



Twenty Years of Academic Integrity:
Top Articles & Book Chapters
1992-2012

Tricia Bertram Gallant, Ph.D.

Lead Editor

© International Center for Academic Integrity, 2012



The International Center for Academic Integrity

TOP 42 AI ARTICLES & BOOK CHAPTERS PUBLISHED BETWEEN 1992-2012

Thanks to the Guiding Team: Brad Zakarin, D.B. Christian, Art Wilson, Karen Clifford, Leah Bryant, Patricia Mahaffey, Christine Killoran

And thanks to the Article Reviewers: Breea Bacon, Karen Clifford, Paula Gabbert, Barbara Grano, Danielle Istl, Anne Jimenez, Charlin Jones, Charlie Myers, Esrold Nurse, Sandi Rhoten, Judy Sheppler, Mark Sheldon, Simon, Fred Van Horn, David Wangaard, Art Wilson, Tim Terpstra, Jennifer Jensen, Shawn Peoples, Neil Morpeth, Katrina Hawes, Nancy Westrup

The articles or book chapters listed in this document were reviewed by 2 reviewers (3 in the case of a significant rating discrepancy) and received a rating of at least 4/5 in four areas: Important Addition to the literature, relevance to a broad (even international) audience, offered something new to the field (e.g., perspective, research method) at the time of publication, and overall quality.

We believe that all new researchers in the field of academic integrity should begin their literature review with these seminal pieces.

-
- 1 Aaron, R. M. (1992). Student academic dishonesty: Are collegiate institutions addressing the issue? *NASPA Journal, Winter (2)*, 107-113.
 - 2 Bertram Gallant, T. (2007). The complexity of integrity culture change: A case study of a liberal arts college. *The Review of Higher Education, 30 (4)*, 391-411
 - 3 Bertram Gallant, Tricia, & Drinan, Patrick (2006). Institutionalizing academic integrity: administrator perceptions and institutional actions. *NASPA Journal, 43 (4)*, 61-81
 - 4 Bertram Gallant, Tricia, & Drinan, Patrick. (2008). Toward a Model of Academic Integrity Institutionalization: Informing Practice in Postsecondary Education. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 38 (2)*, 25-44
 - 5 Christensen Hughes, J. M., & McCabe, D. L. (2006). Understanding academic misconduct. *Canadian Journal of Postsecondary education, 36 (1)*, 49-63
 - 6 Cole, S. & Kiss, E. (2000) What Can We Do about Student Cheating? *About Campus, May-June*, 5-12

- 7 Compton, Josh and Michael Pfau. "Inoculating Against Pro-Plagiarism Justifications: Rational and Affective Strategies." *Journal of Applied Communication Research* (February 2008): 98 – 119
- 8 Davis, S. F., & Ludvigson, H. W. (1995). Additional data on academic dishonesty and a proposal for remediation. *Teaching of Psychology*, 22, 119-122
- 9 Eisenberg, Jacob (2004). To cheat or not to cheat: effects of moral perspective and situational variables on students' attitudes. *Journal of Moral Education*, 33 (2), 163-178
- 10 Genereux, R. L., & McLeod, B. A. (1995). Circumstances surrounding cheating: A questionnaire study of college students. *Research in Higher Education*, 36 (6), p.687-704
- 11 Granitz, N., & Loewy, D. (2007). Applying ethical theories: Interpreting and responding to student plagiarism. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 72, 293-306
- 12 Howard, Rebecca Moore and Laura Davies. "[Plagiarism in the Internet Age.](http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/mar09/vol66/num06/Plagiarism-in-the-Internet-Age.aspx)" *Educational Leadership* (March 2009): 64-67. (<http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/mar09/vol66/num06/Plagiarism-in-the-Internet-Age.aspx>)
- 13 Hutton, P. A. (2006). Understanding student cheating and what educators can do about it. *College Teaching*, 54 (1), 171-176
- 14 Jordon, A. E. (2001). College student cheating: The role of motivation, perceived norms, attitudes, and knowledge of institutional policy. *Ethics & Behavior*, 11, 233-247
- 15 Kibler, W. L. (1993). Academic dishonesty: A student development dilemma. *NASPA Journal*, 30 (4), 252-267
- 16 Kibler, W. L. (1993). A framework for addressing academic dishonesty from a student development perspective. *NASPA Journal*, 31(1), 8-18
- 17 McCabe, D.L. (1992). The influence of situational ethics on cheating among college students. *Sociological Inquiry*, 62 (3), 365-374
- 18 McCabe, D. L. (1993). Faculty responses to academic dishonesty: The influence of honor codes. *Research in Higher education*, 34 (5), 647-658
- 19 McCabe, Donald L. (2005). Cheating among college and university students: A North American perspective. *International Journal of Educational Integrity*, 1 (1), 1-11. (p. 5)
- 20 McCabe, D. L. (2005). It takes a village: Academic dishonesty & educational opportunity. *Liberal Education*, Summer/Fall, 26-31
- 21 McCabe, Donald L., & Bowers, William J. (1994). Academic dishonesty among males in college: A thirty year perspective. *Journal of College Student Development*, 35 (January), 5-10
- 22 McCabe, D. L., & Pavela, G. (2000). Some good news about academic integrity. *Change*, September/October, 32-38

- 23 McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (1993). Academic dishonesty: Honor codes and other contextual influences. *The Journal of Postsecondary education*, 64 (5), 522-538
- 24 McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (1996). What we know about cheating in college: Longitudinal trends and recent developments. *Change, January/February*, 29-33
- 25 McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (2002). Honesty and honor codes. *Academe*, 88 (1), 37-41
- 26 McCabe, D. L., Butterfield, K. D. & Trevino, L., K (2003). Faculty & Academic Integrity: The Influence of Current Honor Codes and Past Honor Code Experiences. *Research in Higher Education*, 44 (3), 367-385
- 27 McCabe, D. L., Trevino, L., K., & Butterfield, K. D. (2001). Dishonesty in Academic Environments: The Influence of Peer Reporting Requirements. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 72 (1), 29-45
- 28 McCabe, D. L., Trevino, L., K., & Butterfield, K. D. (2001). Cheating in academic institutions: A decade of research. *Ethics & Behavior*, 11 (3), 219-233
- 29 McCabe, D.L., Trevino, L.K., & Butterfield, K.D. (2002). Honor codes and other contextual influences on academic integrity: A replication and extension to modified honor code settings. *Research in Higher Education*, 43 (3), 357-378
- 30 Moeck, P. G. (2002). Academic dishonesty: Cheating among college students. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 26, 479-491
- 31 Nonis, S., & Swift, C. O. (2001). An examination of the relationship between academic dishonesty and workplace dishonesty: A multicampus investigation. *Journal of Education for Business*, November/December, 60-76
- 32 Passow, H. J., Mayhew, M. J., Finelli, C. J., Harding, T. S., & Carpenter, D. D. (2006). Factors influencing engineering students' decisions to cheat by type of assessment. *Research in Higher Education*, 47 (6), 643-684
- 33 Payne, S.L., and Nantz, K.S. (1994). Social accounts and metaphors about cheating. *College Teaching*, 42, 90-96
- 34 Pecorari, Diane. "Good and Original: Plagiarism and Patchwriting in Academic Second-Language Writing." *Journal of Second Language Writing* (2003): 317-345
- 35 Power, L. G. (2009). University students' perceptions of plagiarism. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 80 (6), 643-662
- 36 Simon, C. A., Carr, J. R., McCullough, S. M., Morgan, S. J., Olsen, T., & Ressel, M. (2003). The other side of academic dishonesty: The relationship between faculty skepticism, gender and strategies for managing student academic dishonesty cases. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 28 (2), 193-207

- 37 Sowden, C. (2004). Plagiarism and the culture of multilingual students in postsecondary education abroad. *ELT Journal*, 59 (3), 226-233
- 38 Stearns, S. A. (2001). The student-instructor relationship's effect on academic integrity. *Ethics & Behavior*, 11 (3), 275-285
- 39 Strom, P. S., & Strom, R. D. (2007). Cheating in middle school and high school. *The Educational Forum*, 71 (Winter), 104-116
- 40 Townley, C., & Parsell, M. (2004). Technology and academic virtue: Student plagiarism through the looking glass. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 6, 271-277
- 41 Whitley, B. E., Jr. (1998). Factors associated with cheating among college students. *Research in Higher Education*, 39 (3), 235-274
- 42 Whitley, B. E., Jr., & Keith-Spiegel, P. (2001). Academic integrity as an institutional issue. *Ethics & Behavior*, 11 (3), 325-342

SUMMARIES OF ARTICLES RATED 4.0+

Article #	SUMMARY 1	SUMMARY 2	SUMMARY 3
1.	<p>Report on a study that included a national sample of 4-year public and private colleges and community colleges on their publication and dissemination of AI codes and policies with a total of 183 schools responding to the study survey. Vast majority of institutions did publish codes and policies, however, 4 year colleges were recognized to “more likely to possess a specific set of guidelines for violations than community colleges”. Discussion noted, “The greatest concern produced by the data is the limited extent to which faculty discuss student academic integrity in their syllabi or in class.” And thus have not implemented 1986 recommendations by NASPA on AI.</p>	<p>Their suggestions are pretty obvious. Not as helpful on addressing ai issues as other articles.</p>	
2.	<p>This case study examines the efforts of a four-year American liberal arts college to change the academic culture from one characterized by dishonesty to one of integrity during the 1997-98 school year at Lasallian College. A faculty committee decided that the most effective way to change the culture was to create an academic honor code that would express support for integrity, discourage academic dishonesty, and operate as a symbol of the mutual trust and respect between students and faculty. However, faculty resistance, supplemented by the college’s own culture, hampered efforts for cultural change with little chance of an implementation of a culture of academic integrity. The failure was more one of an improperly implemented organizational change of culture than one of denying academic honesty.</p> <p>The strength of this article is a Scheinian understanding of the importance of organizational change and the need for total buy in to change a college’s culture to one of academic honesty.</p>	<p>Excellent analysis of organizational change through a case study of a liberal arts college transformation around issues of academic integrity. Implications for further research and the field. Should be included.</p>	<p>2 purposes: 1) to expand the existing research base with this qualitative case study that examines the complexity of integrity culture change and 2) offer general implications for practice and research in leading integrity culture change.</p>
3.	<p>This article reviews how student affairs professionals may be more successful at institutionalizing academic integrity if they understand the most significant obstacles they face and recognize who the best champions and catalysts are for strengthening academic integrity on campuses. It also provides some insights into the differences in perceptions about the success of institutionalization depending on institution type. It suggests that focusing more attention on faculty than students will lead to greater</p>	<p>This article highlights gaps between “policies and practices” in managing academic integrity on college campuses and pinpoints the inherent struggles that faculty and student affairs administrators have in managing institutionalizing academic integrity. The article provides a very clear and concise approach to understanding the dynamics involved in institutionalizing</p>	<p>The article details the importance of faculty as change agents in the institutionalization of academic integrity as they have opportunities to promote the importance of integrity in their students and in the institution at large. Student affairs professionals have this same responsibility but on a smaller level. Many faculty members do not actually adhere to policies as strictly as administration believes they do; cumbersome</p>

Article #	SUMMARY 1	SUMMARY 2	SUMMARY 3
	<p>success, and provides examples of how this might be achieved. It contributes to the field in that it narrows for academic integrity administrators where they should choose to focus their greatest efforts in order to move their schools closer to academic integrity institutionalization.</p>	<p>the approach to academic integrity on college campuses, by spelling out quite succinctly the role that student affairs and faculty can play in changing the cultural norms on a campus. Main strengths include the review of the current literature and the methodology used in the study. There is much food for thought in this article that adds mightily to field as campuses continue to struggle with institutionalizing academic integrity.</p>	<p>policies and procedures are one of the main obstacles to institutionalization. For institutionalization to be successful this must change and all faculty members must enforce them. It is important that integrity policies are at the forefront and that faculty promote them to students to ensure their education and dedication to the value of integrity and to detract from many institutions' peer culture that supports dishonesty. Institutions must focus more heavily on education than on policing and punishing and must close the gap between cost and benefits. Students must see integrity as profitable and dishonesty as costly; in many cases currently, dishonesty, which can help to raise a student's grade, can be viewed as more profitable without faculty-led proper understanding and education of integrity.</p>
4.	<p>Theory to practice case study model of institutionalized academic integrity. Practical application that provides new look at the role of academic affairs leadership to sustain academic integrity institutionalization.</p>	<p>Model developed and used to identify why academic dishonesty is happening on higher education campuses. How to use the model and theory to inform practice to improve the academic culture in higher education.</p>	
5.	<p>Excellent comprehensive overview of academic integrity research, publications and strategies in US higher education with suggestions for new focus and research in the Canadian higher education institutions. Great recap of academic integrity principles, research and assumptions essential for knowledge of the field.</p>	<p>Canadian higher education can learn from the research and results provided by American studies on academic integrity. Most personal factors cannot be changed by institutions but attitudes can be, as can the various contextual factors that can push students to make poor decisions. To create a community where academic dishonesty is socially unacceptable it is important to maximize student understanding of policies, have a publicized honour code, have appropriately severe penalties for cheating, train faculty and TAs appropriately to recognize, report, and prevent cheating behavior, make coursework worthwhile, interesting, and reasonably challenging though possible, and have good quality teaching rather than faculty who solely focus on</p>	

Article #	SUMMARY 1	SUMMARY 2	SUMMARY 3
		<p>their research responsibilities. These components being absent, particularly those related to quality of teaching and assignments, increase students' opinions that they should copy, should allow others to copy, make them feel like they want to cheat, and that cheating is justified. Students must feel academic integrity is important and that this behavior is warranted, must want to learn rather than have their educations be a means to an end, understand expectations, be assessed in meaningful ways, have minimal opportunities to act with misconduct, and play a part in defining integrity on campus. It is important that faculty do all they can to ensure these factors are present.</p>	
6.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - five fundamental values - provides tips for reducing cheating - provides list of resources <p>Like Fundamental Values</p>	<p>The article discusses the problem of academic integrity, and the recent wave of media attention devoted to it. They go on to note that there are two broad approaches one can take to academic integrity - an "arms race" approach, based on punishing wrong doing, and a "values" based approach, based on promoting the things that lead to good choices apart from sanctions. Specifically, they refer to an ICAI initiative that distilled these down to: honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility. They then go on to illustrate the application of these values with a series of case studies. They also make the point that instances of questionable conduct represent "teachable moments". A particularly useful part of the article are the "tips for discouraging plagiarism", as well as a list of "useful resources on student cheating. While the media attention has come and gone several times since 2000, the latter insights remain quite useful.</p>	

Article #	SUMMARY 1	SUMMARY 2	SUMMARY 3
7.	This article evaluates possible pro-active orientation approaches to discourage violation of academic integrity. It found that fear-based strategies are not very effective, while giving students an opportunity to participate in discussion of cases and possible institutional responses is.	This relatively recent article uses the metaphor of inoculation to propose fighting viral plagiarism. The authors hypothesize that “inoculating” students before they are tempted to plagiarize ultimately helps reduce the incidence and severity of plagiarism much as a polio vaccine protects one from polio. Three types of inoculation can take place: guilt-based, fear-based and rational with the first being the most effective. The article is long and at times pedantic, but ultimately offers a “vaccine to potential plagiarists and makes an intriguing contribution to the literature.	
8.	The authors present survey data on the responses by over 2,000 undergraduates in the junior or senior year regarding, “the frequency of cheating, reasons for cheating, and influence of penalties on cheating.” A model is suggested and discussed to resist cheating. Results included the recognition that cheating in college was incrementally less than cheating reported in high school. Women appeared to be more deterred from cheating if instructors announced strict penalties. Grades were cited (29.5%) most frequently as a motivation to cheat with time constraints (14.3%) followed by “usually don’t study” at 13.6%. The article includes a suggested model to guide teaching practice to reduce cheating.	On the plus side: large sample (2,153); good basic analysis; good lit review; packs a lot in a short article. However, the article doesn’t make clear the definition used for cheating. When answering the survey, were students including exams? Quizzes? Homework assignments? Cards? (Ok, I am pretty sure they didn’t count that last one.) But it makes some good points. One is that contrary to “McCabe’s contention (see Pavela, 1993) that academic dishonesty is learned during one’s collegiate career and is largely determined by its social acceptability at a given institution.” McCabe might disagree, but they have some compelling evidence that links history of cheating in high school to history of cheating in college. If this point is not elsewhere in the literature, then this is worth publishing for that reason.	
9.	This article reviews the correlation between moral development and one’s actual behaviors through a study of junior high school students in a collectivist society. The author differentiated between students who viewed exam cheating as a moral issue and those who did not and discovered that the former were less approving of cheating than the latter,	This article studied the implications of a moral perspective on cheating and of three situational variables on attitudes related to two types of cheating on exams, viz. active and passive cheating. The research found (1) that students who were not morally oriented tolerated	Explores effects of moral orientation on 3 situational variables (exam importance, supervision level and peers’ norms) on attitudes toward two types of cheating in school exams. The results showed that a-morally oriented students approved cheating more significantly than those with moral orientation.

Article #	SUMMARY 1	SUMMARY 2	SUMMARY 3
	<p>although this did not necessarily correlate to their behaviors in the face of certain situational variables. The variables studied were the exam's importance, the level of supervision at the exam, and peer norms. Two types of exam cheating behaviors were examined: active and passive copying. The study revealed that passive copying was viewed as more justified than active copying. With respect to the variables, test importance had a marginal effect on active copying and no effect on passive copying, while both supervision and peer norms had significant effects on both types of copying. These results are instructive in that, among other things, they give educators a sense of how moral development affects cheating perceptions and behaviors, the importance of clarifying moral standards at an early age and creating a climate where cheating is unacceptable, and how best to control situational variables to control cheating.</p>	<p>more cheating than student who students who were morally oriented; (2) that the importance of the exam had only marginally significant on copying and (3) That level of supervision and class norms had significant effects on the attitudes of active and passive cheaters. This article adds a tremendous amount to the field in understanding the role that moral values plays in cheating attitudes, even though the subjects studied were middle school children. Following the connections between the models of Kolberg and Turiel was a little challenging.</p>	
10.	<p>The purpose of this article was to expand on the current research to investigate "planned versus spontaneous cheating, circumstances that increase versus ones that decrease the likelihood of cheating, and different types of cheating." The article nicely reviews the literature to date and places the new study in the context of that literature. The article reports on a study involving 365 students from one institution and provides a statistical analysis for each area of investigation as well as an extensive discussion of the issues in the context of that analysis.</p>	<p>This article sought to highlight beliefs and behaviors associated with cheating. The article builds on previous research in indentifying the circumstances that were most likely to increase and decrease cheating. The authors made a clear distinction between planned cheating and spontaneous cheating, yet no difference in response was found between them. The article adds to the bevy on research on the reasons why students cheat, but also attempts to offer some ways in which we might predict student behavior around cheating.</p>	
11.	<p>Comprehensive study on ethical theories students apply to justify plagiarism as well as strategies to counteract such justification. Well developed construct of applicable theories and content analysis for a specific cohort with generalized implications. Very helpful for on-going discussion concerning understanding student motivation. Disclosure: I was the "dean of students" who helped provide the student's rationalization for cheating as part of the author's content analysis.</p>	<p>Great theories on what causes plagiarism and even better responses to each type of plagiarism. Loved it.</p>	

Article #	SUMMARY 1	SUMMARY 2	SUMMARY 3
12.	<p>Howard and Davies make excellent suggestions on how to build pedagogy that combats cheating. The pedagogy “should both teach source-reading skills and take into consideration our increasingly wired world. And it should communicate that plagiarism is wrong in terms of what society values about schools and learning.” They then provide an outstanding step-by-step curriculum based on the work of Sue Shirley (2004). This article gives excellent anti-cheating strategies for the classroom instructor.</p>	<p>Opinion piece reminding us that the internet is not the problem in plagiarism and that we still need to help students understand the value of scholarly writing and how to strengthen their writing through proper attribution, the skill of summarizing, etc. While well written the article does not offer any new insight. We have been encouraging instructors to help students develop as writers/critical thinkers in these ways for many years and continued to do so even when the internet made it easier for students to fail to follow the tenets of good writing. I do not think that it advances the field and should not be included.</p>	<p>It is important for students to understand the concepts behind proper writing so they can properly complete their assignments without risk of plagiarism. Many students are insufficiently skilled in basic writing skills such as summarizing and it is important that these skills be honed to decrease plagiarism. Alternative projects that probe reflection, creativity, and summarization, or that teach students how to use research tools properly can help ensure students internalize and understand what they read. This way students will not need to resort to putting sentences into their own words, rather than sections that they don’t understand or have the time to read and fully summarize, just so they appear to be paraphrasing. Students must learn to value writing and their assignments and how to use online sources properly rather than taking shortcuts that can lead to plagiarism. Plagiarism may, in many cases, be a result of inadequate time management, disinterest in dull assignments, or an incomplete understanding of basic concepts such as the value of writing, paraphrasing, or summarizing and how to do these things properly, rather than as a result of personal characteristics.</p>
13.	<p>This article arrives at three key conclusions: (1) that persons who cheat are motivated by self-interest and decisions arrived at by a cost/benefit analysis (which analysis ultimately favors cheating); (2) that because cheating is not often observed by professors, improving social norms about academic integrity is important (this is achieved by the use of institutional codes/policies <i>coupled with</i> detection and reporting); and (3) that strong student relationships – and weak student/faculty relationships – lead to a greater acceptance of cheating and increased cheating behaviours. Specific recommendations are provided that involve both faculty and administration. This information is useful to our understanding of how to address cheating because it gives specific practical “tips” about how (and</p>	<p>Discussion of the role of peer influence in cheating and potential amelioration for cheating environment.</p>	<p>To understand reasons why students cheat through benefit/cost analysis and unobservable behaviors with social network analysis, resulting in 10 specific recommendations for educators.</p>

Article #	SUMMARY 1	SUMMARY 2	SUMMARY 3
	why) academic integrity information can be shared by administration and how faculty can strengthen their relationships with students, so as to ultimately combat the peer norms that make cheating acceptable and reduce opportunities to cheat. It challenges the common belief that individual student characteristics contribute most to cheating. To the contrary, instructors have a greater role to play; likewise, the role of the administration/institution should not be discounted.		
14.	This quantitative study looks at why students cheat by assessing two types of motivation, perceived social norms, attitudes about cheating and institutional policy then created a list of predictors for cheating. Institutional policy is the best predictor of cheating rates. Therefore, an honor code is important in the college culture. This article offers good empirical evidence for a college honor code.	Development of students' motivation to learn as related to propensities to cheat as well as the impact of knowledge of institutional policy on cheating	
15.	This article presented a comprehensive review of the literature regarding student development theory, the causes of academic dishonesty, the extent of the problem, personal characteristics of cheaters, situational factors involved (including classroom factors and faculty attitudes and behaviors), and reasons students report for cheating. A brief outline of moral development research is provided, and a developmental framework for addressing academic dishonesty based on moral development and student development theory is presented. This framework includes a clearly written policy, opportunities for discussion and dialogue, equitable adjudication procedures, and appropriate and consistent sanctions.	This article engages the reader on the research surrounding academic dishonesty as a student development problem. The article organizes the review in four key areas as follows: academic integrity as it is defined today; the causes of academic misconduct; the student development perspective and probes the relationship between moral reasoning and cheating. The review is rich and comprehensive and guides the reader through the research in an effective manner. More importantly, the end result is a clearly stated summary of findings based on the review of the literature together with a clear statement highlighting the steps that colleges can take to reduce cheating using a student development approach.	
16.	A seminal piece which is well researched with broad implications for the field on applying student development theory to academic dishonesty. The author developed a foundational framework for assessing how universities address academic dishonesty which has been used as a benchmark since it's' publication. Excellent article which should be included in the best of	This article proposes an ambitious "framework for addressing academic dishonesty". As such, I was prepared to be quite skeptical. I was also put off by the author's seeming suggestion that the modern problem of academic dishonest had its origins in the events of the	Looks at student development theory; looked at developing a framework for assessing how and why; intervention; strength is that it melds the academic side with the student affairs side by looking at student development theory

Article #	SUMMARY 1	SUMMARY 2	SUMMARY 3
	<p>the last 20 years. Has helped to shape the conversation since the 90's.</p>	<p>1960s and the demise of “in loco parentis”. On the other hand, a few paragraphs later, the author notes that concern with academic dishonesty predates the 1960s by at least a few decades, and that “moral” approaches such as honor codes collapsed at many institutions in recent decades because they were ineffective - evidently, not because of events of the 1960s.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the author goes on to make two important contributions. First, the author seems to make the distinction between viewing plagiarism as a “moral failure”, and viewing it as a consequence of insufficient ethical development. If I understand the argument, plagiarism as moral failure lends itself to a focus on sanctions to deter it. Plagiarism as a developmental problem lends itself to systematic efforts to foster the further ethical development of students. This point makes reading the article worthwhile by itself. Second, the authors propose a specific, coherent set of initiatives designed to address academic dishonesty as a developmental issue, rather than simply a moral failing. I expect to discuss this with colleagues at my own institution in the near future. This article should be included.</p> <p>(Parenthetically, if “traditional honor codes” collapsed in recent decades, it may have been because the implementation placed the emphasis on authority based structures rather than a more inclusive consensual emphasis. The more recent “modified honor codes” advocated by McCabe and Pavela (2000) seem designed to recruit students rather than just compel their behavior.)</p>	
17.	<p>McCabe looks at situational ethics to help understand student rationalizations for cheating using a quantitative study of more than 6,000</p>	<p>Excellent article and research on how situational ethics</p>	

Article #	SUMMARY 1	SUMMARY 2	SUMMARY 3
	students at 31 institutions. Their study concludes that students cheat on the basis of higher loyalties and a denial of responsibility; students see cheating as a victimless crime and condemn condemners. This article adds to the understanding of student motivation for cheating.	principles can affect cheating by college students. As always McCabe built on his and others research developing a broad based survey administered to 6,096 students at 31 highly selective colleges. No academic integrity reader would be complete without his work. Should be included.	
18.	This article presents research findings relating to faculty reports of cheating at honor code and non-code schools. These findings support previous studies that more faculty choose to deal with cheating internally rather than report it to the proper authorities under their schools' policies/procedures. The reasons are provided. This study demonstrated that this is the case even at schools with "longstanding honor code traditions," such that honor codes do not guarantee that faculty will follow the appropriate procedures. Nevertheless, the results also showed that more faculty at code schools are likely to report than faculty at non-code schools. Both groups support the involvement of both faculty and students in adjudication of cheating; however, faculty at non-code schools are much more reluctant to turn over adjudication to students only. These results are important because they demonstrate how honor codes may have a positive effect on faculty perceptions and behaviors about how to handle cheating incidents, but essentially caution that they are not a "quick fix." The article further suggests that the key to improving student integrity on campus is to ensure that all members of the campus community share responsibility for its promotion and adjudication.	Excellent analysis of the effects and limitations of honor codes.	
19.	Examination of surveys of undergraduate, graduate and faculty. Focused on other forms of cheating and global perceptions of cheating. Offered strategies to encourage Academic Integrity.	Student's perceptions about academic dishonesty with strategies to improve academic integrity.	
20.	McCabe finds that some forms of cheating have increased dramatically in 30 years and offers suggestions for managing cheating from both student	Emphasizes breadth of issue of academic dishonesty and the need to consider a broad environment and approach	

Article #	SUMMARY 1	SUMMARY 2	SUMMARY 3
	<p>and faculty perspective. McCabe notes that institutional culture is an important deterrent to cheating and that “programs aimed at distributing, explaining and gaining student and faculty acceptance of academic integrity policies may be particularly useful.” McCabe also suggests building a “hidden curriculum” which would pose ethical questions about cheating to help students learn the implications of cheating through discussion.</p> <p>This article adds to the understanding of the importance of institutional policy as mentioned in previously reviewed articles.</p>	<p>in dealing with academic dishonesty.</p>	
21.	<p>This study compares the data from surveys of students by Bowers in the early 1960’s with surveys by McCabe in the early 1990’s to document longitudinal trends in college students’ self-reported cheating behaviors. A major contribution was the study’s affirmation that there were significantly lower levels of self-reported cheating among students at honor code schools. The study found a dramatic rise in unpermitted collaboration on written assignments from the 1960’s to the 1990’s but found little support for the popular belief that there were major increases in cheating among college students during the 1980’s and 1990’s.</p>	<p>This article sought to refute popular claims made in the press in the early 1990’s that cheating on college campus had seen dramatic increases. Using comparison of two large databases gathered previously by the current authors, this study indicated that there was little evidence to support the sense that there was a dramatic increase in cheating. At the same time, two points were made that are worth underscoring: (1) that a majority of students still reported cheating on at least one occasion while in college and (2) that the nature of cheating may have been changed in that there is a slight increase in collaboration among student. This article also found that students at noncode schools reported more cheating on Tests and written work. This study not only contributes significantly to the field, it forces us to continually re-examine data before rather than make unsupported statements.</p>	
22.	<p>Excellent article on effective strategies (specifically modified honor codes) which appear to help reduce high rates of cheating. The article covers the honor code tradition, outlines development/implementation of a modified honor code and reviews the current modified honor codes on several campuses. Clearly contributed to the field and should be included.</p>	<p>Is a hopeful article amid the possible gloom. The authors note that recent research has confirmed the value of “honor codes”, even on the larger campuses thought relatively less suited to honor code based approaches. Particularly, the authors argue for what they call “modified honor codes”, which share some but not all</p>	

Article #	SUMMARY 1	SUMMARY 2	SUMMARY 3
		characteristics of “traditional” honor codes. The crucial aspect of these modified honor code based approaches is that students, faculty and staff are embedded in an encompassing network of policies and procedures that both emphasize and reinforce tendencies toward acting with academic integrity. This article ought to be included in the reader	
23.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -compares AI at colleges with and without honor codes - also looks at contextual factors -correlation with honor code; perception of behavior by peers - institutions need to develop appropriate environment <p>Large survey number, comparison</p>	An excellent article. I’ve been struck by the relative lack of empirical work in this area, and was not sure if this reflected my ignorance, or the nature of the field. This paper goes a long way to addressing that. The authors send 15,000 surveys to 30+ schools, 14 with “honor codes” the balance with other approaches to academic integrity. They conclude that honor codes have a useful effect in reducing survey acknowledged cheating, but that other factors, such as student’s perception of peer dishonesty, understanding of institutional policy on academic integrity, the probability of being reported, and the severity of sanctions, were also important. This article should be included.	
24.	Empirical examination of cheating in institutions of higher learning with suggestions of how to counter the activity. It makes clear that as important as it is to deal directly with cheating, it is also necessary to in some way confront the larger cultural context in which this activity occurs. Emphasis on larger cultural context is important idea.	This article examines and compares two large studies of cheating on college and university campuses: the 1963 Bowers study and the 1993 author’s study. Attention is given to why students cheat, the type of cheating and how students feel about it. Excellent article for an overview of academic integrity at the collegiate level.	
25.	Article expresses the authors’ belief that America’s institutions of higher education need to recommit to a tradition of integrity and honor by establishing a culture of integrity on campuses.	This article is not from a scholarly journal but rather for the AAUP magazine <i>Academe</i> , and so it is shorter and does not present the results of a new study. Rather, it is an essay on honor codes that makes a pitch that they are good things and we need them. A good introduction to the differences between traditional honor codes and	

Article #	SUMMARY 1	SUMMARY 2	SUMMARY 3
		modified honor codes. Well written for the generalist.	
26.	Article reports on research exploring attitudes of faculty in honor code and non-code schools relative to their support for institutional academic integrity policies relating to fairness and effectiveness.	The research presented here offers some obvious results but still provides good tactics on creating a successful ai system.	
27.	This article focuses on peer reporting requirements in student honor codes to determine their impact on the incidence of cheating and to investigate situations that might improve peer reporting efforts. An extensive review of background literature on peer reporting is provided. The paper reports on a large study involving 31 institutions, 14 with traditional honor codes and 17 with other policies. Statistical analyses was provided to support the four main hypotheses of the study: 1) peer reporting is higher at honor code schools; 2) peer reporting increases as the student “role responsibilities” increase; 3) role responsibility for peer reporting increases as students perceive that the chance of getting caught increases; and 4) incidence of cheating decreases as students perceive that the chance of getting caught increases.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - peer reporting as an element of honor codes - surveyed students at 31 colleges – with honor code versus some other disciplinary method for addressing cheating - more students report cheating at schools with HC - if HC requires reporting, more students report - students expect to get caught cheating more if the HC requires peer reporting - cheating rate decreased if students think they are more likely to get caught <p>Multiple schools, comparison HC vs other, surveyed students as to actual practices</p>	
28.	In reviewing a decade of research, the authors learn that cheating has increased dramatically in 30 years. Cheating is influenced by individuals and context but honor codes can make a significant difference in curbing cheating. The authors also offer suggestions to manage cheating. The authors lay responsibility on institutions to stop cheating, writing, “The institution must convince students that cheating will be met with strong disapproval and that cheating is the exception on campus, not the rule” (p. 231).	This article reviewed a decade of research on cheating in colleges. Building on previous research this article reiterates that cheating continues to be prevalent on our college campuses. It underscores that contextual factors have the most influence on cheating. This article is a must read for anyone wanting to understand the total dynamic involved in student cheating. Unlike other research focusing one institution, much of the research in this article is drawn research looking at multiple institutions. The article does an excellent job of highlighting the contextual factors involved in cheating. Of particular importance it the recognition that having an honor code system and of itself is not a panacea for solving the cheating ills. The key is the extent to which the code or institutional polices are embedded in the	

Article #	SUMMARY 1	SUMMARY 2	SUMMARY 3
		student culture. Strong contribution to the field.	
29.	<p>This article reviews whether students at schools with modified honor codes, which are becoming more popular, cheat more frequently than students at traditional honor code schools, but less frequently than those at no-code schools. (The key differences between both types of codes are clarified for the reader.) The answers to both questions were yes. These results are not surprising and reflect what one might have expected. The schools participating differed from those in previous studies by these authors in that they were larger, less selective, and had fewer students living in residence. The study also considered three key contextual influences on academic dishonesty: perception of whether relevant policies are accepted and understood by faculty and students, perception of whether one will be reported by a peer, and perception of how severe the penalties are. The strength of this article is that it highlights for large campuses – where the use of traditional honor codes is usually not feasible – the benefits that modified codes may provide. It also highlights the importance of suitable peer role models as one way to reduce academic dishonesty.</p>	<p>Discussion of the the value for alternatives to all or nothing approach to honor codes.</p>	
30.	<p>This article reviews cheating in community colleges by identifying attitudes and situations that create a climate for dishonesty, discussing prevention strategies, and concluding with recommendations about how to deal with dishonesty when it occurs. While not as theoretical and detailed as other academic integrity literature where in-depth studies have been done, the value of this article is that (1) it may be of greater interest to those who teach in smaller community colleges where the culture is different than at larger universities; (2) it provides an overview of existing literature in a “user-friendly” fashion; (3) it offers many practical pieces of advice for discouraging dishonesty that educators and administrators can readily implement; and (4) it directs the reader to actual resources that are of assistance. (Regrettably some of these resources are dated now given the technological advances in the last decade.)</p>	<p>Community College focus with prevention strategies. Provides an inventory of sources, paper mills, prevention and investigative software programs. Offers diversity perspective from community college.</p>	<p>To define and identify attitudes and situations that encourage academic dishonesty and includes strategies for prevention, offering suggestions as to how to discourage such practices plus some recommendations for educators to deal with cheating.</p>

Article #	SUMMARY 1	SUMMARY 2	SUMMARY 3
31.	<p>This paper investigates the relationship between academic dishonesty in higher education and workplace dishonesty once students graduate and start employment. The paper provides extensive review of the literature for both workplace and academic dishonesty. The study includes business graduate and undergraduate students in six universities and explores two different hypotheses relating to the acceptability of dishonesty and the relationship between the frequency of dishonest acts in the university and dishonest acts in the workplace. The paper provides statistical analyses for these hypotheses and also proposes action items for addressing concerning outcomes from the study.</p>	<p>Explores relationship between cheating in school and workplace attitudes regarding dishonesty. One of a relative few studies in this area.</p>	<p>Students who believe that cheating or other dishonest actions are acceptable are more likely to engage in these types of behaviours. Additionally, those who engage in dishonest acts in high school are more likely to conduct themselves as such in the workplace. Once an individual forms the idea that cheating behavior is acceptable they are more likely to do it in any situation; cheating is not strictly situational. The article also illustrates that business students are more likely than their non-business counterparts to engage in dishonest or cheating behaviours as are males over females and younger students over older students in school, though this increased likelihood only remained true for the gender variable in the workplace. To counter this, faculty should encourage females to share their ethical perspectives in discussions, identify and punish minor blunders before the “slippery slope” begins and more serious blunders occur by adhering to the institution’s dishonesty policies, model appropriate behavior by paying adequate attention to their classes rather than focusing solely on research, stating their academic integrity expectations clearly and specifically, and increasing student awareness by teaching ethics throughout the curriculum rather than only in one course.</p>
32.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - surveyed engineering students about what assessments they cheat on - differences exams vs homework, and year in school - moral deterrent <p>Nice research</p>	<p>This is a very meticulous study of engineering student cheating by type of assessment, specifically exams and homework. They make the point that “cheating” differs greatly across assessment forms, and that factors associated with cheating also differ across assessment forms. Beyond that, they conclude that: 1) schools should carefully define what constitutes cheating for each of the relevant assessment forms, and 2) that student’s perceived moral obligations to refrain from cheating was an important predictor of their refraining from cheating.</p>	

Article #	SUMMARY 1	SUMMARY 2	SUMMARY 3
33.	This article begins with a brief review of the literature on college student cheat and then moves on to report on a study conducted by the authors where they asked students to describe cheating through metaphor. They then consider some of the metaphors offered by students suggest that the understanding acquired could provide possible approaches to reducing cheating. Very original articles. Makes significant contribution to an understanding of how students view cheating.	This is a rambling article incorporating little new research and much summarization of earlier work. The article relies heavily on the fields of social psychology and philosophy emphasizing the whys of cheating in higher education. The authors advise behavioral modification and increased ethical and cultural sensitivities on the part of institutions and students, but don't explain how.	
34.	A deep study of 9 draft theses and 8 completed ones, with thorough examination of the writing for inappropriate use of sources, and, in the case of the draft theses, interviews with the writers and their advisers to explore how and why the inappropriate use came about. Finds that in none of the cases, some of which appear to be extreme examples of plagiarism, was there any intent to plagiarize: the inappropriate use was clearly a matter of inadequate textual skill rather than dishonesty. Concludes that plagiarism is often (generally?) unintentional, and should be dealt with by pedagogical intervention rather than punishment.	I'm of two minds about this. She has a very thorough study – definitely shows that non-native English speakers plagiarize in MA/MS/PhD theses. I also think she does a very good job showing how the students writing these theses plagiarize (e.g, patchwriting), and investigating how much these students realized they were plagiarizing (textual vs. prototypical plagiarism). It is really good article. Unfortunately, as a test of the patchwriting theory, the article falls significantly short because it does not look at native speakers. Are the students plagiarizing because they don't have a good command of English, or because they are unskilled in the discourse of their fields? By just looking at the ESL group, there is no way to answer this question – and as a result, the author unwittingly undercuts her statements that well, people assume but we really don't know that ESL students plagiarize more. That aside – and setting aside that the article is quite long – it is a well done study with documenting just how much plagiarism there is in thesis work, at least among the ESL population. I recommend this.	
35.	Article explores student perceptions of plagiarism and specifically student beliefs relative to the right and wrong of plagiarism.	I really liked this article. Although the sample comes from a group of students at one university, I think the	

Article #	SUMMARY 1	SUMMARY 2	SUMMARY 3
		<p>responses are ones that will seem to fit students of many skill levels at many universities. More significantly, the author does a very good job with her analysis of the interview and focus group material. Her examination of agency and externalization were innovative, and her subsequent discussion was well wrought. She speaks of issues that Valentine also addresses, but she does it in a way that will be understandable to a broader audience. More readers of the CAI volume are likely to agree with Power's point that "Perhaps teachers and university faculty should consider that their current methods of prevention are no longer working for every student... We cannot assume a one-size-fits-al approach will work in preventing plagiarism" (p. 658) than her comments that "Perhaps we should also re-examine the concept of intellectual property for ourselves as well... As our worries about students' plagiaristic behavior evolve with changing times, perhaps our own view of intertextuality is due to evolve as well" (p. 658) – but she opens the area for discussion in an appealing way.</p>	
36.	<p>The study looked at academic dishonesty from a different perspective: researchers sought to determine whether a connection exists between the degree of faculty confidence in the institution and the extent to which faculty use formal deterrence strategies for academic misconduct. It also looked at the differences between male and female faculty on these points. I found this to be of particular interest given that academic integrity professionals are indeed challenged by faculty perceptions about the extent to which they feel supported by the institution and this does affect how they choose to process misconduct cases: either formally (through established institutional protocol) or informally (internally on their own). Two types of faculty were identified: the "trusting" vs. the "skeptical." The "trusting" faculty were confident in the institution and trusted its</p>	<p>Organizational perspective regarding faculty confidence in the institution as it relates to academic dishonesty. Institutional leadership found key in faculty confidence to support academic dishonesty procedures. Adds uniqueness with organizational perspective.</p>	<p>Explores the possible connection between organizational characteristics and the efforts made by faculty to deter student academic ethics violations, which resulted in two important findings: the level of faculty institutional confidence is related to use of formal deterrence strategies, and female faculty members are less confident in the administration yet they are marginally less likely to use formal administrative approaches to manage academic ethics.</p>

Article #	SUMMARY 1	SUMMARY 2	SUMMARY 3
	<p>processes for dealing with misconduct. Thus, they were more likely to use those processes. The “skeptical” members did not share that confidence and therefore were more likely to deal with misconduct on their own. The two groups differed little in size; however, taking in to account gender differences, far more females were in the skeptical category. Researchers offer reasons for this contrast. In summary, this study shows that increasing institutional confidence among all faculty may lead to more effective and consistent adjudication of cheating complaints. This is useful information for academic integrity professionals who are challenged with obtaining as much institutional support for “the cause” as possible.</p>		
37.	<p>The article provides a very cogent way of recognizing that “cultural values of multilingual students are sometimes at variance with Western academic practice.” The author believes that we should respect the traditions that students bring and work within those constricts to help multilingual gain a better understanding of Western academic expectations. This article is essential, more so today than in the past, as more students are landing on our doorsteps to further their study. The author takes a very proactive and scholarly approach to defining the issues and does so in a very easy to read style.</p>	<p>Provides some ideas on addressing the stated issue, but they don’t seem to be very realistic.</p>	
38.	<p>Excellent article on a topic not often addressed: determining if there is a correlation between students’ perception of the student-instructor relationship and acts of academic dishonesty. This particular study focused on student’s self report concerning acts of dishonesty in a specific class/ specific semester. Students who self reported at least one act of academic dishonesty had evaluated the instructor lower than students who reported that they had not cheated. Provided new insight into the importance of a student’s positive evaluation of an instructor in probability of cheating. I found this data extremely helpful in discussions with faculty.</p>	<p>This study, of how student-instructor relationships affects student behavior concerning academic integrity. The study reports on a survey given to 1390 college students at a large western college one month into the semester in a variety of classes. The principle finding is that students are more likely to acknowledge various kinds of “cheating” if they disliked their instructors than students who liked their instructors. The result is certainly interesting, but is limited by the reliance on student self reports. It is not clear which way the causality might run here. Still, the result needs to be included in the reader, although there may be other papers that also find it.</p>	

Article #	SUMMARY 1	SUMMARY 2	SUMMARY 3
39.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - cheating an issue at MS and HS also - pressure from parents - use of Internet – need better education <p>Brings in MS/HS perspectives</p>	<p>This article, on cheating in middle and high schools summarizes a number of studies on the topic, and more importantly, offers useful suggestions to parents and teachers concerned with issues of academic integrity. While the focus is on middle and high school, many of the suggestions are equally relevant to college students. As such, this may be a useful component of the planned reader.</p>	
40.	<p>This paper puts plagiarism in the context of the phenomenon of the internet, and points to the many ways in which the internet has challenges various ethical assumptions. Very original paper, first one that I have read that really provides an analysis of the way in which the availability of the internet has had a thorough going impact on many areas of modern life.</p>	<p>This excellent article tackles the issue of internet plagiarism and plagiarism detection software such as Turnitin.com. At issue is the question of trust in the academic community. The authors argue that “catching” plagiarists with detection software destroys the community of trust and treats the symptom rather than the cause. An excellent article.</p>	
41.	<p>This article provides a meaningful review of 107 studies “of the prevalence and correlates of cheating among college students published between 1970 and 1996.” The author acknowledges limitations of the study due to sampling limitations as variables may have only been in “one or a few studies”. However, for other researchers and those interested in AI, there are multiple tables and analysis of correlates for student cheating that can continue to guide new research and supports the author’s conceptual model for predicting cheating behavior.</p>	<p>Looked at the association of several variables that may relate to cheating including quality conditions when studying, cheated previously at lower academic level, etc. It also offers several suggestions as to how institutions can help deter the behavior including making sure the policy is clearly stated in handbooks, catalogs; create quiet study areas for students, etc. An interesting concept for the late ‘90s which seems to be the norm now.</p>	
42.	<p>Best paper. Thoroughly and thoughtfully explores the strategy an institution’s should adopt in establishing and maintaining a campus-wide ethos that encourages academic integrity.</p>	<p>Loved this article. A good overview of how to create a successful AI system on any campus. We will be building off some of these ideas!</p>	

	ARTICLES & BOOK CHAPTERS	THEMES				
		The Numbers: Establishing the Problem	Perceptions & Attitudes about Cheating/AI	What Shapes Cheating/ AI	Strategies & Responses	Other
1.	Aaron, R. M. (1992). Student academic dishonesty: Are collegiate institutions addressing the issue?	X	X	X	X	
2.	Bertram Gallant, T. (2007). The complexity of integrity culture change: A case study of a liberal arts college.	X			X	Culture Change
3.	Bertram Gallant, Tricia, & Drinan, Patrick (2006). Institutionalizing academic integrity: administrator perceptions and institutional actions.		X	X	X	
4.	Bertram Gallant, Tricia, & Drinan, Patrick. (2008). Toward a Model of Academic Integrity Institutionalization: Informing Practice in Postsecondary Education.	X	X	X	X	
5.	Christensen Hughes, J. M., & McCabe, D. L. (2006). Understanding academic misconduct.	X	X	X	X	
6.	Cole, S. & Kiss, E. (2000) What Can We Do about Student Cheating?	X	X	X	X	
7.	Compton, Josh and Michael Pfau. "Inoculating Against Pro-Plagiarism Justifications: Rational and Affective Strategies."	X	X	X	X	
8.	Davis, S. F., & Ludvigson, H. W. (1995). Additional data on academic dishonesty and a proposal for remediation.	X	X	X	X	
9.	Eisenberg, Jacob (2004). To cheat or not to cheat: effects of moral perspective and situational variables on students' attitudes.	X	X	X	X	
10.	Genereux, R. L., & McLeod, B. A. (1995). Circumstances surrounding cheating: A questionnaire study of college students.	X	X	X		
11.	Granitz, N., & Loewy, D. (2007). Applying ethical theories: Interpreting and responding to student plagiarism.	X	X	X	X	Plagiarism
12.	Howard, Rebecca Moore and Laura Davies. " Plagiarism in the Internet Age. "		X	X	X	
13.	Hutton, P. A. (2006). Understanding student cheating and what educators can do about it.			X	X	
14.	Jordon, A. E. (2001). College student cheating: The role of motivation,		X	X		

ARTICLES & BOOK CHAPTERS		THEMES				
		The Numbers: Establishing the Problem	Perceptions & Attitudes about Cheating/AI	What Shapes Cheating/ AI	Strategies & Responses	Other
	perceived norms, attitudes, and knowledge of institutional policy.					
15.	Kibler, W. L. (1993). Academic dishonesty: A student development dilemma.	X		X	X	
16.	Kibler, W. L. (1993). A framework for addressing academic dishonesty from a student development perspective.	X	X	X	X	
17.	McCabe, D.L. (1992). The influence of situational ethics on cheating among college students.		X	X		
18.	McCabe, D. L. (1993). Faculty responses to academic dishonesty: The influence of honor codes.		X		X	
19.	McCabe, Donald L. (2005). Cheating among college and university students: A North American perspective.	X	X	X	X	
20.	McCabe, D. L. (2005). It takes a village: Academic dishonesty & educational opportunity..			X	X	
21.	McCabe, Donald L., & Bowers, William J. (1994). Academic dishonesty among males in college: A thirty year perspective.	X	X		X	Trends
22.	McCabe, D. L., & Pavela, G. (2000). Some good news about academic integrity.	X	X	X	X	
23.	McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (1993). Academic dishonesty: Honor codes and other contextual influences.	X	X	X	X	
24.	McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (1996). What we know about cheating in college: Longitudinal trends and recent developments.	X	X	X	X	
25.	McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (2002). Honesty and honor codes.		X	X	X	
26.	McCabe, D. L., Butterfield, K. D. & Trevino, L., K (2003). Faculty & Academic Integrity: The Influence of Current Honor Codes and Past Honor Code Experiences.	X	X	X	X	Attitudes of Faculty
27.	McCabe, D. L., Trevino, L., K., & Butterfield, K. D. (2001). Dishonesty in Academic Environments: The Influence of Peer Reporting Requirements.	X	X	X	X	

ARTICLES & BOOK CHAPTERS		THEMES				
		The Numbers: Establishing the Problem	Perceptions & Attitudes about Cheating/AI	What Shapes Cheating/ AI	Strategies & Responses	Other
28.	McCabe, D. L., Trevino, L. K., & Butterfield, K. D. (2001). Cheating in academic institutions: A decade of research.	X	X	X	X	
29.	McCabe, D.L., Trevino, L.K., & Butterfield, K.D. (2002). Honor codes and other contextual influences on academic integrity: A replication and extension to modified honor code settings.			X	X	
30.	Moeck, P. G. (2002). Academic dishonesty: Cheating among college students.	X	X	X	X	
31.	Nonis, S., & Swift, C. O. (2001). An examination of the relationship between academic dishonesty and workplace dishonesty: A multicampus investigation.		X	X	X	
32.	Passow, H. J., Mayhew, M. J., Finelli, C. J., Harding, T. S., & Carpenter, D. D. (2006). Factors influencing engineering students' decisions to cheat by type of assessment.	X	X	X	X	
33.	Payne, S.L., and Nantz, K.S. (1994). Social accounts and metaphors about cheating.	X	X	X	X	
34.	Pecorari, Diane. "Good and Original: Plagiarism and Patchwriting in Academic Second-Language Writing."	X		X	X	
35.	Power, L. G. (2009). University students' perceptions of plagiarism.		X	X		
36.	Simon, C. A., Carr, J. R., McCullough, S. M., Morgan, S. J., Olsen, T., & Ressel, M. (2003). The other side of academic dishonesty: The relationship between faculty skepticism, gender and strategies for managing student academic dishonesty cases.	X	X	X	X	
37.	Sowden, C. (2004). Plagiarism and the culture of multilingual students in postsecondary education abroad.	X	X	X	X	Plagiarism

ARTICLES & BOOK CHAPTERS		THEMES				
		The Numbers: Establishing the Problem	Perceptions & Attitudes about Cheating/AI	What Shapes Cheating/ AI	Strategies & Responses	Other
38.	Stearns, S. A. (2001). The student-instructor relationship's effect on academic integrity.	X	X	X	X	
39.	Strom, P. S., & Strom, R. D. (2007). Cheating in middle school and high school.	X	X	X	X	
40.	Townley, C., & Parsell, M. (2004). Technology and academic virtue: Student plagiarism through the looking glass.	X	X	X	X	
41.	Whitley, B. E., Jr. (1998). Factors associated with cheating among college students: A review.	X	X	X	X	
42.	Whitley, B. E., Jr., & Keith-Spiegel, P. (2001). Academic integrity as an institutional issue.	X	X	X	X	