, and this evidence had been shared with and discussed with students, but some international students returned several times asking faculty to reconsider the penalty. The toll on faculty included significant time spent in emotional conversations with individual students or groups of students over several days. This added extra work to an already busy schedule, and students attempting to negotiate and renegotiate increased the anxiety of reporting AIVs.

> I don't know if it [negotiating] happens all the time, part of it may have been a cultural thing in this case, like I feel like at a certain point hey, that's done... but they stood at my door and cried and I talked to them. You know, I'm, a teacher; students are important to me and the college. I was frustrated with the fact that the students couldn't take ownership and just say, "you know what, I messed up." It was the constant begging and pleading. No matter how many times I said, you know, this is over, I still kept getting emails and then it was excuses.

> The meeting with the students took a long time. Just repeating … long discussions about why it should be OK to plagiarize.

> The students came to me begging for me to reconsider, one of them went through an academic appeal which was denied, and then after that, came back to ask me to reconsider.

The genuine desire to work with international students waned as faculty became more and more exhausted from students attempting to negotiate a more favourable resolution.

Hearing the pleas of international students exacted a heavy emotional toll on faculty due to the severity of the penalties recommended in some specific cases that would impact the student in significant ways.

> That's hard on an instructor like, "I don't want to go back home," if it's an international student. To hear that hey, you're the cause, even though you're not the cause. So I guess, yeah, be emotionally ready if you put your foot down 'cause it could tug on your heart strings.

Pulling at one's heart strings suggests a conflict between what one believes to be right and the emotional cost for this program coordinator, who internalized the burden faced by the part-time instructors in his program. They had endured very difficult circumstances after following his request to report AIVs.

During the interview, he described himself as *exhausted, drained,* and *tired* several times. When asked if there were any moments of relief during the process, he responded:

> In that semester, there was no relief at all ... that was just a horrible, horrible semester.

Then he slowly replied:

> It certainly came with quite a heavy emotional toll. Cheating on a quiz usually isn't as severe as cheating on an exam, but if it is the third or fourth time, then all of the sudden they are failing the course or being removed from the program and you are directly responsible for that. We had students [pause] … that were [pause] … um … put on suicide-watch because [pause] … their whole college experience was being threatened including, you know, not only being kicked out of our program but they could be deported. And so the consequences went beyond being removed from our program. A part-time instructor who comes in to teach one class and the action that they take in filling out that form may … cause a student to threaten suicide like that one single action on a part time instructor has huge emotional consequence on everyone. It is distressing to say the least.

Limitations

"A phenomenological description is always *one* interpretation, and no single interpretation of human experience will ever exhaust the possibility of yet another complementary, or even potentially richer, description" (van Manen, 1984, p. 40). These experiences may not apply to all faculty in all situations. This group of faculty worked at a small Canadian community college that took action to report AIVs as a strategy to strengthen the culture of academic integrity. The interviews were conducted by a single researcher, potentially missing out on the second researcher in those mutually constructed dialogues. A potential future study involves conducting a similar research approach with faculty who were aware academic integrity violations had been committed in their courses but chose not to report them. This single interpretation does, however, provide some insights into the emotionally-rich experience of reporting AIVs so that the appropriate supports for faculty, and students, including mental health supports, can be in place when incidents occur.

Concluding Discussion

This phenomenological study of five instructors who chose to report AIVs at a small Canadian community college sought to illuminate why faculty report AIVs despite formidable disincentives and increased emotional labour. By exploring how reporting AIVs impacts faculty relationships with colleagues and students, especially international students, these experiences shed some light on the faculty development opportunities that need to be in place, especially to support the campus's internationalization. Friesen (2012) identified "faculty members within higher education institutions [as] key agents in the institutional internationalization process" (p. 210). Faculty development in intercultural competence will be an important tactic to successfully support the larger institutional strategy of internationalization.

At the policy level, one of the guiding principles of the college's institutional internationalization plan is to embrace diversity. This policy direction has informed the selection and delivery of meaningful faculty development opportunities to build intercultural competence, including intercultural teaching practices that focus on assignment descriptions and negotiating end-of-semester conversations. These workshops strive to align international student expectations with common Canadian college practices. To date, 15 faculty have completed 225 hours of professional development to better prepare for an international student body. This is an important start, and this small cadre of faculty can be further trained to have structured reflective conversations with students so that students can do their own assessment and begin their education before pursuing punitive avenues (Bertram Gallant & Stephens, 2020).

These interviews provide evidence that significantly more work needs to be done to provide support for engaging all faculty, but especially part-time faculty, in internationalizing the campus around issues of academic integrity. Trilokekar and El Masri (2020) suggest that one important tactic is to provide faculty with cultural experiences. Although exchange programs exist, the current era of austere postsecondary budgets and pandemic travel bans means intercultural experiences are less likely to be realized. Still, within the present constraints, a rejuvenated effort by the institution to afford faculty these opportunities should be considered.

After reflecting on these testimonials, the authors still believe that reporting AIVs is an important method to strengthen a focus on academic integrity, but reporting AIVs was, for the faculty we interviewed, a last resort. As detailed, some took significant steps to change and improve their pedagogy before reporting, and many changed their practices in hopes they could close the intercultural communication gap so that they would not have to file incident reports in the future. When these efforts failed to produce the desired results, frustrated faculty reported AIVs when they could see no other course of action. By reporting AIVs, faculty were aware they were setting in motion an emotionally complex and challenging course of events. Emotional labour, the suppression or control of emotions to complete employer expectations, ranged from minor frustration to post-transgression student dealings requiring significant time and stress as students, especially international students, pleaded for a different outcome. The severity of the

consequences for international students experiencing their own emotional trauma was particularly difficult for faculty. Indeed, having students threaten suicide left one of our faculty participants emotionally exhausted, and we are deeply grateful this tragic end did not come to pass.

Strangely, despite all the difficulties and the emotional labour involved, all of our participants would recommend others follow their path and report AIVs, *if necessary*. When asked what advice they would give to colleagues considering reporting AIVs, the faculty participants expressed that the time and emotional labour was worth the effort because it upheld their values, defended honest students, and protected the future of the profession and their programs. Reporting AIVs, however, should be done cautiously, with care, humanity and a sensitivity that cultural differences need to be explored prior to punitive action.

> Don't lose sight of the fact that you are dealing with a student and that there may be consequences to them that might go beyond what is immediately visible.

Bertram Gallant and Stephens (2020) make a persuasive and passionate call to shift to a developmental approach when dealing with academic integrity. The faculty we interviewed moved in this direction instinctively because it was congruent with their self-identity as teachers. The same call-to-action for a developmental approach can and must be made for faculty, and meaningful faculty development programs for academic integrity must account for the faculty's affective state, which has been overlooked for too long.

References

Adams, C. & Yin, Y. (2014). Undergraduate students' experiences of time in MOOC: A term of Dino 101. *11th International Conference on Cognition and Exploratory Learning in a Digital Age (CELDA 2014).* 225-230.

Barry, B., Olekalns, M., & Rees, L. (2019). An ethical analysis of emotional labor. *Journal of Business Ethics, 160*(1), 17–34. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-018-3906-2

Beck, J. (2018, November 26). The concept creep of 'emotional labor.' *The Atlantic.* Retrieved from https://www.theatlantic.com/family/archive/2018/11/arlie-hochschild-housework-isnt-emotional-labor/576637/

Bertram Gallant, T., & Stephens, J. M. (2020). Punishment is not enough: The moral imperative of responding to cheating with a developmental approach. *Journal of College and Character, (21)*2, 57-66. https://doi.org/10.1080/2194587X.2020.1741395

Biswas, A. B. (2015). "I second that emotion": Minding how plagiarism feels. *Teaching/Writing: The Journal of Teacher Education, (1)*7. Retrieved from

https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1118&context=wte

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research methods in education.* Routledge.

Dylan, B. (1965). Like a rolling stone. On *Highway 61 revisited* [Compact disc]. Columbia Records.

Dylan, B., & Shepherd, S. (1986). Brownsville girl. On *Bob Dylan's greatest hits volume 3* [Compact disc]. Columbia Records.

Eaton, S. E. (2020, January 15). Cheating may be under-reported across Canada's universities and colleges. *The Conversation.* Retrieved from https://theconversation.com/cheating-may-be-under-reported-across-canadas-universities-and-colleges-129292

Friesen, R. (2012). Faculty member engagement in Canadian university internationalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 17*(3), 209-227. doi:10.1177/1028315312451132

Griffin, A., & May, V. (2012). Narrative analysis and interpretive phenomenological analysis. In C. Seale (Ed.), *Researching society and culture* (3rd Edition). SAGE.

Gudmannsdottir, G., & Halldorsdottir, S. (2009). Primacy of existential pain and suffering in residents in chronic pain in nursing homes: a phenomenological study. *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences*, *23*(2), 317-327 11p. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6712.2008.00625.x

Gunawardena, C. N. (2014). Globalization, culture, and online distance learning. In O. Zawacki-Richter and T. Anderson (Eds.), *Online distance education: Towards a research agenda* (pp. 75-108). Edmonton, AB: Athabasca University Press.

Law, M. Z. (2017). *Cultivating engaged staff: Better management for better libraries.* Libraries Unlimited.

Mundava, M., & Chaudhuri, J. (2007). Understanding plagiarism. *College & Research Libraries News, 68,* 170-173.

Perry, D. (2014). Faculty refuse to see themselves as workers. Why? *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* Retrieved from https://community.chronicle.com/news/509-faculty-refuse-to-see-themselves-as-workers-why

Piepenburg, K, (2011). *Critical analysis of Hofstede's model of cultural dimensions.*

Prowse, J., & Goddard, J. T. (2010). Teaching across cultures: Canada and Qatar. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 40*(1), 31-52.

Roberts, T. (2013). Understanding the research methodology of interpretative phenomenological analysis. *British Journal of Midwifery*, *21*(3), 215-218.

Robillard, A. E. (2007). We won't get fooled again: On the absence of angry responses to plagiarism in composition studies. *College English, 70*(1), 10-31. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/25472248?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents

Skallerup Bessette, L. (2020, March 26). Affective labor: The need for, and cost of, workplace equanimity. *Transforming Higher Ed* [blog], *EDUCAUSE Review.* Retrieved from https://er.educause.edu/blogs/2020/3/affective-labor-the-need-for-and-cost-of-workplace-equanimity

Skeat, W. W. *An etymological dictionary of the English language* (Fourth Edition). Oxford University Press.

Thomas, A., & De Bruin, G. P. (2012). Student academic dishonesty: What do academics think and do, and what are the barriers to action? *African Journal of Business Ethics, 6*(1), 13-24.

Trilokekar, R., & El Masri, A. (2020). Internationalizing Teachers' Preparedness: The Missing Link in Ontario's Strategy for K–12 International Education? *Canadian Journal of Education, 43*(1), 170-196. Retrieved October 14, 2020.

Tuohy, D., Cooney, A., Dowling, M., Murphy, K., & Sixsmith, J. (2013). An overview of interpretive phenomenology as a research methodology. *Nurse Researcher*, *20*(6), 17-20.

van Manen, M. (1984). Practicing phenomenological writing. *Phenomenology and pedagogy.* 2(1), 36-69. Retrieved from https://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/pandp/issue/view/1044

van Manen, M. (2007). Phenomenology of practice. *Phenomenology & Practice, (1)*1, 11-30.

Watters, A., & Prinsloo, P. (2020, July 20). *Building anti-surveillance ed-tech! In conversation with Audrey Watters*. Contact North. *TeachOnline.ca.* Retrieved from https://contactnorth.zoom.us/rec/play/6Md8Irqv_To3EtaS4QSDBv98W43pJqOs1SgW-fZZmk3nAXlQMVr0NLMSZep-_8h7rYlfJf12KP6GU2zV

Wideman, M. (2011). Caring or collusion? Academic dishonesty in a school of nursing. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 41*(2), 28-43.