

Binghamton University

The Open Repository @ Binghamton (The ORB)

Teaching, Learning and Educational Leadership Faculty Scholarship Teaching, Learning and Educational Leadership

2020

Ethical practices in the college classroom: teaching and learning from the next generation about academic honesty

V. Sue Atkinson

Binghamton University--SUNY, atkinson@binghamton.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://orb.binghamton.edu/education_fac

Recommended Citation

Atkinson, V. Sue, "Ethical practices in the college classroom: teaching and learning from the next generation about academic honesty" (2020). *Teaching, Learning and Educational Leadership Faculty Scholarship*. 18.

https://orb.binghamton.edu/education_fac/18

This Book Chapter is brought to you for free and open access by the Teaching, Learning and Educational Leadership at The Open Repository @ Binghamton (The ORB). It has been accepted for inclusion in Teaching, Learning and Educational Leadership Faculty Scholarship by an authorized administrator of The Open Repository @ Binghamton (The ORB). For more information, please contact ORB@binghamton.edu.

Abstract

Academic honesty is a perennial concern at the university. Faculty, who endeavor to maintain ethical practices in their own work, may struggle to communicate with new generations of students about important aspects of academic honesty. Communication about this construct is often reduced to a syllabus statement warning students about penalties for plagiarism. Institutional responses are similarly narrowly focused on committees and procedures for the assignment of penalties for breaches of college academic honesty policies. Teaching faculty may benefit from more information and support in conveying to their students the crucial importance of developing and communicating original ideas as well as reporting on the ideas and words of others in an ethical manner.

This chapter is framed by a real but anonymized incident from the author's experience. It reviews current literature on academic honesty, plagiarism, and related issues, as well as historical attitudes on what we now call plagiarism. Also explored are the impact of new media and contemporary student conceptions of academic honesty. Special concerns related to increased use of adjunct faculty to teach university classes and the special challenges contingent faculty encounter when trying to model ethical behavior and mentor students toward academically honest practice are highlighted. Recommendations are drawn from these explorations.

Keywords: plagiarism, academic honesty, new media, adjunct faculty, student writing

Ethical Practices in the College Classroom: Teaching and Learning from the Next Generation About Academic Honesty

My end-of-semester grading was almost finished when I picked up Ryan's paper. It did not look anything like the work I had seen from him over the semester. The writing was clearer and more grammatical, but with an odd shift in tone midway through. A sinking feeling in the pit of my stomach grew as I googled a chunk of the text. It took seconds and only a couple of clicks to find the source of the opening pages. The website that had sourced the remainder of the paper was easy to find as well. Wow, I thought – this is plagiarism. I've never had to deal with this! Oh, no...what now?

A high school teacher by day, I spent one evening each week as an adjunct lecturer at a college an hour's drive from my home. My students found me caring, flexible, understanding, and funny (their comments from end-of-the-semester evaluations). I prided myself on giving assignments that called for unique and personal responses. I believed that I did this because it is good pedagogy. I realized now that I had also assumed that this meant that my students couldn't just find online or purchase such an assignment; like many faculty members (Liddell & Fong, 2005), I considered my assignments "plagiarism-proof." I'd never used plagiarism-detecting software such as Turnitin (2019), largely because my access as a part-time instructor was cumbersome, but also because I assumed that the nature of my assignments and my relationship with students made it unnecessary. From there came a feeling of betrayal; this was personal. How could Ryan do this? How could he do this to me? How could I have allowed this to happen? Is it my fault? What do I do now?

I felt alone in this experience, but I later learned that I was not alone in feeling the emotions of personal betrayal (Gilmore, 2008; Kolich, 1983) over my loss of the relationship I had believed I had with this student. I was confused. Ryan was a student I had trusted and helped, a student who was struggling but passing my course. And now, I realized with growing dread, Ryan had cast us both in a drama that couldn't possibly have a happy ending.

Why do students do this?

Students engage in academic dishonesty, including plagiarism (defined as "the act of appropriating the literary composition of another, or parts or passages of his writings, or the ideas or language of the same, and passing them off as the product of one's own mind" (Garner, 2019, p. 1170) for a variety of reasons. England (2008) categorizes these students into three groups. First, students make lazy, careless, or sloppy mistakes; they leave out quotation marks or make errors in citing. Second, students commit plagiarism because they truly do not know any better; they are genuinely ignorant of the conventions of academic writing and accepted methods within a discipline. They are unclear as to what falls under "common knowledge" within a subject area, and they find the varying referencing systems across disciplines confusing and arcane. Some international students come to college with concepts of intellectual property that differ from those that guide us in American universities (Hua-Li et al., 2008).

England's third group comprises students whom he characterizes as ignorant of the purpose of writing. These students reject or simply do not prioritize the idea that the purpose of written assignments is their learning; instead they prioritize assignment completion and grades. These students see what we call plagiarism as an easy route to *their* goal – satisfying course and degree requirements. As professors, we may assume that our students' goals are complementary to ours – we want to teach and they want to learn. However, in the immediacy of a waning

semester, some students weigh risks and benefits and find copied or very lightly edited material an easy shortcut. Furthermore, students plagiarize because they think that everyone else is doing it, because they are under pressure to produce work in a short time, because often there is no discernible immediate negative consequence, and because the internet makes it easy (Ma, Wan, & Lu, 2008). Some simply continue producing papers by copying and pasting as they did in high school (Hall, 2005).

Today's students have grown up in a culture of collaboration, augmented by ubiquitous group work in their elementary and high school years, work that may have ranged from simply copying others in the group to genuine cooperative learning ((Hua-Li et al., 2008). They may value helping friends more than meeting our standards of academic honesty (Blum, 2009; Williams, 2001), as they draw the line between collaboration, or "communal creativity," and cheating differently than do their professors. In fact, some students view the world wide web as "a bank of common knowledge" (Warn, 2006, p. 206), free to all and available for their uncited use (Moeck, 2002). My student Ryan's actions probably drew on a combination of these factors.

I had no idea what to do. Ryan's paper was not just copied; it failed to address the part of the assignment that called for a personal response to the topic, but I zeroed in on the academic honesty issue. I had no experience with department or college policies on such things. I had read the policies; I'd cut and pasted the syllabus statements, but I didn't know how things actually worked. With trepidation that—somehow-- this would come back to haunt me, I contacted my department chair, desperate for guidance. I truly feared, like the hapless Professor Levin in Bernard Malamud's 1961 semi-autobiographical novel, A New Life, that I would be judged and found wanting by senior faculty if I did not act decisively. So when the department chair informed me of the formal procedures for charging a student with academic dishonesty,

insisting this was the only way to handle it, I complied. I followed procedures, started the paperwork, and contacted Ryan.

Academic honesty is a perennial concern at universities and other academic settings. Most college faculty and students alike are familiar with ubiquitous academic honesty statements that grace all syllabi. Perhaps syllabi include links to more detailed college policy information that defines categories of potential academic honesty violations such as cheating and plagiarism. (See, for example, Binghamton University, 2019). The salient points of most of these syllabus statements are, in effect, “This is cheating; don’t do it,” and, “This is plagiarism; don’t do that”; in other words, “just say no.” Students who follow the links may learn that there are more types and ways to commit plagiarism than they ever imagined.

Academic honesty and contingent faculty

At the time that I received Ryan’s paper, I was a part-time faculty member. Such adjunct or contingent instructors, lecturers, and professors make up an ever-growing percentage of college and university faculty; in fact, the use of non-tenure-track faculty (mostly part-time) has more than doubled since 1999 and now stands at 70% according to the American Association of University Professors (2019). Adjunct faculty are less integrated into college structures and have less information, formal and informal, on policies and resources for dealing with academic dishonesty, policies which may differ from college to college. As the “migrant laborers of academe” (Clark, 1987, p. 209), they spend minimal time on any campus as they hurry from day jobs or to teaching commitments at other colleges. Many handle high course loads and juggle varied deadlines, often without office space, and perhaps without even a campus mailbox or full library privileges. Contingent faculty are vulnerable because their continued employment is often dependent on student course evaluations. Further complicating this picture, full-time and part-

time faculty members differ in their views on what constitutes plagiarism (Hudd, Apgar, & Bronson, 2009). This trend toward the increased use of part-time faculty juxtaposes poorly with another trend. Roughly 68% of undergraduates admit to having cheated on written work (this included plagiarism), a figure that continues to rise, according to a long-running national survey by Clemson University's International Center for Academic Integrity (2017).

*It was hard to pick up the phone, harder to say what I had to say. Ryan claimed it was all a mistake – he'd turned in the wrong draft; he'd just forgotten to put in the quotes. I felt wronged; he felt attacked by a friendly teacher in his first semester at a new college. Ryan's stance became more defensive as he began to see me not as someone who would help him sort out this mess, but as his adversary. As I waded through emails to and from members of the Academic Integrity Committee and filled out paperwork the next day, all while teaching my high school class, I felt as if I were the one being punished. That feeling remained as the process dragged on, a process I was already beginning to regret. But, as college professor Lucy learned in May Sarton's 1961 novel, *The Small Room*, when she reported plagiarism by a top student, "... you've set machinery in motion that cannot be stopped now."*

How did we get here?

The literature on intellectual property, academic dishonesty, and copyright is replete with tales of apparent plagiarism by famous writers through history. These stories point to the fact that attitudes, practices, concepts, rules, and standards for academic honesty are neither universal nor timeless. From the Roman playwright Terence, accused in the second century BCE of borrowing from earlier Greek writers (Arnott, 2019), to Shakespeare, who famously borrowed his stories not only from old folktales but friends, the literary world is full morally ambiguous guidance from those who glibly bent what we now accept as the rules. Mark Twain wrote scornfully of

plagiarism concerns, saying, “substantially all ideas are second-hand” (Smith, Salamo, & Bucci, 1988). Oscar Wilde was repeatedly accused of plagiarism, to the point that when he remarked to a colleague, "I wish I'd said that," the reply was, "Don't worry, Oscar, you will" (Jeffers, 2002). Bertolt Brecht admitted to a “laxity in questions of intellectual property” when he was accused of plagiarizing poet Francois Villon in his play *The Threepenny Opera* (Fuegi, 2002), and James Joyce was “quite content to go down to posterity as a scissors and paste man” (Shovlin, 2012, p. 122).

Our students’ “scissors and paste” look quite different from Joyce’s. Today’s students have a staggering number of possible sources that include old and new media, defined by media theorist Manovich (2003) as digital, computerized, or networked information and communication technologies that emerged in the later part of the 20th century. Web publishing has made many sources, increasingly including scholarly journals, more accessible. While authorship of academic work is typically unambiguous, on the world wide web as a whole, that is not the case. Digital text is re-combined and re-posted (Pelli & Bigelow, 2012) until the most conscientious student may find it challenging to cite such work correctly, contributing to what Harden Blair (2009) called “the massive and tangled discourse that surrounds textual ownership and plagiarism” (p. 188). Harden Blair's statement implies the question, can one “own” text? And, how is student plagiarism related to copyright?

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution states, “The Congress shall have Power ...To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries (Legal Information Institute, n.d.)” Copyright protects the original expression of ideas in a particular form, and addresses economic concerns. While copyright does not provide for the ownership of an idea, the

published statement of that idea in certain words and phrases is protected. The concept of plagiarism applies to those unique and protected expressions of ideas, though in academic settings, typically not to economic concerns. Academic authors are mostly not materially hurt when a student fails to cite their work in a course assignment.

Stealing words

As the story goes, in first century CE Rome, poet Martial accused his rival Fidentinus, using the Latin word for kidnapping, *plagiarius*, claiming metaphorically that Fidentinus had stolen words that belonged to him (England, 2008). Many of our students understand plagiarism as just this – taking someone else’s words as your own. Blum (2009) expanded upon this understanding, raising these additional points: “If plagiarism involves *improperly* taking another person’s words and claiming them as one’s own, it follows that (1) there are proper ways to take others’ words, (2) people can “own” words, and (3) others’ words (ideas as well as texts) can be distinguished from one’s own” (p. 29).

Blum’s first point subsumes the mechanical formatting rules that students must learn and use. Rules of citation and attribution can be learned, coached, practiced, and assessed. There is indeed a proper way to “take,” or at least borrow, the words of another. On Blum’s second point, postmodern scholars hold that one cannot own ideas or words; however, authors are due “honor and recompense [for] the encoding of those ideas” (Buranen & Roy, 1999, p. xviii), though the forms of recognition and compensation have varied over time and context. In student work, the “honor” they owe is proper acknowledgement. Blum’s third point implies the question of whether or not there is a clear line between one person’s written or published work and that of another. Authorship has become more universal and harder to define, with web publication and

self-publication more common and accessible, and the growth of social networks and other user-generated content, all blurring lines that formerly seemed clear.

Nor are citation rules always as straightforward as they are sometimes presented to be. For example, while guidelines for plagiarism avoidance typically dictate citing any source that is not common knowledge, as writing tasks grow in complexity, citing conventions become less clear. For example, intertextuality, a literary discourse strategy utilized by writers in novels, poetry, and theatre (Bazerman, 2003), in which literary references evoke other texts, does not require quoting or citing.

How does this look to students?

“You wanted an essay and I found one” (Kellner, 2107, n.d.) remarked a student when confronted with having copied an entire writing assignment. When surveyed, however, students largely believe that they accept our conception of academic honesty and college policies enforcing the same (Blum, 2009); however, they also highly prioritize academic achievement, measured narrowly by grades, and these values conflict at times. College students surveyed reported wanting uniform policies on academic dishonesty, with stronger penalties for infractions; however, they did not wish to have a role in reporting their peers. They did not regard passive participation in academic dishonesty as worthy a consequence, because there was no material gain for the student who, say, allowed another to copy.

Students not incorrectly regard their course work as having an audience of one (their instructor or professor). They may therefore wonder why, for example, full citations are necessary, as their sources may be assigned and are clearly known to the instructor (Malgwi & Rakovski, 2009).

A framework for understanding and responding to student plagiarism

Cressey (1973), writing about a non-academic context, theorized three elements -- pressure, opportunity, and rationale -- necessary for an individual to commit fraud. He asserted that removal of any or all of these elements precludes or greatly reduces the likelihood of fraud. Cressey's three elements were later termed the "fraud triangle" and applied to other contexts including academic honesty (Malgwi & Rakovski, 2009).

A number of factors and student circumstances may contribute to each category. *Pressure* may result from students' fear of failing a course, fear of losing financial aid or parental support, and a desire to keep up with peers, either to avoid embarrassment or to have a strong graduate or professional school application. *Opportunity* factors include the ease of electronic retrieval, storage, and reproduction of text, writing without supervision, access to previous semester's assignments via peers, perceived or actual low likelihood of detection, anticipated lack of consequences, and exam administration conditions that enable copying. *Rationalization* factors include a belief in entitlement to passing or achieving a good grade, a belief that "everyone is doing it" in school and in the larger world, coursework that is viewed as extremely difficult or unfair, an instructor who is viewed as a hard grader, unclear course policies, a belief that no one is being hurt, and a lack of knowledge of what constitutes academic dishonesty (Malgwi & Rakovski, 2009).

Applying Cressey's theory to my student Ryan, I see that pressure was present in his end-of-semester crunch to complete one last assignment for my course. In fact, this assignment was a menu of options that included conference attendance, an interview, participation with a professional organization, and the fallback option of a 10-page paper. Ryan's late-semester choice of the paper option, once it was too late to do the other activities, argues for the existence of pressure in his academic life. Opportunity was also present; Ryan certainly had the resources

to locate and easily cut and paste from two sources on his paper topic. While I had made an effort to thwart this opportunity by including a component of the assignment that called for writing about his choice of and personal connection to the topic, the fact that I pursued the incident as a plagiarism case, rather than a deficient response to an assignment, negated my attempt to minimize opportunity. Ryan's rationale is less clear. It seems obvious that Ryan knew what he was doing by cutting and pasting pages of unaltered text, and it is hard to imagine that he truly believed that this would have been an acceptable way to address the assignment had he just used quotation marks. At the official meeting, he presented himself as hapless, contrite, and guilty, but still puzzled by all the fuss and truly unaware of exactly what he did wrong. He had previously expressed high hopes of doing well in the course, and until this incident occurred, I believe that he had regarded me as a fair professor. But clearly some rationale existed in his mind.

Potential utility of Cressey's framework lies in his theory that removal of any one of the three elements will prevent or reduce the incidence of fraud, or in an academic setting, cheating or plagiarism. While no single strategy, deterrent, policy, or punishment has been successful in addressing academic dishonesty (Malgwi & Rakovski, 2009), a combination of strategies to address pressure, opportunity, and rationale may be effective. Some of the strategies that follow address the removal of opportunity for students to commit plagiarism, such as the development of better assignments and the use of plagiarism-detection software. While none of the strategies expressly address pressure that students feel, especially late in the semester, some of the education strategies might indirectly contribute to a lessening of feelings of pressure. Strategies of modeling and education aim at weakening any rationale students may have that justifies

plagiarizing. Education efforts also address the needs of students whose apparent plagiarism actually constitutes a genuine lack of knowledge and experience with academic writing.

There was a formal meeting early in the next semester. Although I was not teaching a course that semester, I made the drive to the college to meet with Ryan and my department chair, whose help I had sought and appreciated in getting to this point. But now, he acted as if he were Ryan's pal. That cast me as the bad guy in the story, and I left the meeting feeling worse and more confused. I wished I had figured out some other way, with less paperwork and fewer committees, some way that I felt like a teacher, not accuser, some way that I wasn't ruining Ryan's life, some way that he could learn more and defend less.

What to do?

Advocate for support for contingent faculty. In order to be effective in all aspects of teaching, including promoting academic honesty, part-time faculty members must be included and integrated into academic systems including orientation, support, communication, resources, and social networks (Ryesky, 2007). Academic integrity initiatives cannot be successful when the majority of teaching faculty are not functioning and interacting members of their department or school. Academic integrity committees typically exclude contingent faculty from membership, depriving the committee of perspective these faculty members could provide, as well as denying contingent faculty the insight that such service might impart.

Use plagiarism-detection software, cautiously. For more than two decades, the ability to cut and paste, including from online sources, has been a blessing to students, teachers, researchers, and many others, as well as providing an infamous source of easily plagiarized material. And for nearly as long, there has been a virtual arms race of plagiarism-detection measures and counter-measures, as software has been developed, refined, and marketed to ferret

out such copying. Students have responded to plagiarism-detection programs by tweaking their writing techniques to fall below the software's radar, often with the help of programs available to them on the internet designed to help them avoid detection (Warn, 2006).

Professors may choose to access commercial plagiarism-detection programs, some of which link to ever-growing databases from many sources, though some faculty member object to having their students' work to such databases. An alternative to software specifically developed and marketed to detect plagiarism is simply to use the same search engine that students use, usually google, if faculty wish to hunt down copied material, although specially designed software certainly streamlines the detection process. Programs such as Turnitin efficiently detect verbatim copying (iParadigms, 2011), though they may miss lightly paraphrased uncredited material. For example, they may not detect the popular practice of using material from a source such as Wikipedia but then citing a more academically acceptable source (Warn, 2006).

Be good role models. The most effective technology cannot replace the need for good role models. Many instructors, from resource-lacking adjuncts to full professors, could be more conscientious in citing sources and giving credit when preparing class materials. Many professors are guilty of using a colleague's presentation slides only lightly edited, without explicitly crediting the creator. While student presenters are expected to create their own slide shows and to include a source slide, their professors do not always do this. Uncredited photographs and graphics frequently appear on slides, and material posted to on-line course management sites such as Blackboard may lack full citations on reading assignments. We need to lead by example; students learn from their professors' actions as well as from their syllabus statements.

Educate. Plagiarism is dishonest not only because the plagiarizer appropriates the words of another without acknowledgment; it is dishonest in its representation of a false image of the student's ideas and abilities. Furthermore, students cheat themselves when they plagiarize because they forfeit the benefit of meaningful feedback on their own written work.

Blum (2009) recommended approaching plagiarism avoidance as a set of skills to be taught and learned, one of the competencies that comprise academic writing. Students can be instructed to routinely mark text and record the source of anything they cut and paste from the internet. Some websites offer support, prepared citations or a clickable "cite this page" option; some automatically add a web reference to cut and pasted text. Professors can demonstrate that they value proper citing of sources by including this as a criterion on grading rubrics. Other supportive practices include having students do some of the assignment in class, collecting notes, reviewing drafts, and conferencing with students about work in progress (Williams, 2001). This provides an opportunity to point out a questionable passage, or ask where a passage or idea came from, questions that may net either reassurance or a teachable moment with the student.

In addition to the important need to directly teaching about the conventions of appropriate citing, students also need instruction and mentoring in developing and finding their voice as they use and write from academic sources (Emerson, 2008). Students, especially those who come to higher education without fluent writing skills or an orientation to academic writing, struggle with what appear to them to be contradictory directives. These have been organized into four statements by the Purdue University Online Writing Lab (2019) of the messages students believe they are hearing from their professors:

- (1) Develop a topic based on what has already been said and written BUT Write something new and original

(2) Rely on experts and authorities' opinions BUT Improve upon and/or disagree with those same opinions

(3) Give credit to previous researchers BUT Make your own significant contribution

(4) Improve your English to fit into a discourse community by building upon what you hear and read BUT Use your own words and your own voice.

Academic writing is a complex process that involves engaging with and incorporating the ideas and published words of others. Students who are just beginning this process often engage in a practice termed "patchwriting" (Howard, 1993, p. 233), defined as "copying from a source text and then deleting some words, altering grammatical structures, or plugging in one-for-one synonym-substitutes." This term subsumes insufficient efforts at paraphrasing, and also describes writing that comprises a number of short passages that are cut and pasted from the internet into a document, then lightly paraphrased as Howard describes. This may describe plagiarism, or it may reflect the student's current skill level in using academic sources, and may reveal their struggle to perform that task as they experience the sort of contradictions in the four statements above.

Researchers in the Citation Project (Jamieson, 2015) applied Howard's (1993) work to common source-use errors, making recommendations for interventions for each type. These researchers believe that patchwriting is not plagiarism. Patchwriting can (1) result from a student's inexperience with conventions of academic writing and proper quotation and source attribution. In this case, they recommended that the student be provided with instruction in correctly citing sources (from the course instructor, a college Writing Center, or other source) and then asked to submit a revision of the paper. However, they found that patchwriting more

often results from (2) a student's lack of familiarity with the words and ideas in the source text; in this case, the student needs further instruction in and engagement with the source material prior to revising their paper. Work that looks like patchwriting can also result from (3) a student's intent to deceive, in which case punitive measure were recommended, ranging from course failure to suspension. Citation Project researchers advocate separating acts of plagiarism from uninformed misuse of sources, with sanctions for the former and education for the latter (Jamieson, 2015).

Develop better assignments. Professors can work to develop assignments that are less prone to plagiarism. If we are not already doing so, we need to replace papers in which students extract and report on a body of knowledge (“write 10 pages about...”) with purpose-driven work (Abilock, 2009). Students might well ask why cut-and-paste plagiarism is *not* an acceptable response to an assignment that asks them to locate information and turn in a certain number of pages, to regurgitate, rather than to analyze. Strategies that may reduce the likelihood of student plagiarism include assigning writing topics not readily found on the internet (Bailey, 2018), making changes in our assignments from year to year, limiting the sources students can use for a particular assignment, asking students to relate their own experiences to a published work, or incorporating peer review or a presentation on the topic as an additional assessment of student learning and engagement with the topic.

When we ask students to gather information on a topic using existing written sources, we must be clear that we expect their product to provide new ideas, or commentary, in the student's own words and own voice. Students may need help in developing that voice in their writing. As detailed in the previous section, they need examples, instruction, and feedback to do so. These strategies take valuable time that we rarely believe we have, but they are less time-consuming

than the efforts to detect and follow up on plagiarism, and they certainly extract less emotional toll.

No Happy Ending...

I wish my story had a better ending. I gave Ryan a failing grade. He had another unsuccessful semester, though no further difficulties with academic honesty, and he left the college. Could I have helped him more? At the time, I could not figure out a way, but I am sure now that I could have. Could I, as Colvin (2007) wrote about a similar incident, “have used the opening to teach, not prosecute” (p. 149)? I have wondered in the time since this incident what I could have done differently then with the knowledge I have now. This is what I wish I had done:

I wish I had found a way, even so late in the semester (Ryan had already returned to his parents’ home for semester break) to meet with him informally, even if this pushed resolution of the assignment into the following semester. I wish I had had a place to meet with him. I wish I had the option of giving him an incomplete in order to make time for this to happen. I wish I had held my ground, despite my insecurity as an adjunct, when I was told to do things that didn’t feel right. I wish I had responded to all the inadequacies in his paper (because the assignment was not “write 10 pages about...”) by requiring it to be redone, bringing my plagiarism concerns and findings to his attention, listening to his response, and then choosing mine. Did he need to be disciplined by the Academic Integrity Committee? Did he need instruction? I wish I had been able to seek input from colleagues informally, meaning that I wish that as an adjunct, I had such colleagues. Perhaps we could have compared notes on this student that would have allowed me to make more informed decisions. In other words, I wished to be included in the discourse of teaching faculty. Most of all, I wished I had known more, done better, and remembered that above all else, I was first a teacher.

In Conclusion

Academic honesty is a perennial concern in higher education. As university faculty endeavor to maintain ethical practices in our own work, we struggle at times to communicate with new generations of students about important aspects of academic honesty. Too often, communication about this construct is reduced to “grim warnings” (England, 2008, p. 37) in syllabi about penalties for cheating and plagiarism, and our conversations with colleagues may focus narrowly on faculty options related to plagiarism-detecting software use. Institutional responses are similarly narrowly focused on committees and procedures for the assignment of penalties for breaches of college academic honesty policies.

Faculty in teacher preparation programs, like all university faculty, wish to model for our students academically honest and ethical behaviors that extend beyond screening our students' papers for duplication. As academics, we wish to convey the crucial importance of developing and communicating original ideas as well as reporting on the ideas and words of others in an ethical manner. As teacher educators, we also want to model approaches that teacher candidates can take with them into their practice.

College faculty have a variety of responses available to us, ranging from attempting to ferret out all instances of copying and poor or missing citations to simply ignoring the problem. Ignoring is a tempting response; confrontation is unpleasant, we are never 100% sure, we are busy, someone else surely will catch them, and it is messy. However, ignoring, as we know, is not a responsible or professionally ethical response. Between ignoring the problem and a strict legalistic response is teaching.

No one understands better than college faculty members the work that goes into creating a piece of writing. Hours and days of our lives are spent creating the collections of words that a

plagiarist might take. Plagiarism, evidenced by its Latin root word referring to kidnapping, gets to the heart of our identity as academics and writers—our words are treasures to us. If we can get students to understand this, we can teach them the rest.

References

- Abilock, D. (2009). Guiding the gifted to honest work. *Knowledge Quest*, 37(3), 12-15.
- American Association of University Professors. (2019). *Background facts on contingent faculty positions*. Retrieved from <https://www.aaup.org/issues/contingency/background-facts>
- Arnott, W.G. (2019). Terence: Roman dramatist. *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Terence>
- Bailey, J. (2018, February 22). Crafting plagiarism-resistant assignments. *Plagiarism Today*. Retrieved from <https://www.plagiarismtoday.com/2018/02/22/crafting-plagiarism-resistant-assignments/>
- Binghamton University. (2019). Ethics and Integrity Policy. Retrieved from <https://www.binghamton.edu/ccpa/resources/academic-policies/ethics.html>
- Bazerman, C. (2003). Intertextuality: How texts rely on other texts. In C. Bazerman & P. Prior, *What writing does and how it does it: An introduction to analyzing texts and textual practices* (pp. 83-96). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Blum, S.D. (2009) *My word! Plagiarism and college culture*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Buranen, L., & Roy, A. M. (1999). *Perspectives on plagiarism and intellectual property in a postmodern world*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Clark, B.R. (1987). *The academic life: Small worlds, different worlds*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and Princeton University Press.
- Colvin, B.B. (2007). Another look at plagiarism in the digital age: Is it time to turn in my badge? *Teaching English in the Two Year College*, 35(2), 149-158.
- Cressey, D.R. (1973). *Other people's money* (2nd ed.). Montclair, NJ: Patterson Smith.

- Emerson, L. (2008). Plagiarism, a Turnitin trial, and an experience of cultural disorientation. In C. Eisner & M. Vicinus (Eds.), *Originality, imitation, and plagiarism: Teaching writing in the digital Age* (pp. 183-194). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- England, R. (2008). Plato among the plagiarists: The plagiarist as perpetrator and victim. *Journal of the National Collegiate Honors Council*, 9(2), 35-37.
- Fuegi, J. (2002). *Brecht & Co.: Sex, politics, and the making of the modern drama*. New York: Grove Press.
- Garner, B.A. (Ed.). (2019). *Black's law dictionary*. Toronto, CA: Thomson Reuters.
- Gilmore, B. (2008). *Plagiarism: Why it happens & how to prevent it*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Hall, J. (2005, February 9). Plagiarism across the curriculum: How academic communities can meet the challenge of the undocumented writer. *Across the Disciplines*, 2, 1-18. Retrieved from <https://wac.colostate.edu/docs/atd/articles/hall2005.pdf>
- Harden Blair, C. (2009). Panic and plagiarism: Authorship and academic dishonesty in a remix culture. *MediaTropes eJournal*, 1(1), 159–192.
- Howard, R.M. (1993). A plagiarism penitence. *Journal of Teaching Writing*, 11(3), 233-246.
- Hua-Li, J., Sandnes, F., Yo-Ping, H., Li, C., & Law, K. (2008). On students' strategy-preferences for managing difficult course work. *IEEE Transactions on Education*, 51(2), 157-165.
- Hudd, S.S., Apgar, C., & Bronson, E.F. (2009). Creating a campus culture of integrity: Comparing the perspectives of full- and part-time faculty. *Journal of Higher Education*, 80(21), 46-177.
- International Center for Academic Integrity. (2017). Statistics. Retrieved from <https://academicintegrity.org/statistics/>

- iParadigms. (2011). *Plagiarism and the web: Myths and realities* [White paper]. Retrieved from <http://go.turnitin.com/paper/plagiarism-web-myths-realities>
- Jamieson S. (2015). Is it plagiarism or patchwriting? Toward a nuanced definition. In T. Bretag (Ed.), *Handbook of academic integrity* (pp.1-13). Singapore: Springer.
- Jeffers, T.L. (2002). Plagiarism high and low: Is it ever permissible to steal words? *Commentary* 114(3), 54-61. Retrieved from <https://www.commentarymagazine.com/articles/plagiarism-high-and-low/>
- Kellner, M. (2017, April 6). Are millennials programmed to cheat? *Deseret News*. Retrieved from <https://www.deseret.com/2017/4/6/20596502>
- Kolich, A.M. (1983). Plagiarism: The worm of reason. *College English*, 45(2), 141-148.
- Legal Information Institute. (n.d.). U.S. Constitution Article 1. Retrieved from <https://www.law.cornell.edu/constitution/article1>
- Liddell, J., & Fong, V. (2005). Faculty perceptions of plagiarism. *Journal of College and Character*, 6(2). DOI: 10.2202/1940-1639.1416.
- Ma, H., Wan, G., & Lu, E. (2008). Digital cheating and plagiarism in schools. *Theory into Practice*, 47(3), 197-203.
- Malamud, B. (1961). *A new life*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy.
- Malgwi, C.A., & Rakovski, C.C. (2009). Combating academic fraud: Are students reticent about uncovering the covert? *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 7(3), 207-221.
- Manovich, L. (2003). New media from Borges to HTML. In N. Wardrip-Fruin & N. Montfort (Eds.), *The new media reader* (pp. 13-25). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Moeck, P.G. (2002). Academic dishonesty: Cheating among community college students. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 26, 479-491.

- Pelli, D. G., & Bigelow, C. (2009, October 20). A writing revolution. *Seed Magazine*. Retrieved from http://seedmagazine.com/content/article/a_writing_revolution/
- Purdue University Online Writing Lab. (2019). Avoiding plagiarism: Overview and contradictions. Retrieved from https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/research_and_citation/using_research/avoiding_plagiarism/index.html
- Ryesky, K.H. (2007). Part time soldiers: Deploying adjunct faculty in the war against student plagiarism. *BYU Education and Law Journal*, 2007(1), 119-151.
- Sarton, M. (1976). *The small room*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton.
- Shovlin, F. (2012). *Journey westward: Joyce, Dubliners and the literary revival*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, H.E., Salamo, L., & Bucci, R. (1988). *Mark Twain's letters, Volume 1: 1853-1866*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Turnitin. (2019). *Education with integrity*. Retrieved from <https://www.turnitin.com/>
- Warn, J. (2006). Plagiarism software: No magic bullet! *Higher Education Research and Development*, 25(2), 195-208.
- Williams, S. (2001). How do I know if they're cheating? Teacher strategies in an information age. *Curriculum Journal*, 12(2), 225-239.

Author Biography:

V. Sue Atkinson is a visiting assistant professor in the Department of Teaching, Learning, and Educational Leadership at Binghamton University, where she teaches in the special education program. She has had a long career teaching and supervising programs for infants through postsecondary students serving both typically developing children and students with disabilities, and she trains teachers to work with these students with an emphasis on inclusive teaching practices. She holds a Doctor of Education in educational theory and practice and a Master of Science in special education from Binghamton University. Her bachelor's degree in child study is from Tufts University. She writes on topics related to education, policy, child development, and disability and has presented papers at national/international and regional conferences including the Council for Exceptional Children Division on Career Development and Transition, New York State Council for Exceptional Children, and New York State English Council.

The vignette that frames her chapter is an anonymized true story that did *not* take place at her current university.