International undergraduate students' perspectives on academic integrity:

A phenomenological approach

by

Miriam Christoph

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of

The University of Manitoba

in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of

MASTER OF EDUCATION

Educational Administration, Foundations and Psychology

University of Manitoba

Winnipeg, Manitoba

Acknowledgements

I must first thank the participants who volunteered their time for this study. I greatly appreciate their openness, candor, and willingness to be interviewed.

Abstract

Anecdotal evidence suggests that international undergraduate students are engaging in academically dishonest behavior on an increasing basis (Marcus, 2011; McGowan & Lightbody, 2008). In other words, they are found to occupy more time and resources than domestic students in the promotion of academic integrity and in administering punishments for academic dishonesty. This study explores international undergraduate student perspectives on issues related to academic integrity at a large, Western-Canadian university. Hofstede's (1980) six cultural dimensions are used to learn to what extent, if any, culture and academic integrity are intertwined. Participants of the study were international undergraduate students in various faculties, years of study, and from various countries of origin: Azerbaijan, China, Hong Kong, India, Malta, Pakistan, South Korea, and United States of America. The findings of this study indicate that international undergraduate students have the impression that their group is more susceptible to engaging in academic dishonesty. Conversely, international undergraduate students are also found to possess a more advanced understanding of moral behavior, although they are sometimes unable to translate this fully to their academic lives. Implications for practice include: shifting to a taxonomy that frames positive or desired behaviors as opposed to the negative, sharing the burden of dealing with academic dishonesty, and better supporting faculty in relaying the message of academic integrity at the university using a bottom up approach.

Contents

List of Tables

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Features in newspapers, in magazines, and on television all reflect what is relatively undisputed in the literature: academic dishonesty is on the rise in higher education (Bradshaw & Baluja, 2011; Christensen Hughes & McCabe, 2006; Merit Motion Pictures, n.d.; Ercegovac & Richardson, 2004). Stories of fraud and dishonest behavior continue to pop up within the academic community, calling into question the ethical standards of students, faculty, and the university community. In many cases, students admit to engagement in academic dishonesty at some point during their academic careers (Ercegovac & Richardson, 2004; McCabe, Butterfield, & Treviño, 2012; McCabe, Treviño, & Butterfield, 2001). A study by Davis, Grover, Becker, and McGregor (1992) found that as many as 76 per cent of students admit to cheating, although at least 90 per cent of students believe that cheating is wrong. In addition, faculty and other academics in the greater community are also being targeted for alleged engagement in plagiarism or fraud; they have shocked the research community and called into question their credentials where misconduct has been found (e.g., Clarke, 2006; Lee, 2009a; Munro, 2012; Scher Zagier, 2011). Stories of such misconduct are garnering the attention of the general public and this leads to an increased awareness of the growing concern and the opportunity to examine the issue more clearly.

In Canada, Merit Motion Pictures (n.d.), in cooperation with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC), produced the documentary *Faking the Grade*, which sheds light on the various ways in which students engage in dishonest behavior at university. More recently, the CBC published a report stating that over 7,000 university students from 42 Canadian universities were disciplined for academic dishonesty in the 2011-2012 academic year alone (Moore, 2014). Other news reports have been written on the culture of cheating and the increasing problem it has become (e.g., Bradshaw & Baluja, 2011; Marcus, 2011). The media buzz is consistent with much of the research on academic integrity; however, there are also reports that question the validity of the

research (Blair, 2009). Others, in turn, say that the discrepancies in research must be considered in efforts to quell the epidemic of academic dishonesty (McCabe et al., 2012).

All in all, there is no one area of the world or university that can claim to be "cheat-free." Students from various walks of life and circumstances are being charged with academic dishonesty in their academic careers. In order to address the rapid spread of dishonesty, several initiatives have been created to instill an appreciation for the importance of academic integrity and offer better prevention or detection strategies for faculty. This study seeks to contribute to our understanding of a growing issue that continues to afflict universities across Canada (Moore, 2014). All types of students are involved in academic dishonesty; however, this study sought the perspectives of a particular group that is often over-represented in cases of academic dishonesty but under-represented in terms of perspective. The increasing concern over issues of academic integrity among international students – in line with the researcher's own interactions – has sparked an interest in the prominence of misconduct among this student group (Bradshaw & Baluja, 2011; Marcus, 2011; McGowan & Lightbody, 2008). By examining the current level of awareness among international students, including dissonance between perspectives of the home and host countries, we gain a better understanding of how best to support and promote academic integrity. More specifically, this study seeks to understand international undergraduate students' perspectives on issues related to academic integrity.

In order to gain a better understanding of the issue at hand, the context is laid by discussing the internationalization of higher education and how it leads to an increase in international student numbers. In addition, the benefits and challenges are considered as they offer insights into issues among international students.

Context for the Study

Across Canada and much of the western world, international students are increasing in number (Beykont & Daiute, 2002; Chapman & Lupton, 2004; Chen & Van Ullen, 2011; Heggins &

Jackson, 2003). Nowadays, many students are seeking opportunities in education that will offer them knowledge and experience in their chosen fields and aid in the job hunt upon graduation. An education has become a symbol of personal capital, which contributes to the global thirst for knowledge and training (McFarlane, Zhang, & Pun, 2012). For students in countries outside of Canada, Australia, Britain, U.S.A. and much of Europe, though not exclusively, gaining a competitive edge in the working world often corresponds with degree studies at a university in one of these countries or continents. The universities accepting these students are realizing the benefits of increased knowledge capital brought on by this student population and they are employing strategies to recruit them (Choudaha, Chang, & Kono, 2013). This leads to greater diversity among the student population and faculty community, thus increasing challenges for the organizational culture within a university, particularly as it relates to policies surrounding academic integrity.

This study is particularly interested in Canada as a country of choice for students seeking an international degree. It has long been a country of choice for international students, and the increasing interest is evident in an economic impact report presented to the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade. The report lists that there were 114,093 international students in Canada in 2000 and that number nearly doubled to 218,245 in the year 2010. Within this data set, the number of university students more than doubled from 53,168 to 116,890 in the same year span (Roslyn Kunin & Associates, Inc., 2012). More recent data from the Canadian Bureau for International Education (2015), lists that 336,497 international students came to Canada in the year 2014. In addition, the report ranks Canada as the seventh most popular destination for international students in the world.

Canada's relatively low cost of living is one of the reasons for the increase in the number of international students. Furthermore, the degree programs are generally accessible and economical compared to other countries such as the U.S.A. In fact, the program and living costs in Canada are

often half or less the cost in the U.S.A., which can be attributed as a factor in the increasing appeal of Canada to international students (Starobin, 2006).

With the appeal of Canadian higher education in mind, three perspectives provide the backdrop for this study: 1) the internationalization of education; 2) institutional and governmental responses to the effects of internationalization; and 3) the ground-level efforts that inform policy and practices to ensure successful and meaningful internationalization. The conceptualization of internationalization at various universities throughout Canada and the world are highlighted in the following sub-sections and the University of Manitoba context will follow.

Internationalization of education. The internationalization of post-secondary education has become a priority for many universities around the world and, as a result, efforts to internationalize have increased dramatically. A university's effort to internationalize its organizational culture acts as a means to remain competitive and relevant in the global education market; the university can promote itself as a key player that offers globally minded policies, curricula, faculty, and students.

The internationalization of a university also draws in funding by way of increasing the intake of students paying international fees, seeking grant offerings in the global market, and pursuing entrepreneurship as an institution (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Tadaki & Tremewan, 2013). One of the greatest endeavors of internationalization has been increasing or maintaining an international student population.

Moreover, global interactions have become vital for the growth and development of Canadian universities and their academic culture, a need that is not unique to Canada. Many universities around the world are seeking to offer programs in partnership with foreign institutions, exchange programs for their students, and increased efforts to recruit international students and faculty (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Tadaki & Tremewan, 2013). The benefit to the

university community, as a whole, has been promoted although challenges are evident as the student demographic continuously evolves.

Benefits of internationalization. The growing international student population has been said to enrich the experiences of domestic students and faculty (Ladd & Ruby, 1999; Lee, 2009b). Enriched experiences might include "opportunities for collaborative knowledge production, exposure to different contexts and worldviews, more complex and nuanced analyses, and improved capacity to respond to change and diversity" (Association of Canadian Deans of Education, 2014, p. 3). Furthermore, internationalization of education promotes intercultural experiences and opportunities to better understand the "local and global connections critically", as well as creating opportunities for reciprocal exchange of knowledge and practices (Ibid., p. 3).

The benefits of internationalization are indeed appealing, however, the challenges that arise from a more diverse student population must also be considered.

Challenges of internationalization. Efforts to increase the international student population present a number of challenges for universities in Canada. These efforts contest many of the policies and procedures currently in place by pressing their limits and stretching their goals. For example, the *Accord on the Internationalization of Education*, developed by the Association of Canadian Deans of Education (2014), outlines several risks associated with internationalization efforts, highlighting specifically that services and supports for students will be stretched thin with increasingly diverse student populations. Additional risks include: 1) exploitive recruitment that focuses on attaining much needed funding from international students; and 2) "systemic exclusion" of international students from less privileged backgrounds (Ibid., p. 4). This list of risks is non-exhaustive yet it highlights the complexity and severity of challenges presented by the internationalization of education.

Greater access to education will contribute richly to the global knowledge base, but it also presents new challenges for the university community. International education can foster

international relationships, support awareness of global issues, and advance the breadth and depth of disciplinary knowledge; however, increased access to higher education comes with many challenges (Starobin, 2006). For example, international students in a new context may very well develop their own appreciation and understanding of university policies, namely, academic integrity (Lee, 2009b).

Consequently, significant infrastructure must be in place to monitor students and ensure that the program objective of ensuring a meaningful student experience is achieved. Other challenges include: preparing students for study abroad; learning the language at an academic standard that is sufficient to succeed; understanding the policies and procedures of the host university; and adjusting to a new culture of education. As much as international students need to demonstrate an understanding of their new environment, so too must faculty and administrators understand and appreciate the various backgrounds from which students come. In an effort to better understand issues of academic integrity among the international student population and how faculty can better support them, this study explores the issue of academic integrity and the challenges that surface with an increasingly diverse university community.

Interestingly, internationalization offers a paradox for universities; they must make an effort to internationalize in order to stay relevant, yet there are several challenges that require attention, funding, and continuous review. Despite the challenges, many of the objectives of internationalization have been realized at universities in Canada and around the world. For example, increasing international student numbers, internationalizing the curricula of various programs, implementing study abroad programs, and promoting visiting scholar programs (Jones, 2009; University of Manitoba, 2014d; University of Saskatchewan, 2003).

Fortunately, universities in Canada acknowledge the cross-cultural implications of moving in this direction. In their work, Chapman and Lupton (2004) express that meaningful work has become a priority as the effects of increased internationalization are realized; for example, "cross-

cultural pedagogical research... for effective classroom management" and comparative studies across cultures with special attention to issues of academic integrity (p. 427). Universities are also creating their own investigative teams to learn more about the issue, as well as exploring better programming for students in this area, and possibly reframing policies where needed (Chapman & Lupton, 2004; Lee, 2009b, Yeo; 2007).

Institutional and governmental responses. One such priority that evolves out of need for improved practices in increasing student diversity is *Strategic Enrolment Management*. Strategic Enrolment Management signifies the need to approach student enrolment with a purposeful and attentive method, while ensuring that students are properly supported (Bontrager, 2004).

Moreover, it is the job of the university to recruit and maintain a student population that fits with the mission and goals of the university, but there must be concern for and action on issues such as attrition and student success. Strategic Enrolment Management aims to ensure that a diverse and talented student population is maintained and properly supported (Ibid., 2004).

Increasing or maintaining a significant number of international students is well intentioned, however, a large part of managing enrolment is to ensure a positive student experience. Employing aggressive recruitment strategies are fruitless if attrition and time to completion rates are ignored, and, furthermore, poor student success rates may undermine recruitment efforts once word gets out about performance. The dramatic increase in international student populations has ultimately led university administrators to recognize that supports and services must also increase, in number and in effectiveness. For example, a dramatic increase in student failures in a first-year math course may lead to the design and implementation of a non-credit pre-requisite course. After the successful development and implementation of the pre-requisite, data should be continuously collected to determine if student success actually improves. If not, it may mean that other measures must be taken to support the students in this area. Similarly, other areas of concern must be

supported and the services in place re-evaluated to ensure that the challenges of
internationalization are met.

Meeting the challenge. The pressing issue of academic integrity is causing a redirection of
resources. Working groups and task forces have been formed to understand the problem of
academic dishonesty and to consider effective and sustainable solutions. Hot topics in education
will get increased funding from central administration, not necessarily for the distinction they offer,
but for the ability to increase gains and financial investments from stakeholders – in other words,
increased revenue supported by increasing student numbers has a tendency to drive decision-
making (Rhoades, 2006). This does not belie the ethical obligation to ensure that
internationalization is not realized at the expense of any person and his/her integrity.

It is vital that academic integrity be continuously examined with respect to the limitations
imposed on the university's organizational culture (Simon et al., 2003). How will efforts to
internationalize a university's campus, curriculum, and processes affect the climate of academic
integrity? With students bringing a wealth of various backgrounds and understandings to the
university, the overall community and organization may feel an impact. Simon et al. (2003) infer
that the mission and goals of a university are compromised and go unfulfilled if academic integrity
is not upheld. The authors argue that unfulfilled objectives at the level of central administration are
a disservice to each and every student. Students have the right to learn in an environment that is
"relatively unmarred by ethical problems or incivility" and it is the mission of many universities to
defend this position and offer needed resources (Ibid., p. 194).

Potential consequences that result from compromised integrity within academics include:
1) students missing the opportunity to develop a deep understanding of the content material; 2)
students acquiring a sense that everyone cheats, that it is easy to do, and that it is a normal part of
life; 3) students risk becoming "desensitized to the academic cultural norm of integrity in learning"
(Harding, Carpenter, Finelli, & Passow, 2004, p. 2). Various factors have been explored in relation to

academic dishonesty and its significant increase over the years. This study will continue the discussion of how we can tackle the issue.

The University of Manitoba context. The *Strategic Enrolment Management (SEM): Planning Framework 2013-2018*, released in June 2013 by the Strategic Enrolment Management Planning Committee, establishes goals and directives for enrolment management at the University of Manitoba. It states the need for an underlying framework to guide and inform student enrolment aligning the student population with the University's mission statement. Ensuring that students are successful is crucial to both the mission and enrolment management of the university. Focusing on student numbers alone is an insufficient objective; Strategic Enrolment Management acknowledges this goal and builds on it by outlining the need to support and promote student success.

The University of Manitoba (2013a) has made public its plan to maintain international student enrolment so that it accounts for 10 percent of the undergraduate student population and 20 percent of the graduate student population. A significant international student population such as this requires considerable supports and provisions for success. Strategic Enrolment Management acknowledges the benefits of diversity, but it also takes ownership of cross-cultural implications as they relate to the international student population and provides data to support the need for "targeted support services" (University of Manitoba, 2013a, p. 16). The theme of Strategic Enrolment Management is to offer a framework for ensuring the success of all students and projecting numbers from initial enrolment to degree completion.

Complementary to the Strategic Enrolment Management framework and initiatives of the University is the Government of Manitoba's *International Education Act* (2016). This act came in the wake of reports on international students who felt misled during recruitment to colleges in Manitoba (e.g., Larsen, 2012). The International Education Act acknowledges that increasing student numbers are creating a strain on resources and that more must be done to ensure that international students are protected. This act supports the framework proposed in the Strategic

Enrolment Management: that the student experience is of utmost importance within higher education and it is the duty of the University to ensure that this experience is a positive one.

Participants. The participants selected for this study are international undergraduate students at the University of Manitoba. As expressed above, the University has a significant international student population and it is essential that their interests and integrity are protected. That is not to say that their interests are paramount over domestic students; however, the population is of particular interest to this study and their perspectives are sought on issues of academic integrity. Furthermore, this group of students may help shed light on the widespread concern over academic dishonesty at the University.

Theoretical Framework

Taras, Kirkman, and Steel (2010) state the long history of examining cultural influence on behavior in various fields of research. In addition, the researchers examine a specific set of "cultural values" known as Hofstede's "cultural dimensions" and the notion that culture is implicit in all human interaction. Hofstede's dimensions seek to provide a cultural roadmap for themes found in human interactions with others and with the world around them. The six dimensions outlined in Hofstede's work are "power distance", "individualism", "masculinity", "uncertainty avoidance", "long-term versus short-term orientation", and "indulgence."

Research Question

In keeping with cultural values impact, this study focuses specifically on perspectives of international students. On one hand, the expectation that international students should know all local rules and procedures may be unrealistic and unfair, but on the other hand, they should be expected to meet the same standards as any other student. This study examines the perspectives of international undergraduate students on issues of academic integrity. The rules of academic integrity and consequences for not following them may be new and different for international

students. The question is how do we maintain high standards of academic integrity but also take into account the unique backgrounds of international students?

This study explores the role that culture plays in the ability of students to learn and appreciate policies regarding academic integrity. The experiences of undergraduate international students are used to better understand this phenomenon. In listening to international student perspectives on academic integrity, we can gain insight into tackling the issue of increasing misconduct.

The research question relevant to this study is as follows: To what extent is culture reflected in the perspectives of international undergraduate students on issues related to academic integrity?

Limitations

Academic integrity and its related issues are generally framed negatively; the statistics often paint a gloomy picture of the number of cases of academic dishonesty on university campuses. International students are also increasingly accused of dishonest behavior, which further promotes a negative view of the situation. It seems to be an increasing problem despite our efforts, despite our research and there are no signs that this trend will change any time soon (Macfarlane, Zhang, & Pun, 2012).

Participants in studies involving academic integrity are often presented with a negative picture of the issue. This is due, in part, to bad behaviors or disreputable events being relayed in order to elicit a response or to seek greater understanding of the issue (Macfarlane et al., 2012). This study relies heavily on these self-reported experiences. Participants are asked to share their understandings and candor is encouraged as much as possible; however, it cannot be ignored that self-reported data must be carefully and reflectively analyzed. Particularly, with a topic that may be deemed as sensitive, participants might feel that they could be put at risk if the complete truth were told. Macfarlane, Zhang, and Pun (2012) suggest that participants may be prone to social

desirability reporting; in other words, telling the researcher what they think is a desired answer, and if this happened it would have tainted the data.

It seems a daunting task to teach any student about the concept of academic integrity and mixing in students of another culture, with different points of view, adds to the complexity (Chapman & Lupton, 2004). Macfarlane et al. (2012) suggest that academic integrity may not be understood in the same way across international contexts. The authors report that greater attentiveness and a willingness to understand the dynamics of academic integrity across cultures is vital in the current research. How best to provide a lens with which to examine issues of academic integrity is an important question to ask; letting differences breathe into the process rather than seeking supreme clarification on academic cultures.

Overview

This chapter outlined the effects, benefits, and challenges related to the internationalization of education. The specific outcome of increasing the number of international students on Canadian campuses is highlighted in order to present the benefits and challenges of internationalization. This led to discussion of academic integrity as a particular issue arising from an increasingly diverse student population. The international undergraduate student group is introduced to establish the context for the study and outline the research question. The following chapter will offer a review of the literature and outline the theoretical framework. More specifically, the next chapter will explore academic integrity and related issues, as an understanding of the issue and its effects on international students are vital for expanding on the context of this study.

CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

This chapter will present the literature relevant to issues of academic integrity among international students. Initially, the chapter will be dedicated to the concept of academic integrity, its role within higher education and how it is generally perceived among students. The chapter will then outline the types of academic dishonesty most commonly of concern in higher education and the methods and practices that aim to prevent dishonest behavior among students. Later in the chapter the theoretical framework is outlined.

International students are also discussed as there are unique factors that contribute to and affect their susceptibility to engage in dishonest behavior. Cultural differences and the international student population will be highlighted in order to gain an understanding of the challenges that at least some international students may face with academic integrity at a foreign university. Understanding this is paramount for ensuring the success and well being of international students.

The Role of Academic Integrity

Academic integrity has become a priority and focal point for university administrators. It is embedded in the organizational culture of higher education, and universities around the world are increasingly aware of its importance (Davis, Grover, Becker & McGregor, 1992; McCabe, et al., 2001). A good deal of this attention results out of necessity; the number of academic dishonesty cases is increasing and senior academic administrators have responded to the need for proactive measures (Yeo, 2007). Academic integrity demands to be better understood among all groups in education (for example, faculty, administrators, and students) and the standards ought to be raised. The interest is spreading around the globe for the study of academic integrity and what are the best theories and practices to promote scholarship (Macfarlane et al., 2012).

References to academic integrity can be found in most course syllabi, on literally all university websites, and, increasingly, in the minds of administrators and faculty. In essence,

academic integrity refers to the wide range of ethical decisions a person makes during his/her academic career and the extent to which those decisions are moral and fair. Additionally, academic integrity is understood, or rather misunderstood, as a set of offenses one can commit or avoid during his/her university career (McCabe et al., 2001). Academic integrity is also described as the principles and policies of ethics in academia. These principles include avoiding cheating, plagiarism, and any academic activity deemed as fraudulent. Universities and colleges normally list the "dos" and "don'ts" of academic misconduct and then define the parameters for faculty, administrators, and students.

Why all the fuss about academic integrity? Why should there be such great concern for ensuring that students are behaving honestly in their university careers? The answer is simple: education is built upon a foundation of truth; cheating, plagiarism, and other forms of academic dishonesty present a paradox to the university community. How can one claim to study, learn, and achieve when they do not do so with integrity? In addition, academic integrity is at the root of education and is far more than a condition or requirement; it is what makes an education. The International Center for Academic Integrity (2012) states that the foundational principles of what it means to learn is forgotten in higher education as "grades, rather than education... become the major focus of many students" (para. 6). As a result, academic integrity must now be taught alongside content to ensure that the mission of education is achieved (International Center for Academic Integrity, 2012).

The University of Waterloo (2010) states the following on the importance of academic integrity:

> Communication, inquiry and the free exchange of ideas are fundamental to a university education, and require an environment of tolerance and respect... Academic integrity is a commitment to five basic values: honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility. It applies to all academic endeavors – teaching, learning and scholarship, and applies to a

range of academic activities… Students are expected to know what constitutes academic

integrity, to avoid committing offences, and to take responsibility for their actions. Students

are responsible for demonstrating behavior that is honest and ethical in their academic

work. (para. 8-9.)

These words are echoed by the Center for Academic Integrity (1999) which states that

academic integrity offers responsibility for students and faculty in that it presents the moral

imperative that is fundamental to the goal of education. Furthermore, knowledge dissemination is

bound by five principles: honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility. Princeton University

also says "the ability of a university to achieve its purposes depends upon the quality and integrity

of the academic work that its faculty, staff, and students perform" (as cited in The Center for

Academic Integrity, 1999, p. 5). In order to achieve their missions, universities must ensure that

integrity is central to the practices and works of their people. Furthermore, they must identify how

this can be accomplished; faculty, administrators, and students must exhibit and model academic

integrity and policies must offer clearly defined goals and objectives.

There is some debate in the research literature on how to define the elements of academic

misconduct, and despite the commonalities among institutional policies and procedures, there are

often disputes regarding what the consequences of academic dishonesty should be. As will be

discussed in the next section, the concept itself has been interpreted differently among various

disciplines as well as cultural groups (Blair, 2009; Chapman & Lupton, 2004; Gullifer & Tyson,

2010; Macfarlane, 2012; McCabe et al., 2012). Faculty, administration, and students have also been

shown to hold diverse perspectives on what it means to have integrity in higher education. While

most agree on the fundamental principles surrounding plagiarism, a fixed definition has not been

established and its meaning varies (Blair, 2009; Ercegovac & Richardson, 2004; Yeo, 2007).

Macfarlane (2012) notes that "academic integrity is widely used as a proxy for the conduct

of students" and aims to define one's capacity to complete academic work via ethically sound

methods (p. 2). The ambiguity in this definition is apparent as it calls into question the expectation

and whoever defines it. This poses a dilemma for faculty and administrators: how can an institution

accurately define what it interprets as 'integrity' when the parameters of that integrity are open to

interpretation? In other words, the challenges in understanding academic integrity are born by the

university community. Those students and faculty who have come to know the organizational

culture of the university learn to navigate through the seemingly conflicting expectations as a result

of their experiences. However, the process is much more challenging for international students who

are new to the university context. Macfarlane (2012) also suggests that it is insufficient to say that

honesty is synonymous with integrity; integrity implies so much more and that is why the concept

can be difficult to grasp. As a result of the ambiguity presented by academic integrity, the problem

of dishonesty has increased. The following sub-section will explore the issues that have been

presented.

   Academic integrity at risk. Research on issues of academic integrity is extensive. For

example, Löfström (2011), at the University of Helsinki, studied university student perspectives on

academic integrity, specifically in the context of writing and citing; Compton and Pfau (2008) are

American researchers in writing and rhetoric who studied methods of "inoculating" students

against plagiarism; Roig, an American psychology professor, and Caso (2005) examined the

prevalence of fraudulent excuses among undergraduate students; Gullifer and Tyson (2010), a

lecturer and professor in psychology, conducted a focus group study on university students'

perceptions of academic integrity. In separate studies, Chen and Van Ullen (2011), Liu (2005), and

Nazir and Aslam (2010) studied international student experiences with academic integrity. McCabe

(1993) studied the modes of academic dishonesty and the reasons why students act without

integrity. There appears to be growing concern among and for students; fear that opportunities

might become limited or reduced as a result of classmates getting ahead without actually having

earned their place or that student caliber will deteriorate (McCabe et al., 2001; McCabe et al., 2012).

In addition, comparative studies across cultures have also been conducted, where perspectives of academic integrity are examined among various student groups and across different aspects of academic dishonesty (e.g. plagiarism, cheating, etc.) (Abasi & Graves, 2008; Chapman & Lupton, 2004; Gullifer & Tyson, 2010).

Over the past few decades – as higher education has become more accessible to female students and students from different socio-economic and cultural backgrounds – the discourse on student ethics and integrity has expanded. It begins more than 50 years ago, in 1964, when Bill Bowers presented his research on academic dishonesty in university. Students from 99 different American universities and colleges participated and 75 percent of the 5,000 participants admitted to misconduct (McCabe et al., 2001). More recently, Ercegovac and Richardson (2004) found that 97.5 percent of high school students in 1989 openly admitted to cheating at some point in their education, compared to 58.5 percent in 1969. The authors go on to report studies that have shown 91.7 percent of students have self-reported that they had engaged in some form of academic misconduct during their university education.

Further research by McCabe and his colleagues (2001), one of the foremost experts on academic dishonesty, finds that dishonest behavior in higher education remains a reality for the majority of students. These researchers also find that acts of misconduct have increased particularly in the areas of cheating on tests and exams and inappropriate collaboration among females (McCabe et al., 2001). Though cheating is prevalent in many faculties and schools, the literature shows that students in the Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics faculties are among the most likely to engage in academically dishonest behavior (Harding et al., 2004). There is also a noted escalation in instances of cheating and plagiarism among international students, a group that is of particular interest in this study.

Ercegovac and Richardson (2004) report that academic dishonesty is found in various places: secondary schools and universities; among researchers, professors, and instructors; as well

as scholarly journals, newspapers, and magazines. The authors also note that there is evidence that

universities experience a lack of research integrity amongst their faculty. Some researchers are

found to have falsified data, withheld adverse results, or were careless in their research endeavors.

One defamed professor is Diederik Stapel, a psychologist and former dean of the School of Social

and Behavioral Science at Tilburg University in the Netherlands. Stapel committed research fraud in

his studies on human attitudes and behavior. Following accusations of the fraud in 2011, Stapel

admitted to using fake data in his study relating unkempt surroundings and racist tendencies, and

was immediately dismissed from Tilburg (Bhattacharjee, 2012). In Canada, scientist Dongqing Li,

and his research assistant, Yasaman Daghighi, from the University of Waterloo retracted a research

paper on "lab-on-a-chip technology" when it was found to have been plagiarized (Munro, 2012).

Faculty members are expected to exhibit and teach academic integrity, however, cases such as

Stapel and Li's demonstrate that even those meant to uphold the principles of academic integrity

are not immune to dishonesty. Conversely, a greater focus is placed on student dishonesty and what

can be done to ameliorate this increasing problem.

Much of the literature on academic integrity focuses on plagiarism among university

students. The literature is also varied by topic discipline, focusing on issues specific to STEM,

business, and others. Research in this area is also widely focused on how to deal with issues related

to academic integrity, offering insight into best practices for cases of plagiarism or other offences

(Ercegovac & Richardson, 2004). Despite the extensive literature available in this area and the wide

range of studies that have already been conducted, academic integrity remains a serious issue for

university administrators who have increased their efforts in tackling the problem (Compton &

Pfau, 2008). This has resulted in the formation of working groups and the expansion of services

designed to support students in issues related to academic integrity.

Current research trends include studying international student populations as well as

faculty confidence and teaching experience as they relate to issues of academic integrity (Shaw,

Moore & Gandhidasan, 2007; Simon et al., 2003). In the following section, common types of

academic dishonesty will be outlined including cheating, plagiarism, fraud, inappropriate

collaboration and new types of academic dishonesty that have surfaced more recently.

Academic Dishonesty

Any act against the principles of academic integrity can be deemed as academic dishonesty.

This section will present the behaviors that are most frequently reported as academic dishonesty.

Cheating. Cheating is among the most obvious and literal forms of academic dishonesty and

there is very little argument as to what constitutes cheating in academic settings (McCabe et al.,

2012). The descriptors used to define cheating indicate that it is a deliberate attempt to make an

unearned or unwarranted achievement in one's collegial endeavors, based on the fact that one has

acquired knowledge dishonestly. Burke (in Ercegovac & Richardson, 2004) offers the following

definition: "cheating is intentionally using or attempting to use unauthorized materials,

information, or study aids in any academic exercise" (p. 304). Materials and information that are

prohibited and considered cheating are procuring or accessing contraband material for the purpose

of increasing achievement on an assessment (i.e. notes, calculators, cell phones, or other aids that

would allow an unfair advantage); acquiring test or exam materials from previous semesters

without explicit permission; direct copying of another person's material or work; and falsely

submitting coursework that has been completed by another person. Further to this non-exhaustive

list of offences, McCabe, Treviño, and Butterfield (2001) add that allowing a fellow student to copy

one's responses during a test or exam is also considered cheating. This extends to other

assignments or coursework where collaboration is unacceptable and aiding a fellow student is

considered an offence. Later on in this section, this final form of cheating is described in a broader

sense as 'inappropriate collaboration'.

Cheating is often thought to be a greater problem where it becomes the social norm. If a

group or community at a university tends to engage in cheating, this can become normalized and

difficult to reverse (Lee, 2009b). Cheating is often related to naiveté, lack of preparedness, instructor inexperience and poor classroom management skills, and class sizes (Diekhoff, LaBeff, Shinohara, & Yasukawa, 1999). Cheating on written work is often referred to as its own category of misconduct: plagiarism.

Plagiarism. Plagiarism, a varied exploit, is described by Gullifer and Tyson (2010) as "fraudulent behavior that diminishes the intellectual property of the original author and rewards plagiarists for their work" (p. 463). It is posited that plagiarism is neither easily defined nor understood and, therefore, is somewhat ambiguous. The literature suggests that there is a general lack of consensus on how best to define plagiarism, particularly as it applies across all disciplines (Ercegovac & Richardson, 2004). Having said that, several descriptors are used repeatedly in the literature to explain plagiarism, offer insight into its detection, and propose methods to reduce its prevalence. Plagiarism is often referred to as the act of improperly citing sources of information in one's writing, lying or stealing ideas, and insulting a primary author (Ibid., 2004).

The University of British Columbia's *Vancouver Academic Calendar 2014/15* describes plagiarism as follows:

> Plagiarism, which is intellectual theft, occurs where an individual submits or presents the oral or written work of another person as his or her own. Scholarship quite properly rests upon examining and referring to the thoughts and writings of others. However, when another person's words (i.e. phrases, sentences, or paragraphs), ideas, or entire works are used, the author must be acknowledged in the text, in footnotes, in endnotes, or in another accepted form of academic citation. Where direct quotations are made, they must be clearly delineated (for example, within quotation marks or separately indented). Failure to provide proper attribution is plagiarism because it represents someone else's work as one's own. (para. 2)

The University of Manitoba's *2014-2015 Academic Calendar* adds that inadequate and incorrect citation methods are also considered to be academic dishonesty as it is a discourtesy to readers because they would be unable to determine the original source and would not be able to refer to the appropriate document or text from which the initial idea came. Therefore, it is the non-attempt to disclose where information came from that is the actual offence.

Submitting a piece of writing that is wholly or in part plagiarized is considered a serious offence and grounds for suspension or expulsion at most universities (University of British Columbia, 2014; University of Manitoba, 2014a; University of Waterloo, 2010). Although plagiarizing comes with serious consequences, it can be difficult to understand as it is complex and comes in many forms. Walker (2010) identifies three different types of plagiarism:

"Sham": the act of pretending to paraphrase where a direct quote is properly cited but quotation marks are not used;

"Verbatim": the act of copying a section of text and inserting it in one's paper without paraphrasing, quoting, or citing; and

"Purloining": the act of submitting a paper where a significant or entire part has been completed by another person or student.

The various types of plagiarism are not arguable and the academic community understands it to be so. However, there is debate and confusion as to how to properly paraphrase, quote, and cite someone else's work (Löfström, 2011). Students can often see their fault and understand why it is wrong; however, they have more difficulty in establishing attitudes and behaviors which show an appreciation of academic integrity that go beyond attempts to avoid it (Ibid., 2011).

Fraud. Students can be directed to the descriptions and warnings outlined for plagiarism and cheating when searching for fraud in the academic calendar (University of Manitoba, 2014a). In fact, many acts of cheating could be constituted as fraud as well (for example, submitting an assignment as one's own when it was written by another person). It is also widely understood that

one student impersonating another for the purpose of completing a test or exam is considered an

act of fraud. This is punishable for both the imposter and the student seeking an imposter

(University of British Columbia, 2014). Fabrication is another form of fraud where one might falsify

or invent information or citations (Ercegovac & Richardson, 2004).

Fraudulent excuses are studied by Roig and Caso (2005), who find that they play a

significant part in self-reported academic dishonesty. Several students in their study admit to using

a fraudulent excuse to buy more time to complete an assignment or to release themselves of course

requirements. Some excuses are found to be legitimate, but more importantly, they are extremely

varied; this leads to difficulty in detecting which excuses are legitimate and which are fraudulent. It

is also noted that instructors and administrators must become more aware of fraudulent excuses as

a form of academic dishonesty.

Inappropriate collaboration. Collaborating on coursework is generally forbidden, unless

explicitly outlined by the professor. Ercegovac & Richardson (2004) propose that inappropriate

collaboration can be described as "intentionally or knowingly helping or attempting to help another

to commit an act of academic dishonesty" (p. 304). However, this extends beyond pairing with a

classmate to work on an assignment; it suggests working with peers in any way may be construed

as inappropriate collaboration.

Although collaborating with others can often enhance learning, students are generally not

permitted to work with others on their coursework without instructions to do so. For example, the

University of Manitoba's *2014-2015 Academic Calendar* addresses inappropriate collaboration as

working with others on assignments, tests, or laboratory work when one has not been instructed to

do so or has not been granted permission (University of Manitoba, 2014a).

Regardless of the benefits of collaborating with others, by and large, university professors

continue to place more importance on *individual* rather than collective efforts. In keeping with this

trend, collaborating on coursework or enabling one's own success – or the success of others –

through dishonest measures is considered misconduct and can result in serious consequences.

Novel types. Academic dishonesty in higher education is constantly evolving and it will

likely continue to change with increased accessibility to information. As a result, the types of

offences are growing and new ethical questions are being raised.

Students are sharing information in unprecedented ways and issues of intellectual property

and privacy continue to be discussed. For example, the use of video and audio recorders in the

classroom has become a contentious issue. Universities now state that the recording of lectures

may or may not be permitted and this is "entirely at the discretion of the individual instructor"

(University of Toronto, n.d., para. 4). Some students have been found to be using the lecture

material they have recorded for personal gain which infringes on copyright laws and compromises

the intellectual property of the lecturer (Scher Zagier, 2011). The sharing of information poses new

challenges for the university community in that faculty and students alike may not know what is

considered misconduct. In other words, the information age is changing the landscape of academic

dishonesty and setting new definitions and boundaries for what constitutes an act of misconduct in

higher education (McCabe et al., 2001).

The "Information Age" or the increased prevalence of technology is a great contributor to

the increase in academic dishonesty as well as the improved detection of misconduct. There is

greater access to information today than ever before, and it is suggested that this magnifies the

temptation to engage in academic dishonesty (Blair, 2009). Modes of cheating and plagiarism have

evolved with the increase in accessibility of information and, similarly, efforts to catch students

have also improved. Ercegovac and Richardson (2004) note that research shows extensive use of

paper mills or online sources for ordering customized papers written by another person; the

researchers go on to explain that the "interdisciplinary nature of the topic and the ethical

challenges of accessing and using information technology, especially in the age of the Internet"

shine a spotlight on research related to issues of academic integrity in higher education (p. 301).

The works of Ercegovac and Richardson (2004) and McCabe et al. (2001) show that no

student group or demographic is immune to academic dishonesty; it is an epidemic that plagues all

types of students – and some faculty – in a range of programs and from various backgrounds.

However, the research does show a trend in the characteristics of those students who openly admit

to academic misconduct and those who are accused and tried for the offense. These characteristics

are discussed in the following section.

Conceptions of Academic Integrity

Academic integrity is a commonly used term in higher education; however, the

understanding of these words often varies amongst students. In addition, an operational definition

of academic dishonesty that translates across all disciplines has yet to be defined at most

universities. That is to say that the explanations are often ambiguous in their attempts to outline

the specific steps one must take to avoid academic dishonesty. Ercegovac and Richardson (2004)

uncover that one form of academic dishonesty, plagiarism, is not well defined in the literature and a

wide range of definitions is found. This, of course, has implications for students who must interpret

the policies and procedures related to academic integrity.

To some students, academic integrity is an inherent quality that one must possess, to other

students, it is a set of rules that are meant to be followed; and to others yet, it is ambiguous,

confusing, and represented poorly by peers and professors. There are varied experiences with

academic integrity and it seems that negative encounters are more readily understood; students

who never experience penalties related to an incident of academic dishonesty or learn the concepts

through some other experience may never truly understand the full meaning of academic integrity.

Those students who learn through experience and suffer consequences or remediation – whether

unintentional or deliberate – may gain a better understanding of academic integrity.

Nevertheless, Christensen Hughes and McCabe (2006) find that many undergraduate students become involved in some form of academic dishonesty, "despite knowing that such behavior is ethically or morally wrong" (p. 49). This suggests that students are not unfamiliar with policies of academic integrity and that they act dishonestly for some reason rather than out of ignorance. Löfström (2011) also reveals that a basic, shared understanding of plagiarism often means that a consensus can be found on the severity of the offense. Furthermore, a basic understanding of procedures for writing means that students can easily identify ethical challenges in citing the work of others.

Specifically in the instance of plagiarism, Löfström (2011) finds that students generally understand that copying or submitting work is unacceptable and that it amounts to an academic offense; further evidence shows that depraved intent is often the culprit in cases of academic dishonesty. More specifically, students demonstrate an understanding of the steps involved in producing an academically honest piece of work and an awareness of processes involving citing and authorship has been shown among them; they predominantly show an understanding that copying someone else's work verbatim is indeed plagiarism – there is little ambiguity in this area. Students do not offer examples of Walker's (2010) "purloining" and few examples of sham paraphrasing (Löfström, 2011).

According to Löfström (2011), proper and mandatory citations as well as the responsibility to provide reliable research act as innate moral questions that are easily fulfilled; that is to say that students understand that credit must be given where it is due. However, the greater moral dilemma at hand, with respect to integrity and knowledge dissemination, is not as easily recognized. Students generally display an acute understanding of how to write a paper that is accurately cited; however, the theoretical basis for this act is often confused or not understood. In other words, although students can cite correctly, they do not appreciate the underlying principles that the procedures of academic writing are built upon.

Additionally, researchers have studied students in specific content areas, years of study, locations, different sizes of university, and different cultural groups (Abasi & Graves, 2008; Chen & Van Ullen, 2011; Compton & Pfau, 2008; McCabe et al., 2001; Shaw et al., 2007; Simon et al. 2003). These studies indicate that students generally acknowledge the importance of academic dishonesty and express a desire to behave honestly in their coursework, although they do not necessarily have the ability to appropriately translate this into practice (Abasi & Graves, 2008; Löfström, 2011). In fact, translating good intentions into actual practice can prove to be challenging for many students. Löfström's (2011) work shows that much of the problem lies with the understanding of academic misconduct, and that it is perceived that one can avoid dishonesty by following a protocol or set of established directives. Abasi and Graves (2008) find this to be true in their study of international graduate student experiences with plagiarism policies. Students surveyed in the study gave the impression that the writing process was formulaic and that crediting original authors was achieved by observing standard guidelines with precision. Although there are many print and online sources that offer guidelines for citing sources properly (e.g. Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, 2010; The Purdue Online Writing Lab, n.d.; Handouts, Academic Learning Centre, University of Manitoba, 2014b), some students still find it difficult to appreciate the need for ethical consideration in writing and for respecting the intellectual property of others. For example, it is found that "many students are ignorant of the guidelines pertaining to academic integrity and even when they do understand they often attribute differing values to their importance" (Ercegovac & Richardson, 2004, p. 305). In other words, students who understand the concepts of academic integrity have varied perceptions of its significance; their reasons for following rules and guidelines and establishing integrity are subjective and are not necessarily predictable. In addition, some professors exhibit ambivalence in issues of academic integrity; they might believe that their task is to teach content and feel that the task of teaching integrity is an onerous one.

Furthermore, a degree of ambivalence has also been found in student attitudes towards plagiarism (Halupa, 2014). Some students seem unconvinced of the need for stringent rules and regulations in academic writing. They voice frustration about the importance of the issue and the stance that professors or instructors take with regard to implementing policies on academic integrity. Moreover, student perspectives are vital to understanding the problem; in fact, much of what we know and understand about academic integrity comes from qualitative research and self-reported data. Therefore, the question that is often asked is: Can students be relied on to be truthful in their accounts of academic dishonesty and are the results of research in this area of any value?

The attitudes and perspectives have also changed over time, so Bower's conclusions from decades ago may not be applicable to today's context. For example, citation techniques are understood and appreciated differently by different students and some may not deem certain citation strategies as inappropriate (McCabe et al., 2001).

"However, while most students know that plagiarism is wrong, they often do not fully understand the various actions that constitute plagiarism," leading to their involvement in misconduct and enduring the consequences of these actions (Yeo, 2007, p. 201). This shows that students are not always malicious in their academic misadventures and may understand them differently than their professors (Chapman & Lupton, 2004). Furthermore, it is suggested that international students, in particular, come with cultural conditioning that may involve them in more than their share of academic dishonesty cases. In addition, international students may have a different understanding of intellectual property and the sharing of ideas; this could prove troublesome when attempting to follow the policies and procedures of a foreign university (Chapman & Lupton, 2004; Chen & Van Ullen, 2011, p. 210). Knowing that ambiguity and confusion often accompany issues related to academic integrity, one must ask how it can be promoted and remediated.

Tackling the Problem

For many years, universities and colleges have tried to quell the academic dishonesty epidemic and a number of initiatives have been undertaken to better understand and impede this growing trend (MacFarlane et al., 2012; McCabe, 1993). These include preventative measures, strong disciplinary actions, remediation for offenders, support to faculty, and the examination of existing policies and procedures (Compton & Pfau, 2008; Simon et al., 2003). Some important questions to ask are: 1) When is the best time to incorporate lessons on academic integrity? 2) Who is best suited to deliver these lessons and talk about the importance of adhering to policies? And 3) where does the education for appreciation and adherence need to happen? It is not simply a matter of ensuring that resources are present for students and instructors to access. Creative, new measures are taken to ensure that students graduate with degrees honestly and fairly, which moves universities and colleges to adopt unique methods in the educational delivery of academic integrity.

Löfström (2011) reports that the concern for academic integrity has grown with increasing student numbers and the subsequent strain on resources. Some suggestions are offered on how to quell the increase in academic dishonesty, such as changing policies and procedures so that the focus is on proactive measures rather than listing the dos and don'ts of academic integrity. For example, most policies on academic integrity teach students how to avoid dishonest behavior, rather than foster an understanding of what it means to be a good and honest writer (Abasi & Graves, 2008). Suggestions on how to improve an understanding of academic integrity include: engaging faculty in discussions on how to improve student awareness of expectations; offering workshops to first-time offenders; and encouraging faculty to allow for varying modes of discourse in the writing tasks they assign (Abasi & Graves, 2008; Chen & Van Ullen, 2011). While each of these solutions has merit, there is a recurring theme in the literature on some of the most effective solutions; that is, we need to place a greater emphasis on preventative programming in universities and colleges (Lee & Rice, 2007).

Gullifer and Tyson (2010) observe that students often gain a better appreciation of academic integrity as they progress through their studies. It is probable that with experience, students will become more aware of the policies and procedures and feel more comfortable with how they are to be followed. Unfortunately, this does not help visiting students on exchange; the timeframe within which they can learn about academic integrity within a new context is significantly reduced for these students. Regrettably, those students who will study abroad for a short period of time may never develop an appreciation for how academic integrity is defined in the new context. Compton and Pfau (2008) echo this in their research on tackling academic dishonesty; they write that identifying student mindset is essential in confronting the issue. In other words, students' backgrounds are an indicator for understanding and tackling the problem of academic dishonesty. Regardless of program length, there must be measures in place to understand where the students are coming from and why they think what they think. In order to curb actions that lack integrity, we must understand the roots of those actions.

In the following sections, four themes related to troubleshooting and prevention will be discussed: 1) detection; 2) faculty-administration partnerships; 3) changing attitudes; and 4) empowering students.

Detection. The Internet makes detection of academic dishonesty a great deal easier than it has been in the past. This alone has become a deterrent to plagiarism – though paradoxically – as now more than ever, the World Wide Web is ripe with paper mills and cheating aids as much as there are search engines to hunt for copying (Walker, 2010). It is also argued that academic dishonesty has not actually increased, rather it has merely become more detectable and, therefore, the number of reported cases has grown immensely (McCabe et al., 2001). The ability to detect academic dishonesty will always be a strong deterrent in that it plays on the fear that students may be caught and charged with academic dishonesty. There will be students who are fearless or

desperate, yet the threat of detection is a powerful one; it will continue to promote academic integrity.

When administrative policies, in general, and faculty, in particular, make it clear that academic dishonesty will not be tolerated and will be taken seriously, it can influence students to act appropriately in their work. Conversely, threats are insufficient as they may not lead to a fuller understanding of the principles underlying academic integrity (Abasi & Graves, 2008). In order to assist students in gaining a better understanding, faculty and administration must be prepared to offer guidance beyond the threat of detection. On this note, Gullifer and Tyson (2010) state that "amongst academics, there appears to be an assumption that, by merely providing access to the academic misconduct policy and plagiarism guidelines, students would utilize these resources and, therefore, have a good understanding" of the policies and procedures (p. 466). They believe that faculty and administration should be encouraged to take an increasingly active role in the teaching of academic integrity and to think of it more as an educative rather than a punitive process.

Faculty-administration partnerships. Individual perceptions of academic integrity play a significant role in how academic integrity is understood more generally. Faculty and administrators who emphasize the importance of the policies and procedures are found to instill a greater degree of fear when it comes to academic dishonesty. It is found that when the faculty and administration are successful in translating the importance of academic integrity, students are less likely to engage in academic dishonesty (Diekhoff et al., 1999; McGowan & Lightbody, 2008). McCabe et al. (2001) suggest that when students believe that academic integrity is a serious issue, they were "less likely to rationalize or justify any cheating behavior that they did admit to, and were more likely to talk about the importance of integrity and about how a moral community can minimize cheating" (p. 226). Furthermore, when faculty collaborate and share practices for teaching proper citation students are more likely to see the issue as important in all areas of their university education. To accomplish a unified understanding among students, it is essential that the faculty and

administration work in partnership on efforts to quell academic dishonesty. In fact, strengthening partnerships among university administration and faculty members is vital for improved communication and overall cohesion of policy implementation.

Simon et al. (2003) find that faculty can sometimes be critical of university administration for being non-supportive in the delivery of education, thinking that action is not taken when it should be. The researchers point out that the centralization of power within university administration is often misleading, as it suggests that they are highly influential in decision-making and responding to limitations such as academic dishonesty. Alternatively, faculty members exhibit power and authority as guided by their own precedence; in other words, professors' own interests will influence the classroom atmosphere and the perceived importance of academic integrity. Moreover, the greater confidence instructors have in the administrations' effectiveness, the less likely it is that their students will engage in academic dishonesty in that course. Employing techniques in the classroom that promote academic integrity are often contingent on faculty convictions with regard to administrative functions. A level of trust is required between "street-level bureaucrats (i.e. faculty) and organizational elites (i.e. administrators)" in order to maintain sound morals throughout the institution (Ibid., p. 194).

Faculty members often choose to manage classroom issues on their own without administrative involvement. This is extended to cases of academic dishonesty; instructors generally prefer to deal with these issues immediately and either prescribe punishment or suggest some form of remediation. If afforded this freedom, instructors are able to bolster their position as leaders in the classroom and further establish respect. Instructor success in classroom management – including cases of academic dishonesty – is shown to decrease the instances of caustic or dishonest behavior. Alternatively, faculty members can benefit if their judgment in how to respond to cases of academic integrity is backed by the administration. On the other hand, their authority in the

classroom may be compromised if the administration does not back actions taken in dealing with academic dishonesty (McCabe, 1993; Simon et al., 2003).

Changing attitudes. Löfström (2011) argues that avoiding plagiarism detracts from the core principle of ethics in research and creates an academic culture that is reactive to academic dishonesty rather than being proactive. Preventative strategies related to plagiarism are said to be most important, as their ability to elicit a change in attitude towards academic integrity is strongest in the early stages of a student's academic career (Compton & Pfau, 2008). However, that is not to say that reacting to plagiarism cases as they arise is a lost cause, as this will likely always be needed. Establishing strict rules and regulations within course syllabi can cause students to miss opportunities to fully understand and appreciate academic integrity (Abasi & Graves, 2008; Löfström, 2011). The focus is taken off of the core purpose for citation: to contribute and build upon the knowledge base. "More effective pedagogical tools are needed to engage students in real-life moral dilemmas at their levels of moral reasoning" if we are to reach the heart of the problem (Ercegovac & Richardson, 2004, p. 302). Essentially, students need to be affected by experiences and case studies in order to appreciate academic integrity and see how it will play out in their academic careers.

Compton and Pfau (2008) outline their research on "inoculating" students against rationalizing academic dishonesty and suggest that it is possible to protect students from plagiarism. This is based on ideas related to behavior analysis research and the idea that "individuals can be inoculated against persuasion, similarly to how individuals can be inoculated against viruses" (p. 100). Give students a small measure of plagiarism and they will produce the antibodies needed to fight against future temptation. Appendix A offers an example of an inoculation message used by the Asper School of Business at the University of Manitoba to warn students of the punishments that are administered due to academic dishonesty. The poster displays typical offences and their punishments and attempts to instill fear in students to prevent them from

engaging in academic dishonesty. Materials with this message are designed to plant a two-fold message in the minds of students: 1) students understand the wrongdoing; and 2) they feel greater guilt or fear of punishment than temptation to engage in academic dishonesty (Ibid., 2008).

The inoculation approach also involves showing students messages that justify plagiarism. Messages are written with carefully selected vocabulary and writing-styles so as to elicit an emotional or rational response (Ibid., 2008). Compton and Pfau (2008) have found that using "fear-based inoculation messages" could be useful in preventing students from plagiarizing (p. 112). They also conclude that using messages designed for a rational response may be useful in treating student attitudes towards plagiarism and can act to improve awareness and reach students on a logical level that they can understand. This evidence shows that attitudes toward issues of academic integrity are the largest hurdle in tackling the issue. If attitudes towards plagiarism are generally negative, "enhancing vested interest should further discourage plagiarism" (Ibid., 2008, p. 112). Helping students to change their attitudes is a step in tackling the growing problem of academic dishonesty and employing preventative and creative measures rather than directions for avoiding misconduct seems to be worthwhile.

Empowerment. Recent evidence suggests that student cheating and plagiarism are increasing with an increased knowledge and awareness of the issue. Löfström (2011) agrees stating that the "university environment is not per se particularly fruitful for facilitating the development of ethical sensitivity" (p. 258). The question then becomes how to promote scholarship within both academic and professional programs. Macfarlane (2012) argues that if students feel the responsibility of a scholar, they will be less likely to give in to the temptation of academic dishonesty. They will also be more likely to care about establishing routines and practices that are honest, than getting ahead at whatever cost. On this note, Ercegovac and Richardson (2004) offer the following:

Learners need to be introduced to appropriate academic conduct. All these different forms

of academic dishonesty should be explained to students regardless of their academic status.

However, we need to develop appropriate levels of presentation to different levels of

students' moral reasoning. (p. 305)

Logic and moral reasoning are cornerstones in academia and professional life, and in order

to promote academic integrity, this must be acknowledged and better understood. We cannot

assume that all students are novices when considering ethics; however, for most students,

additional learning must take place to solidify ethical behavior. Ultimately, scholarship can act as a

tool to promote academic integrity (Ibid., 2012).

As changing attitudes become a reality, it follows then that students may better understand

the bigger picture and why they should behave ethically. As much as there is a need to take

preventative measures and respond retroactively, yet timely, on issues of academic integrity, there

remains the concept of scholarship as a weapon against misconduct. Macfarlane (2012) argues that

scholars strongly believe that their ideas and thoughts are their own intellectual property.

Consequently, the possession of ideas can establish hierarchies within the learning community,

namely, professors above students. Professors generally exclude students from the scholarly

community because they see them as consumers rather than contributors. If students are included

as contributors and given the chance to act as scholars rather than culprits in the academic integrity

showdown, issues of academic dishonesty might just dwindle. The problem is that students

"essentially occupy a position of dependence in that they are subject to the authority of their

teachers and institutions" and they are not encouraged to act as scholars (Ibid., 2012, p. 720). It can

then be assumed that given this apprenticeship status, students are not equipped to act as scholars

or practice the equivalent amount of academic integrity as faculty or administrators (Ercegovac &

Richardson, 2004; Macfarlane, 2012). This notion – that students are less capable of integrity – acts

as a self-fulfilling prophecy; in other words, they feel they are pigeonholed so they may as well

resort to academic dishonesty as it is almost expected of them.

Lastly, with all the concern surrounding academic dishonesty, it may be that faculty

members and administrators should be less focused on accusing and punishing students and more

focused on establishing proactive measures to ensure that students understand the expectations.

Even proactive measures, it has been argued, are not enough. Blair (2009) writes that:

Figuring out ways to "catch" plagiarist-students and even finding ways to develop

assignments in the hope of preventing plagiarism, while worthwhile pursuits, are not

enough… In both theoretical and practical ways, our contemporary culture makes such

issues even muddier. That is, we drown in a sea of information, print-based and electronic,

and work through even larger questions of authorship, identity, autonomy, and subjectivity

posed by poststructuralist and cultural studies theories, we are forced to 'examine our own

assumptions and lay bare the misconceptions and fuzzy definitions that derive from a

dearth of inquiry into the nature of the beast that we want to tame'. (p. 159)

The issue is "muddy" and we must re-examine our misconstructions and perceptions of the

issue. It is particularly important that we do this for international students who are continuously

processing their understanding of the issue as they come in contact with academic integrity at their

host universities. More specifically, these students may need more time to fully understand the

policies and procedures. It cannot be assumed that they possess the same habits and expectations

as domestic students. Perhaps we should be more forgiving of new international students, so that

we acknowledge the value placed on their past educational experiences, while helping to guide

them to a solid understanding of their new educational environment. This is not to say that

domestic students do not also require a softer landing; this study focuses on the international

student context.

To sum up, academic dishonesty is beginning to generate so much "hysteria" that faculty and administrators seem to be more focused on catching students in the act than they are focused on educating and treating students as contributors to the knowledge base (Macfarlane, 2012). In addition, faculty and administrators may be unhurried or unwilling to reassess their own conceptions of academic integrity (Blair, 2009). All that said, the focus should remain on building rapport, meeting students' individual needs, ensuring that policies are fully understood, and providing supports and learning opportunities for all students, and particularly international students. Despite the initiatives and institutional supports that have been put in place, the problem persists. The following section will take a look at the reasons why students are academically dishonest.

Motives for Misconduct

New forms of academic dishonesty are on the rise, which is forcing universities and colleges to keep up with these trends. As the types of dishonest activities emerge and develop with changing times, certain principal offences remain at the heart of the issue. Understanding who, specifically, is engaging in academic dishonesty is a common focus for researchers in this area.

For example, researchers such as Compton and Pfau (2008), Löfström (2011), and McCabe et al. (2001) find differences between novice and advanced students. More specifically, they find that students' views on proper citation methods develop over time and with experience they are able to produce their own analytical thoughts as opposed to carbon-copied ideas that are generally offered by first-year students. The research shows that with further university experience, students are able to avoid academic dishonesty with the advancement of their critical thinking skills (Löfström, 2011; McCabe et al., 2001; Walker, 2010). According to Löfström (2011):

> [A]mong the more advanced students, the level of understanding reaches a multi-structural level, at which the student is able to enumerate, describe, illustrate, sequence, select, combine, do algorithms, and follow procedures, but they struggle with making the

connections between these or draw conclusions based on inter-relations. The students

would need to reach a relational level of understanding in order to compare, contrast,

explain causes, analyze, relate, integrate and apply knowledge of research ethics and

academic writing. At this level, a student is able to address why an issue is ethical in nature,

and can provide reasonable explanations for what might have caused the issue and how it

may be solved. (p. 259)

The inexperience of some students and the contribution of other factors likely contribute to

the significant increase in self-reported academic dishonesty cases. Among the other factors are the

massification and internationalization of education, increasing access to information, and

increasing competition and pressures among students (Macfarlane et al., 2012). There are also

several contextual and individual factors that are highlighted in the literature.

Contextual and individual factors. Reasons for engaging in academic dishonesty vary

from ignorant unawareness to a malicious intent to seek academic gain by way of deceit in one's

accomplishments. McCabe, Butterfield, and Treviño (2012) have done extensive research in

academic dishonesty in order to identify the motives. They found that factors contributing to

engagement in academic dishonesty generally fall into two categories: "contextual factors" and

"personal factors." Individual or personal factors include age, gender, grades, and extra-curricular

participation. For example, younger students are found to engage in cheating more often than older

students; and students with lower grade point averages are found to engage in cheating behavior

more so than students with higher grade point averages (Ibid., 2012). Furthermore, McCabe and

colleagues (2001) found that cheating and inappropriate collaboration have increased among

female students. Lastly, students who are heavily involved in extra-curricular activities are more

likely to report that they engage in cheating behavior (McCabe et al., 2012).

Contextual factors include peer behavior, peer approval or disapproval, individual

perceptions, and severity of punishment. McCabe and colleagues (2012) find that "peer influence

exhibits a stronger relationship with academic integrity than does the presence or absence of an honor code" (p. 114). In addition, the researchers find that students are less likely to engage in cheating behavior if they feel their peers would disapprove of the behavior (Ibid., 2012).

Specific to academic integrity, these factors relate to: the overall culture of academic integrity within a class and within the university community, adherence to policies and procedures, effectiveness of training opportunities in academic integrity, the size of the student population, the presence of honor codes and faculty involvement and/or sternness in disciplinary actions (McCabe et al., 2001).

Despite both factors playing a role in the likelihood that a student will engage in academic dishonesty, contextual factors are found to be a greater influence (McCabe et al., 2012). In other words, the context in which an act of academic dishonesty presents itself is heavily tied to the frequency of its occurrence among students. McCabe et al. (2001) state that larger campuses are more likely to have instances of self-reported misconduct and speculated that students in their first years of university who are enrolled in large, introductory classes and are less likely to make any kind of special connection with their instructors or may show a lack of interest in the course topics. These factors may result in dishonest behavior because of a lack of engagement and interest resulting from large class sizes and generalized topics. Students further along in their studies are more likely to be in smaller classes with more specialized topics, resulting in an environment that facilitates engagement and a personal connection with their professors. McCabe et al. (2001) note the likelihood that fewer students will behave dishonestly in their studies when they are engaged and feel a worthwhile investment in their courses; however, this often only comes about as a result of experience and progression in one's studies.

Individual factors are also quite commonly noted as reasons for engaging in academic dishonesty, although students are often quick to shift the blame and are often reluctant to take

personal responsibility for their actions. Some students also cheat when they feel that their instructors do not take academic dishonesty seriously (Ibid., 2001).

One specific individual factor known to have a significant impact on academic integrity is disinterest in the course content. McCabe et al. (2012) find that students often feel inclined to cheat when they are disinterested in the topics they are studying. Stephens, Fomakin, and Yukhymenko's (2010) work echoes that studying a subject that is not of interest has been known to influence a student's involvement in academic dishonesty. In fact, the researcher has personal experiences with several international students who could be categorized as such. At the University of Manitoba, international students who do not meet the English language requirements might be admitted conditionally which allows them to study English prior to entering degree studies. International students who enter the university on this track can even bypass the seemingly daunting language proficiency tests, such as Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) and International English Language Testing System (IELTS). In order to enter degree studies without meeting the language proficiency requirements, students must achieve a certain level of proficiency within the language program. While this may be a great opportunity for students who do not meet the language requirements, it is important to note that English language training may be seen as an obstacle to overcome before studying their program of interest. While having a firm grasp of English is obviously necessary to be successful in a Canadian university, this does not guarantee that students who speak English as an additional language will be interested in nouns, verb tenses, or prepositions.

In addition to topic disinterest there are several other factors that may affect international student engagement in academic dishonesty; these unique factors are outlined in the next section.

International Students

The works of Bradshaw and Baluja (2011), Marcus (2011) and McGowan and Lightbody (2008) mention increasing reports of international student engagement in academic dishonesty.

While the research is limited in this area, universities and colleges are reporting a greater increase in academic dishonesty among international students than among domestic students (Bradshaw & Baluja, 2011). In particular, they have found that international students are more likely to cheat and/or plagiarize (Marcus, 2011; McGowan & Lightbody, 2008). There are few statistics published, as universities do not normally record the nationality of those caught; however, anecdotal evidence from faculty and administrators demonstrates to the researcher that international students occupy a great deal more time and effort in incidences of academic dishonesty than domestic students.

Stephens et al. (2010) find that undergraduate students at a Ukrainian university are more likely to cheat than American undergraduate students at an American university. Additional research shows that Japanese students are significantly more likely to engage in academic dishonesty than American students (Diekhoff et al., 1999). Furthermore, accusations and convictions of academic dishonesty among international students are so much on the rise that universities are beginning to take notice and think proactively for solutions to the problem (Bradshaw & Baluja, 2011). Some of the research and a lot of the media attention focused on academic dishonesty do little to help us better understand why international students are academically dishonest and seem to be increasingly so. However, it is theorized that international students come from different educational backgrounds and that they may not hold the same academic values as their host university. In other words, international students might not share in the belief of the severity of the issue, nor do they always fully understand the meaning of academic integrity in the context of a foreign university (Bradshaw & Baluja, 2011; Reynolds & Constantine, 2007).

Added stressors. International students must contend with a new educational system and must learn to understand the policies and procedures of their host university. This period of learning is not unique to international students as it can be compared with first-year students and any unpreparedness that they experience when starting university. However, in addition to the

normal stressors of university life, international students must also navigate different habits of

learning and unfamiliar expectations in academic integrity. Reynolds and Constantine (2007) make

the following case on the additional stress that is put on international students:

> In addition to dealing with the typical stressors with college life (e.g., financial demands,
>
> academic pressures, loneliness, career indecision), international students also must contend
>
> with the challenges associated with adapting to a foreign country. Such challenges include
>
> culture shock, confusion, about role expectations…, homesickness, loss of social support,
>
> discrimination, and language barriers. (p. 339)

In other words, these factors and others can cause a great deal of stress for international

students and therefore, one of the common results is their predisposition to engage in academic

dishonesty.

Language barriers. Added to the additional stress experienced by international students is

a common concern for some of them – language barriers. On one hand, language can pose a

problem for several international students and it can affect them academically, socially, and

emotionally. On the other hand, language may not be a barrier for international students as they

may come from countries where English is the national language, or where English has been the

language of instruction throughout their education. However, for those international students

whose first language is not English, the literature states that they often lack the confidence to

express themselves in an additional language (Bradshaw & Baluja (2011); Starobin (2006). This

lack of confidence can lead students to resort to plagiarism in order to write in a way that they feel

will be accepted by their professors. The works of Lee and Rice (2007) and McGowan and

Lightbody (2008) also indicate that students whose first language is not English are more inclined

to engage in academic dishonesty as they feel pressure to meet certain standards, to be on par with

peers, and to meet the expectations of their instructors. More specifically, Gullifer and Tyson (2010)

report that "students experience difficulty in defining their own ideas, and being able to

discriminate between common knowledge and knowledge that requires citation" (p. 470); this might only be magnified for students whose first language is not English.

While there are language proficiency requirements in place in universities and colleges, international students whose first language is not English may feel inadequate when communicating and studying in this language. This inadequacy may translate to their perceptions of their own academic abilities and the stress that this causes is found to contribute to engagement in academic dishonesty (Lee & Rice, 2007; McGowan & Lightbody, 2008).

Unfair stereotyping. Abasi and Graves (2008) and Liu (2005) suggest that international students may not actually engage in academic dishonesty more often than domestic students. It is hypothesized, however, that international students, particularly those whose first language is not English, are simply more likely to get caught. Liu (2005) writes of the common stereotype that Chinese students believe that copy and paste is acceptable. He does not deny that culture is a factor in this type of academic dishonesty; however, he suggests that this stereotype of Chinese students is inaccurate. He argues that just as language may cause international students to be targeted for academic dishonesty, the idea that certain behaviors are acceptable can propel unfair stereotyping of international students. Liu also writes of this concern:

> I am not suggesting that there are no cultural differences in writing or other areas of learning. I know there are, and I appreciate methodical and accurate discussions of cultural differences…. I am hesitant to endorse false assumptions based on inaccurate information because such assumptions often lead to cultural stereotyping, something that is detrimental to and as common in our profession as the practice of neglecting or negating cultural differences. (p. 235)

Abasi and Graves (2008) also suggest that international students whose first language is not English "may be more vulnerable to accusations of fraud as their inappropriate textual borrowing is a more obvious departure from their own style of writing" (p. 222). To elaborate, this means that

international students, whose first language is not English, and who plagiarize, are more likely to be caught on account of their writing sounding too good or better than what is believed that they could write. This is apparent in the researcher's own experience in working with international students and English-language learners. For example, when their writing shows eloquence, great syntax, and sophisticated vocabulary, it is often flagged as a potentially plagiarized piece. It might be thought that a domestic student or an international student with an excellent command of English could write so effectively; however, it may also be thought that international students whose first language is not English could not possibly possess the same gift in the English language. It could be that the students are academically honest, but because of the panic and fear surrounding academic misconduct, we are more consciously *looking* for wrongdoers and find that the easiest targets are the international students whose first language is not English. Consequently, they may be targeted as cheaters or plagiarizers simply because of this common stereotype.

Peer behavior. Peer behavior is among one of the most fervent of variables in explaining why students engage in academic dishonesty (McCabe et al., 2012). Western culture is often viewed as more individualistic than other cultures. Therefore, peer behavior can be even more influential for students from cultures that are more group oriented. Diekhoff, LaBeff, Shinohara, and Yasukawa (1999) suggest this in their comparative research on Japanese versus American perspectives towards cheating. They find that peer pressure is a significant factor in attitudes toward, and instances of, engagement in academic dishonesty. In other words, students may feel pressured by classmates to help them complete an assignment or cheat on a test. Feeling pressure from others can lead students to engage in academically dishonest behavior despite their intentions. In addition to peer pressure, a lack of peer support may also contribute to a decline in academic integrity. On this point, Reynolds and Constantine (2007) suggest the following with regard to international students and their peers:

Interpersonal relationship difficulties with U.S.-born peers often represent another factor that contributes to some international students' heightened stress and coping difficulties. For instance, international students who possess limited English speaking skills and who feel disconnected from their peers may experience heightened levels of interpersonal distress. Peer support can provide… a sense of validation and inclusion for many international students. (p. 340)

Students who have large social networks may have happier outlooks on life. International students who feel isolated and alone can experience heightened levels of stress and, therefore, may become more likely to engage in academic dishonesty. It is important to consider that while administrative supports can be put in place, the vitality of students' social lives often depend on them. Students who are lonely and without a support network may be less likely to think about issues related to academic integrity.

We must acknowledge the unique needs of international students and the fact that they must deal with all the same pressures and issues as domestic students in addition to potential language barriers and culture shock that they might experience. There is often a learning curve or a period of time when international students must navigate their new culture both on and off campus. There are many cultural factors that contribute to international students' engagement in academic dishonesty; the next section will explore these factors.

Culture Clash

The organizational culture within a university may inhibit academic integrity, in that a culture of cheating is formed and becomes normalized. This alone can dictate the ethos of a university student body and if academic dishonesty becomes a cultural norm, then they will continue to be that way (Simon et al., 2003).

Furthermore, student perspectives on academic integrity are very different today than they once were within the context of higher education (McCabe et al., 2012; Gullifer & Tyson, 2010). As

noted earlier, the ease of access to information and the pressures felt by students are attributed to an increase in academic dishonesty. The evidence suggesting that perspectives can change within a country is an important consideration when trying to understand why international students might hold a unique view on ethics.

Chen and Van Ullen (2011) suggest that international students may display different habits with regard to academic integrity; in other words, they may have learned different behaviors in their home countries, which might conflict with domestic student expectations. This, in turn, indicates that culture plays a role in the relationship between student engagement and academic dishonesty. Therefore, if culture is indeed a factor, then a significant advantage is afforded to students of the dominant or home culture. That is not to say that domestic students are less likely to act dishonestly than international students; it implies that the international students will not be as good at understanding academic integrity at the host university. International students must navigate the maze of institutional policies and procedures, as well as having to adapt and integrate into a new social and academic environment. Unfortunately for these students, the consequences of academic misconduct are often much more severe than merely shaking hands at the wrong time or fumbling through some other minor cultural task. 'Messing up' due to issues related to academic integrity might easily mean a greater loss for international students.

These challenges can certainly affect one's well-being and ultimately one's ability to navigate the policies of academic integrity. Pressures such as these may lead international students to behave dishonestly. Engaging in academic dishonesty may be due to a frustration with trying to sort out life in a new country and in figuring out how to integrate into the university community.

In her work with international students, this researcher has made a number of observations regarding academic integrity. In one incident, a student had been caught plagiarizing a large portion of a term paper. When confronted with the obvious and blatant copying, the student was apologetic but expressed that his/her home country had permitted this type of copying. The student claimed

ignorance to the fact that proper citations were required as this was not a requirement at his/her home university. In another incident, a student was caught browsing websites during an online exam; the student claimed that his/her exam had been completed and no misconduct had occurred. Ultimately, it was decided that the student would receive a failing grade and when informed of this, he/she merely stated, *in my country we're allowed to search the Internet when we're done the exam.*

These international students are two of many that have come under scrutiny for academic dishonesty. While cheating can be deemed as blatant and conscious, it is common that international students are not actually aware of the protocols on matters relating to academic integrity. It is a common claim that behavior deemed as academically dishonest in the western world, would not be deemed as such elsewhere. If this is indeed the case, then is it not unfair to lump all students into the same category and expect the same from them? If students are legitimately unaware of the policies or procedures because they come from another country, are they truly engaging in academic dishonesty?

Blair (2009) warns that academic dishonesty takes on various forms and one must be aware of the fact that it can be unintentional, in that greater access to information has created easier ways to copy text and manipulate it in a way that might not satisfy the requirements of academic integrity. This unintentional behavior does not necessarily show a disregard for policy or lack of respect for giving credit to the original author(s). It may indicate that students are honoring an author in the way in which they were taught or that they feel they have adequately manipulated the text to make it their own (Ibid., 2009). While this may be considered dishonesty in their work, if this is the norm to students or if they do not recognize their own actions as dishonest, it is too strong to say that they lack academic integrity. Prior to determining a lack of academic integrity, it must be established that the student understands the policies and procedures. It has been observed that where a greater amount of academic dishonesty is found, there is also a lower level of understanding of the rules and procedures (Gullifer & Tyson, 2010). Shaw, Moore, and Gandhidasan

(2007) suggest that incoming students may be unfamiliar with the policies and procedures on academic integrity and, therefore, they must be treated as novices requiring guidance, clear instruction, and collaboration to fully appreciate what is expected of them in their new academic context.

Evidence of disparity. A study by Stephens et al. (2010) shows that Ukrainian undergraduate students hold significantly different beliefs with regard to academic dishonesty than American students. Their study explores differences in "task value, goal orientations, moral beliefs about cheating and engagement in cheating behaviour" (Stephens, Fomakin, & Yukhymenko, 2010, p. 47). The researchers find that Ukrainian students are similar to American students in terms of task value and goal orientation, however, Ukrainian students find the severity of cheating to be lower than American students. They also report a greater number of instances of engaging in academic dishonesty than American students. Furthermore, American students are found to fear the consequences of academic dishonesty significantly more than Ukrainian students. Ultimately, Stephens et al. (2010) find that increasing academic task value among Ukrainian students is attributed with more compelling beliefs that cheating is wrong. Their comparison of Ukrainian and American students supports the perspective that behavior in academic integrity is culturally constructed.

A similar study with Japanese students shows that, there is a cross-cultural dimension to the interpretation of academic dishonesty and its gravity. Diekhoff et al. (1999) conducted a study of 392 American and 276 Japanese university students where similarities and differences are found among the student groups. The researchers find that,

> Japanese students reported a higher incidence rate of cheating on exams, a greater tendency to neutralize (i.e., justify) cheating, and a greater passivity in their reactions to the observed cheating of others. Among cheaters of both nationalities, Japanese students rated social stigma and fear of punishment as less effective in deterring cheating than did American

students... Among noncheaters of both nationalities, guilt was the most effective deterrent. And students of both cultures, cheaters and noncheaters alike, viewed social stigma as the least effective deterrent to cheating. In both cultures, most students react to cheating by ignoring it, about one-third react by resenting it, and active reactions (i.e. reporting the cheating or confronting the cheater) were seldom reported. (p. 343)

This indicates that certain elements of academic dishonesty might be seen as normative and the consequences not great enough to cause concern or rectify the behavior. There appears to be different viewpoints across the cultures, which may cause culture clash and a lack of understanding for a Ukrainian, Japanese or other international students studying in the U.S.A. or Canada.

A culture clash with respect to academic integrity is not unprecedented; the transition to a host university brings with it a variety of new learning opportunities for international students. They will be introduced to cultural norms that domestic students take for granted and that professors often ignore. The cultural norms of the host university may be at odds with the experiences and reality of international students in their country.

Chen and Van Ullen (2011) explain that "international students bring with them conditioning and expectations that may be at odds with the academic practices of their new settings" (p. 210). The authors go on to state that experiences in the native country may cause a dissonance with the expectations of the student's new environment. Perhaps the student is inexperienced in writing papers or working collaboratively on projects due to course expectations that differ from the new academic environment (Ibid., 2011). That is not to say that expectations are better from one country to the next – that argument is reserved for a later time – it means that student perceptions are variable and depend on their academic background. Even students' understandings of acts of academic dishonesty are erratic, in that their "own perceptions of what is acceptable, such as copying small passages without attribution, and even writing a paper for another student, were surprising" (Chen & Van Ullen, 2011, p. 210).

East (2006) finds that some international students believe that copying without proper citation is deemed as legitimate in the dissemination of knowledge. In fact, when it is done, it implies that the writer has a good understanding of the literature and acknowledges that the thoughts or ideas are valid. Students may believe some behavior to be sound, whereas faculty and domestic students may understand the behavior to be otherwise. Researchers find that some students understood copy-and-paste of text to be acceptable as it shows that one is able to collect information from a variety of sources and piece it together as a coherent and truthful body of text (Chen & Van Ullen, 2011). This is at odds with university policies on plagiarism; in no way, shape or form is one permitted to copy text and fix one's name to it. Some international students do not understand that any text taken directly from another author must be paraphrased or quoted, in addition to being properly cited. This concept may be distinctly "western" in that researchers from China and the Middle East note that university and high school students in these areas believe copy-and-paste to be acceptable on some level.

Chen and Van Ullen (2011) note that international students are often unfamiliar with the standard assessment practices of their host universities. Often times they come from academic cultures that encourage memorization and rote-learning and de-emphasize analysis or critical thinking. Given that many habits of learning are ingrained in childhood and can be difficult to relearn, it is possible that the host universities, often unbending in their practices, may label some international students as inept or even untrustworthy for no good reason.

Collectivist cultures. Collectivist cultures tend to be more liberal in their classifications of academic misconduct from the perspective of present-day individualists. They are generally more tolerant of academic dishonesty when compared with Western perspectives on the issue (Thomas, Raynora, & McKinnon, 2013). It is suggested that academic integrity is a Western concept, one that is derived from cultural norms and practices of the Western world. In support of this idea are other personal factors that might attribute to the rise in issues of academic integrity among international

students (Christensen Hughes & McCabe, 2006). Even in this day of increased collaboration, Canadian universities continue to place more emphasis and weight on solo as opposed to collective efforts. This is evident on the University of Manitoba's website informing students about inappropriate collaboration, which cautions students: "Ensure that your work is original and 100% a result of your effort and yours alone" (University of Manitoba, 2014a). Western cultures view one man's contribution without the aid or addition of collaborators as the utmost in achievement. In fact, "professors and instructors work within departments and are rewarded or sanctioned as individuals, generally related to their academic performance… often seen as evidence of individual independent academic success of failure" (Simon et al., 2003, p. 194).

Collectivist cultures are described as those that put a greater emphasis on togetherness and collaboration than on individual efforts. Collectivists are inherently predisposed to work together on projects, operate under the assumptions that accomplishments are a group effort, and ensure that multiple perspectives and knowledge is presented. Grief (1994) describes collectivist cultures as follows:

> In collectivist societies the social structure is "segregated" in the sense that each individual socially and economically interacts mainly with members of a specific religious, ethnic, or familial group in which contract enforcement is achieved through "informal" economic and social institutions, and members of collectivist societies feel involved in the lives of other members of their group. In individualist societies the social structure is "integrated" in the sense that economic transactions are conducted among people from different groups and individuals shift frequently from one group to another. Contract enforcement is achieved mainly through specialized organizations such as the court, and self-reliance is highly valued. (p. 914)

In the educational context, this means that students from collectivist cultures may be more likely to seek collaboration in their learning and operate on the basis that "integration" is a social

norm. Students who are familiar with the Western context of education will better understand that

the social norms of a university's culture are skewed much more to individualism rather than

collectivism. The University of Manitoba is an example of an institution with a "segregated"

academic achievement structure. By and large, students are awarded degrees based on their sole

contribution or what has been accomplished alone.

The University of Manitoba Context

In Fall 2013, the University of Manitoba reported record enrolment. Student populations

included full-time students, part-time, undergraduate, graduate, and international students

(University of Manitoba, 2013b). Enrolment data were aggregated but what is clear is that the

growth that had been planned has actually occurred, particularly with respect to international

student enrolment. According to data reported by the Office of Institutional Analysis at the

University of Manitoba (2011, 2012, 2013, 2015a, 2015b, 2016), the number of international

students has increased by a minimum of 384 students each year between Fall 2011 and Fall 2015

(see Table 1).

Table 1

International student numbers

Term	Total Students	International Students	Percentage Increase in International Students	Percentage of International Students
Fall 2010	27,747	2,354	8.7%	8.5%
Fall 2011	28,352	2,738	16.3%	9.7%
Fall 2012	29,114	3,266	19.3%	11.2%
Fall 2013	29,682	3,869	18.5%	13.0%
Fall 2014	29,612	4,464	15.4%	15.1%
Fall 2015	29,875	4,854	8.7%	16.2%

While the percentage increase in the number of international students has decreased in the

most recent fall term, the overall percentage of international students at the University of Manitoba

continues to increase. It is worthwhile to note that between 2012 and 2015, the University of

Manitoba reported a greater number of international students from countries that are non-exempt from the English language requirements, versus the number of international students who are reported to be from countries that are exempt from the English language requirements (University of Manitoba, 2012, 2013, 2015a, 2015b). In other words, international students whose first language is not English make up the largest international student group at the University of Manitoba.

Naturally, the Province of Manitoba looks favorably on the international student numbers, as many of the international students will remain in the province after graduation (Mandal & Wilkinson, 2008). However, this significant growth in the number of international students means the use of existing resources at the University of Manitoba may be greater than ever, including the need for English as Additional Language resources, which may be in need of improvement. It also means that there may be increased challenges in the area of academic integrity because, as the researcher discusses, these students come with unique perspectives on academic integrity and may be prejudged as being academically dishonest. In order to assist these students, a number of supports have been put in place.

Functions in support of academic integrity. The University of Manitoba demonstrates a dedication to providing quality education and promoting academic integrity (University of Manitoba, 2013a; 2014c). The working groups, workshops, and support services available to faculty and students are high in number – but the concern about academic dishonesty remains. The success of these services and supports is vital for a positive student experience and the preservation of academic integrity on campus.

One of these supports is the Academic Learning Centre, which, in some cases, is sought for remediation assistance with students who are accused of academic dishonesty. The Academic Learning Centre offers one-on-one workshops for students who have been accused of plagiarism and tutors will work with these students so that they learn proper citation techniques and the

ethics of writing (University of Manitoba, 2014b). This is a fundamental service for students who are not aware of their misconduct and, when used as a learning tool, can help promote an appreciation of the importance of academic integrity and the notion of intellectual property.

Policies and procedures. The University of Manitoba is very clear in its policies on academic integrity; in fact, all instructors are required to include information on these policies in their course syllabi. The academic calendar also offers the policies as well as information to provide guidance in the event of an accusation. The University's website also houses various resources for students and faculty to avoid dishonesty and to understand the consequences.

The University of Manitoba (2014a) states that an instructor cannot take disciplinary action against students who are suspected of academic dishonesty. They must refer the matter to the dean or department head. Arguably, this attempt to centralize punishment within a faculty weakens the authority of the instructor and can compromise the trust between instructor and administration; in other words, an instructor's judgment in a case of academic dishonesty may not align with the administration's method in dealing with the issue and can therefore compromise trust between the two (Simon et al., 2003). In addition to mistrust of the reporting system that is in place, instructors may not report instances of academic dishonesty because they feel the system is flawed, they find reporting to be burdensome, or they believe they can best resolved the issue on their own. Furthermore, centralized punishment does not necessarily allow for a teaching moment to occur at the classroom level, where it may be of extreme benefit to students, particularly if they are first-time offenders and classified as unaware (Ibid., 2003).

Lastly, students at the University of Manitoba are also entitled to appeal the charge made against them and the disciplinary measure taken (University of Manitoba, 2014c). This may further compromise the authority of the instructor and the administration procedures with regard to decision-making in cases of academic dishonesty.

Among the cases of academic dishonesty at the University of Manitoba several have been international students. The following section will examine the case of these students, in particular.

The International Undergraduate Student Context

There were 4,854 international students enrolled at the University of Manitoba in the fall of 2015; this equates to 16.2 percent of the student population. International students made up 14.7 percent of the undergraduate student population (University of Manitoba, 2015). The number of international undergraduate students was not found in the government of Canada reports available online; however, the Canadian government reported that 336,497 international students came to Canada in the year 2014 (CBIE, 2015).

The University of Manitoba sets quotas for international undergraduate and graduate student numbers to manage the enrolment of its students. The plan is to maintain a 10 percent international undergraduate student population over the next few years (University of Manitoba, 2013a). However, it is worth noting that this quota has been exceeded in Fall 2015 as international undergraduate students account for 14.7 percent of the undergraduate student population (University of Manitoba, 2015b). While the international undergraduate student population is managed and meant to remain at a targeted amount, these students may be over-represented in cases of academic dishonesty. Furthermore, international undergraduate students face the contextual and individual factors affecting academic integrity of domestic students, as well as the unique factors affecting international students. For example, topic disinterest may be a factor for international students who are studying the English language with the English Language Centre or Intensive English Program, prior to pursuing their degree of choice. It is worthwhile to explore the various cultural backgrounds of these students and their perspectives on issues of academic integrity to better understand their position within the university and to best support them in their studies.

Theoretical Basis for this Study

It is known that culture affects international students' positions at the university. For the purposes of this study, the overarching theme of culture was used as it applies to a particular organizational structure within the university: policies and procedures related to academic integrity. How do these affect international students' understandings of their university education? Is enough being done to support and guide them, given that they are new to the context? Are standards of academic integrity maintained but at a cost to international students themselves?

Increasingly, the socio-cultural, psychological, and sociological factors affecting international students' success have come to light as an increasing number of international students study abroad. Issues of academic integrity as it relates to adjustment factors for international students are examined through the lens of Hofstede's cultural dimensions as defined in his 1980 work, *Culture's Consequences*. Culture and historical constructs are working to develop students' psyches and their understanding of the world around them. Furthermore, these constructs have implications for that world and the collective understanding within an organization or group.

One set of rules is applied and all students are expected them to follow or face the consequences. International students are entering a new university culture when they step onto their host campus. This unique culture must be navigated and understood rather quickly and over time, acculturation may take place. Undoubtedly, the vast majority of international students will experience culture shock and will learn to adapt to their surroundings. A new understanding of what is meant by academic integrity will be an integral part of this experience. International students come with unique backgrounds and different points of view; the host university must ensure that all necessary measures are taken to make students aware of any new or unforeseen expectations. The policies and pressures to conform create an "anxiety" among international

students causing them to miss the important part that is at the heart of the issue: creating a product that contributes to the field and shows your complete understanding (Abasi & Graves, 2008).

The international student population at Canadian universities, including the University of Manitoba, is burgeoning and so should the concern for adaptation to their new academic environments. This study draws upon the theory that culture is a major player in the success of international undergraduate students at the University of Manitoba. Cultural differences are present from one society to the next; therefore, the success of an organization is defined by its ability to acknowledge differences and build a strong subculture (Hofstede, 1980). In essence, a one-way street approach for policy and planning is illogical. University policies and procedures, faculty and domestic student perspectives, as well as campus life are constrained by culture. Even among faculties and schools the organizational culture may differ due to varying practices and attitudes (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010). Academic integrity is one area of policy within higher education that may be deemed as "culture-bound" (Hofstede, 1980, p. 372). This study uses the national culture dimensions outlined in Hofstede's (1980) *Culture's Consequences* and subsequent works to study international undergraduate student perspectives on issues related to academic integrity. Many Canadian universities are increasingly focused on recruiting international students, thus, diversifying the institutional population and organizational culture. Understanding the differences of a particular international student population and how it compares to the domestic student population can offer support for the actions needed to benefit all parties invested in the university.

Culture's Consequences is a widely used framework for empirical research involving cross-cultural values in the workplace (Taras, Kirkman, & Steel, 2010). Hofstede's theories also offer a framework with which to compare teacher and student relationships in education (Signorini, Wiesemes, & Murphy, 2009). The basic assumption is that culture dictates attitude and behavior, and varies from one society or organization to the next (Hofstede, 1980; Hofstede et al., 2010).

Variations in culture lead to different expectations and expressions from any person, potentially leading to conflict within a multicultural environment.

Hofstede et al. (2010) identified six dimensions that make-up an index of national cultures used to compare countries or societies. These dimensions are "power distance", "individualism", "masculinity", "uncertainty avoidance", "long-term versus short-term orientation", and "indulgence"; each of which offers a spectrum of characteristics for different cultural groups that will now be explained in more detail (Hofstede, 1980; Hofstede et al., 2010; Signorini et al., 2009).

1. "Power distance" – The degree to which power relations are accepted within a group or organization and maintained by its members (Hofstede, 1980; Hofstede et al., 2010; Signorini et al., 2009). Canada ranks 39, which means that the country is egalitarian and its hierarchies are useful for its organizational structure, rather than obligatory as in class-based societies. This ranking also shows that Canadians are arguably more inclined to view leaders as team members (The Hofstede Centre, n.d.).

2. "Individualism" – The degree to which people within a given culture identify themselves individually or collectively (Hofstede, 1980; Hofstede et al., 2010; Signorini et al., 2009). Those with individualistic tendencies are focused on taking care of themselves and their immediate families; those that fall toward the collectivist end of the spectrum have a tendency to work as and for a group (Hofstede et al., 2010; Signorini et al., 2009). Canada ranks 80 on this index indicating that we are an individualistic society; Canadians in the workplace are expected to display creativity and self-management. This ranking also suggests that Canadian organizations operate on meritocracy (The Hofstede Centre, n.d.).

3. "Masculinity" – The favoring of masculine characteristics, such as competition and aggression, over feminine characteristics, such as nurturing and humility (Hofstede et al., 2010; Signorini et al., 2009). The tenet of this cultural dimension is motivation and

whether success is defined by a completed checklist or by loving one's work. Canada

ranks 52 which indicates that they are moderate in their "masculinity"; in other words,

Canadians are not highly competitive and have a tendency to lead well-balanced lives in

terms of work and play (The Hofstede Centre, n.d.).

4. "Uncertainty avoidance" – The degree to which people within a society are willing to

accept a sense of ambiguity as opposed to absolute truth. Some groups require rigid

rules and systems that members must follow, whereas other groups tend to be involved

in discourse surrounding rules and standards (Hofstede et al., 2010; Signorini et al.,

2009). Canada ranks 46 in uncertainty avoidance, which is characterized by a society

that generally accepts that the future is unpredictable. Canadians are also thought to

accept various opinions and encourage freedom of expression (The Hofstede Centre,

n.d.).

5. "Long-term versus Short-term Orientation" – This dimension relates to the moral

standards in place in a society. Long-term oriented societies tend to believe that life is

circumstantial and certainties are contextual. Change is a part of the moral standard of

societies with a long-term orientation; they are non-conformist and feel that future

achievement takes priority over short-term goals. On the opposite end of the spectrum,

short-term oriented societies are bound by static tradition and values. Conventions are

deep-rooted and achievement is measured by instant gratification. Canada scores

relatively moderate on this index at 36, which means it is a relatively normative society.

Canadians are somewhat traditional and short-term oriented (Hofstede et al., The

Hofstede Centre, n.d.).

6. "Indulgence" – The sixth and newest dimension is described as "the extent to which

people try to control their desires and impulses, based on the way they were raised.

Relatively weak control is called "indulgence" and relatively strong control is called

'restraint'. Cultures can, therefore, be described as indulgent or restrained" (The

Hofstede Centre, n.d., para. 13). Canada ranks at 68 on the indulgence index, which

indicates that it is an indulgent society that is focused on fun, enjoyment, and optimism.

(The Hofstede Centre, n.d.).

Each cultural dimension offers powerful insight into the dynamics of multicultural

organizations and can inform the research on a specific area of interest. Academic integrity has a

culture of its own within a university and international students are expected to align their

behaviors with those of the university. Hofstede's cultural dimensions can shed light on the

different attitudes and behaviors international undergraduate students may have with regard to

the culture of academic integrity within a foreign university. The differences between cultures

represented by the participants – as seen in Hofstede's cultural dimensions – are used to inform the

research. There are many factors at play for international students studying at the University of

Manitoba; they are faced with the pressures of an undergraduate journey, as well as the shock of

new social and educational organization schemes (Zhou, Jindal-Snape, Topping, & Todman, 2008).

This study explores their perceptions on issues related to academic integrity through the lens of

Hofstede's six cultural dimensions.

Although each of Hofstede's dimensions make intuitive sense, the researcher has gone to

great pains not to be limited to these dimensions when analyzing the data. Instead, the researcher is

mindful of the fact that some of the data may fall outside of these dimensions; in other words, the

participants may describe experiences that do not fit within any of the above dimensions or are not

consistent with their country's ranking on the dimensions themselves. These are addressed

accordingly in the discussion of the findings.

Summary

As part of an effort to internationalize education in Canada, the government is aggressively

recruiting international students (Government of Canada, 2014). These students are seen as an

asset in many respects, contributing revenue and resources to the Canadian economy as well as strengthening the already multicultural nature of Canadian society. It is the hope that international students will eventually join the work force, further contributing to the economy, knowledge, and expertise in Canada. The Canadian economy stands to benefit a great deal from these students, they are recognized as an asset, and the efforts to bring increasing numbers to universities and colleges are just beginning. While it may sound wonderful, there are increasing numbers of cases of academic dishonesty and many of these violations are made by students from elsewhere. What do we do with them and how do we address these cases in an educative and morally defensible way?

In summary, the landscape of academic integrity has grown and changed with the internationalization and the massification of education. Furthermore, the Internet has made it easier to cheat than ever before and it has also affected students' perspectives on academic dishonesty.

Students are often able to point out when someone has plagiarized or improperly cited someone else's work but they tend to lack the knowledge to appreciate the ethical principles underpinning the concept of academic integrity (Gullifer & Tyson, 2010; Löfström, 2011). They are generally familiar with the concepts surrounding acts of misconduct and can follow the instructions to avoid the offence. In addition, students often do not understand the bigger picture surrounding their ethical obligations to others and advancing the knowledge base (Löfström, 2011).

Fully understanding the reason for integrity in academics is an even greater challenge for international students who will bring their cultural norms to the host university. An appreciation for the unique needs and perspectives of international students is vital in administering the policies and procedures of academic integrity. These students will continue to come to Canada to study and will bring with them different perspectives. Universities like the University of Manitoba need to be prepared to support international students and acknowledge that they come with different cultural norms than domestic students. One specific example of these different cultural norms is academic

integrity and how it is addressed across contexts. In this study, the researcher examines

international undergraduate students' perspectives and how their understandings of academic

integrity has changed as a result of attending the University of Manitoba. Although the study is

relatively small in scale, it is hoped that the findings may contribute to our understanding of

academic integrity across cross-cultural contexts and how we might best support international

students when they study abroad.

CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to examine the perspectives of international undergraduate students on issues related to academic integrity at a large, Western-Canadian university. This student population is selected as a target group for analysis because while some believe that international students are over-represented in cases of academic dishonesty they are under-represented in having their voices heard on this increasingly important issue. Furthermore, at the outset of the study the researcher believed that international undergraduate students are most likely to experience difficulties in learning the norms of a new academic culture.

As mentioned in the previous two chapters, universities are faced with the challenge of responding to the needs of both domestic students and international students. International students, in particular, have unique and varied needs as they adjust to the expectations of a new context, so student services play an important role in bridging gaps and instilling the importance of international and intercultural communication (Starobin, 2006). In order to better understand the context from which international undergraduate students come, their perspectives are sought, data on those perspectives was collected and analyzed, and it is hoped that the study's findings can shed new light on issues related to academic integrity among international students. Furthermore, anything we can learn about international student experiences in this regard can help us better support them in the future.

Researcher's Positioning

The researcher situates herself within this study based on her understanding of the literature and her own experiences and assumptions on issues of academic integrity. It is evident that among the many challenges that a university faces, issues related to academic integrity are among the most common and concerning. As a student advisor at the University of Manitoba, the

researcher has a particular interest in how to best to assist students in this area of their work. In the researcher's work, this issue presents itself frequently among students, although it generally appears to be a minor concern or an after-thought. What is evident, through the researcher's interactions with students, is that the topic of academic integrity is often misunderstood and sometimes requires harsh lessons or severe consequences before one begins to understand the concept.

In the researcher's experience, the myriad of felonies and excuses often emulate one another, yet she feels that each student is a different case with unique experiences and personal reasons for why he/she acts dishonestly. The researcher has yet to witness a student who is not remorseful or ashamed and, it is because of this, the researcher believes that many students behave dishonestly out of desperation or due to pressures to succeed. The researcher also believes that some students are truly ignorant of the requirements in writing academic papers. And lastly, perhaps the measures taken to promote academic dishonesty are more punitive than educative.

The researcher feels strongly that the bigger picture is often lost on international students; in other words, the concepts of ethics and knowledge dissemination are not appreciated and international students do not necessarily understand the Western notion of dissemination or building on the knowledge base. This over-arching assumption of international students offers evidence of difficulty the researcher might experience in fully appreciating the students' perspectives on the issue. Having never had an issue with academic dishonesty as a student herself, the researcher has always found it easy to understand and appreciate the "rules" of academic integrity. As far back as she can recall, doing the right thing in her studies has been easy and the temptation to cheat or plagiarize never won over the fear of punishment if caught. The researcher has always considered herself a moral person in her studies, career, and day-to-day life; integrity, in the Western context, has come easy to her. However, the researcher has experienced culture shock in work abroad and can certainly identify with international students in this regard.

The researcher has experienced alternate cultures in both Egypt and Thailand as an expatriate. These experiences taught her that knowledge of others and the world around us is limited to one's own surroundings and the nature of their upbringing. The researcher's German-Canadian background heavily influences her view of the world and shapes her into the person she is. It became apparent when she first travelled abroad that other viewpoints and opinions are just as valid – and context-specific – as her own. It is these experiences that allow her to empathize with international students who are new to Canada and the University of Manitoba.

The researcher's experiences inarguably affect the research and interpretation of the findings. Atkinson, Coffey, and Delamont (2003) argue that this phenomenon is quite natural, as the researcher inevitably affects responses and the direction of an interview. Charmaz (2008) also adds that "identifying these positions and weighing their effect on research practice, not denying their existence" is a key element to the data collection process (p. 402). Acknowledging the assumptions that the researcher brings into an interview is a primary step in allowing a reflexive mind to direct the research. As Van den Hoonaard (2012), suggests, allowing a participant to simply validate the researcher's assumptions is unethical and poor practice in qualitative research.

The research question presented in this study lent itself to qualitative research methodology. This study is worth conducting in order to acquire a better understanding of how international students experience academic integrity policies at the University of Manitoba. There are stories to be told, stories that might just help inform further policy development in this area at a time when the University of Manitoba, like other universities across Canada, are increasing their international student enrolments.

Methodological Framework

Anderson (1998) describes qualitative research as "a form of inquiry that explores phenomena in their natural settings and uses multi-methods to interpret, understand, explain and bring meaning to them" (p. 119). In addition, Creswell (2014) states that "qualitative research is an

approach for exploring and understanding the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to social or human problems" (p. 4). Essentially, a qualitative inquiry is a means to determine the underlying issues that affect a person or group of people in a specific context. In keeping with the goal of qualitative inquiry, this study seeks to understand the 'how' and 'why' aspects of a phenomenon. This conceptual framework is chosen for this study in order to allow participants' perspectives to create the meaning within the context of issues of academic integrity. Both Anderson (1998) and Creswell (2014) state that personal experiences can help us better understand a phenomenon. As a result, learning about lived experiences may help in shaping practices in such a way that marginalized or at risk students are better supported. In particular, international students have a lot to lose if faced with the consequences of academic dishonesty; it is in their best interest that we learn from their experiences by speaking to them. As a result, an understanding of academic integrity issues among international undergraduate students is best sought by an exploratory and holistic approach, that is, qualitative inquiry. In keeping with the holistic nature of qualitative inquiry, the specific method selected from within the qualitative paradigm was a phenomenological approach.

Phenomenology. Phenomenological research is rooted in the writings of German mathematician Edmund Husserl (1859-1938), whose philosophy stems from the notion that we need to understand things as they are without assumption or bias (Anderson, 1997; Creswell, Hanson, Plano Clark, & Morales, 2007; Moustakas, 1994). The philosophical underpinnings of phenomenology are interpreted and developed differently by various writers throughout the years; however, it remains that "the philosophical assumptions rest on studying people's experiences as they are lived every day, viewing these experiences as conscious" (Creswell et al., 2007, p. 253).

Two forms of phenomenology have been identified in the literature: hermeneutic and transcendental. Each form seeks meaning within lived experiences as offered by the participants, however, one key difference separates the two; hermeneutic phenomenology requires

interpretation by the researcher whereas transcendental does not (Creswell et al, 2007; Moustakas, 1994; van Manen, 1990). In other words, hermeneutic phenomenology involves the description of the phenomenon, the lived experiences within it, and the researcher's interpretation of these experiences. Transcendental phenomenology calls for non-interpretive description where the researcher's past experiences are bracketed to prevent interpretation and allow the lived experiences to speak for themselves (Giorgi, 1997; Moustakas, 1994). The former of the two approaches is utilized in this study by acknowledging the researcher's positioning and past experiences, and subsequently interpreting the lived experiences of the participants (Creswell et al., 2007; Ehrich, 2003).

According to Giorgi (1997), a key step in this approach is "the phenomenological reduction" (para. 11). The reduction asks why it is that an object or phenomenon is interpreted, and, even more so, how is it that a person interprets the object or phenomenon. Essentially, reduction involves the description and explanation of experiences in their pure form (Giorgi, 1997). A crucial element of phenomenological reduction is the acknowledgement of past experiences and recognizing that one must look beyond these in the research; in other words, do not let assumptions and biases cloud the experiences as they are described (Anderson, 1998). In this regard, Giorgi (1997) suggests that the researcher must "bracket past knowledge about a phenomenon, in order to encounter it freshly and describe it precisely as it is intuited" (para. 14).

Giorgi's (1997) second stage of the phenomenological approach is description: this involves the articulation of the experiences as they are described. Basically, the description stage of transcendental phenomenology is a non-interpretive, non-explanatory account of what is presented to the researcher; in other words, the experiences are offered as they were presented without making assumptions or offering interpretation (Giorgi, 1997; Moustakas, 1994). Alternatively, the hermeneutic approach allows for interpretation of the lived experiences as the researcher puts herself "in the place of the author of the text in order to comprehend the situation and the person

more fully" (Ehrich, 2003, p. 51). In other words, the participants' experiences are interpreted for meaning in this stage of the phenomenological approach.

The last step, the search for essence, is explained by Giorgi (1997) "as the articulation, based on intuition, of a fundamental meaning without which a phenomenon could not present itself as it is" (para. 20). In other words, it is the search for constants that present themselves in the descriptions and experiences; essentially, the roots of the phenomenon (Ehrich, 2003).

A phenomenological approach is selected as the methodological framework for this study. Creswell (2003) states that a phenomenological approach is utilized to explore the "'essence' of human experiences concerning a phenomenon" (p.15). This study explores the 'essence' of perceptions of academic integrity among international undergraduate students at a large Western-Canadian university. Since international students are thought to experience academic dishonesty in greater numbers than domestic students, the examination of a sample from this particular group using a phenomenological approach will allow us to better understand their experiences and perhaps better support them in this area (Bradshaw & Baluja, 2011).

The questions that are asked in this study lend themselves to the phenomenological approach in that they seek retrospective perceptions of students (van Manen, 1990). The aim is to capture a picture of these students' perceptions on issues of academic integrity as they discussed their experiences at the University of Manitoba. The study is built around what they have learned or how their perceptions may or may not have changed over the course of their studies.

Interviews

Gullifer and Tyson (2010) note that in order to understand student attitudes and behaviors, their positions must be understood so as to gain a deeper understanding of how international undergraduate students make meaning of academic integrity. Creswell, Hanson, Plano Clark, and Morales (2007) add that "essence" questions are best suited for a phenomenological study that seeks to understand the experiences of this student group (p. 239).

With this in mind, participants in this study were interviewed to gain insight into their perspectives on academic integrity at their host university and semi-structured interviews were designed to accomplish this. The interview questions (Appendix B) are open-ended in nature so that participants can direct the interview and allow for rich discussion (Van den Hoonaard, 2012). It is important to start with the basics and work into the deep end, but it is important to the researcher that the participants guide the discussion (Ibid., 2012). As already mentioned, the primary goal is to solicit the thoughts and perspectives of international students in short-term programs at a large Western Canadian university on issues of academic integrity.

As a qualitative researcher, it is important to remember that supposed theories may be less significant than the data revealed by the participant. The interviews themselves endeavor to be organic processes where the interviewer responds to "emergent questions, new insights, and further information and simultaneously construct[s] the method of analysis, as well the analysis" (Charmaz, 2008, p. 403).

The interview questions are written with the methodological framework in mind and made use of Hofstede's cultural dimensions to organize the discussion between interviewer and participant. The interview questions seek to collect data that offer insight into how the six dimensions of culture are represented by the participants' perspectives on academic integrity. Furthermore, interview questions seek responses that would highlight perceptions of international undergraduate students' interactions and experiences with academic integrity.

Interviews were recorded digitally and transcribed by the researcher. All electronic files related to the interview data are stored on a password-protected computer.

Data Analysis

Upon completion of the interviews, they were transcribed and coded for meaning and evidence of key themes. The coding process involved three thorough readings of each transcript while making note of themes as they presented themselves. As part of the coding, themes were

organized by cultural dimension and recorded in a spreadsheet with participant quotes, interesting thoughts, or questions noted so that the researcher could compile the data. The resulting data, categorized by Hofstede's six cultural dimensions, was then read through and compared against each transcript a final time, in an attempt to highlight the themes presented and to examine overlaps or linkages in student perspectives. The categories and evidence were carefully and thoughtfully described, followed by a search for the essence of issues related to academic integrity as perceived by international undergraduate students (Creswell et al., 2007; Giorgi, 1997).

Lastly, the process was reflexive in that it endeavored to allow the participants' voices to speak, while acknowledging researcher bias and assumptions (Giorgi, 1997; Van den Hoonaard, 2012).

Participants

The participant group included eleven international undergraduate students at the University of Manitoba. Participants are of various backgrounds and are pursuing a variety of degree programs. The only limitation on participation is that students could not be enrolled in Extended Education's Intensive English Program. These students did not qualify as undergraduate students, as they are currently enrolled in non-degree courses, and furthermore, the researcher has a position of authority over these students in her job as their student advisor.

Students were recruited on a voluntary basis. Permission was sought to post recruitment posters at the International Centre for Students, as well as in high traffic areas such as Arts Buildings, Drake Centre, Engineering Buildings, Science Building, University Centre, etc. In addition, the recruitment poster was posted in the International Centre for Students' weekly newsletter (Appendix C).

At the point of first contact with potential participants, they were sent an electronic copy of the Information and Consent Form and were asked read and forward any questions to the

researcher (Appendix D). Interviews were scheduled on the university campus over a three-week period.

The participants represent the following majors or desired areas of study: Accounting, Actuarial, Computer Science, Ecology, Engineering, Geography, Linguistics, Political Studies, Psychology, and Statistics. Each participant considers him or herself to be an international undergraduate student. The gender and country representation as well as year of study of each participant is shown in following table.

Table 2

Demographics of Study Sample

Name[a]	Gender	Country	Faculty/Department	Year[b]
Fred	Male	Azerbaijan	Computer Science	Second
Bridget	Female	China	Statistics	First
Chad	Male	China	University 1	First
Yolanda	Female	China	Biological Sciences	First
Fiona	Female	Hong Kong	University 1	Second
Casey	Male	India	Management	Second
Olivia	Female	Malta	Geography (Pre-Masters)	First
Marcus	Male	Pakistan	University 1	First
Zane	Male	Pakistan	Engineering	Third
Jack	Male	South Korea	Arts	Second
Max	Male	United States of America	Political Science	Second

Note. [a]Names have been changed to protect the identities of the participants. [b]Year since arriving at the UM; does not equate with current program year.

Fred is in his second year at the University of Manitoba and came from Azerbaijan. He feels that academic integrity is an important concept for students and scholars alike. He describes vast differences between expectations in academic integrity at the University of Manitoba and expectations at a university he attended in Azerbaijan; that is, cheating, plagiarism, and fraud were commonplace at the university in Azerbaijan. Fred admits to cheating in his former university because he felt that this was the norm. He also describes instances of corruption that occurred at his former university which he felt were unavoidable for students as well as for faculty. Upon arriving in Canada, Fred first studied at the International College of Manitoba. He then transferred

to the second year of his degree program. Fred very much appreciates the lessons in academic integrity taught by International College of Manitoba faculty. He recalled one English course where students were taught writing, citation, and referencing.

Bridget is a first-year student at the University of Manitoba, originally from China. She completed a Journalism degree at a Chinese university, and a desire to study abroad and change careers brought her to the University. She feels that her second degree is more suitable for her personality and feels positive about the career change. Bridget identifies herself as an honest student that has not had any personal interaction with cheating in her university career. Although she mentions that strangers had approached her to copy her answers in class, as well as in a midterm exam situation. She maintains that she did not involve herself in any behavior that was deemed inappropriate or dishonest. However, she admits to her surprise that cheating does occur at the University of Manitoba, having experienced a classmate asking for help during a midterm exam. She mentions that a similar scenario in China would not occur, however, students would talk with their friends. She feels that rules are stricter at the University of Manitoba than they are at her university in China. Bridget feels that undergraduate students at the Chinese university concern themselves less with integrity than scholars.

Chad is a first-year student at the University of Manitoba and came here from China. He was initially planning to study at a Chinese university by way of a sports scholarship, however, he and his family experienced corruption during the admissions process and they chose not to offer money for a spot at the university. Chad worked very hard to get into a top university in China, however, he was disappointed with the results of his college entrance exam and then shifted his focus to studying English so that he could come to Canada. Since studying at the University of Manitoba his drive and determination in his studies had decreased and he felt that he would like to explore degree options at other Canadian institutions. He tells stories of his friends who have cheated on midterm examinations and discussed his distaste for their behavior. He avoids cheating behavior

although he feels pressure from his friends to partake. He also feels mixed emotions regarding friends of his that have been caught and punished for cheating; he is happy they were caught because they were in the wrong; however, they are his friends so he feels sorry for them as well. Chad feels that his language is an issue for him and he appreciates the help of his classmates or friends when needed.

Yolanda is in her first year at the University of Manitoba, however, she is in the third year of her degree program because her home university in China is connected with the University. Yolanda is very driven by topics that interest her and feels that she does not need to partake in academic dishonesty. Yolanda explains that she would rather receive an F grade than risk getting caught in academic dishonesty for the shame it would bring. She also feels that she does not need to resort to this sort of behavior because she manages her workload just fine.

Fiona is a second-year student at the University of Manitoba and initially studied in an associate degree program in Hong Kong. Fiona appears to be out-going and confident in her studies and she is very quick to offer that university in Canada has been relatively easy for her thus far. She describes differences in terms of the strictness associated with academic integrity at the University of Manitoba and at her former institution in Hong Kong. Fiona also describes herself as motivated by good grades, however, she also expresses that spending time with friends is important to her and is sometimes a distraction from schoolwork.

Casey is a second-year student at the University of Manitoba and came here with no previous university experience from India. Casey feels that his strict primary school in India has instilled strong values of academic integrity. He discusses that topic interest plays a large role for him in assignment completion and the integrity of those assignments. The topics in which he has some background knowledge will be completed in a timely manner and with proper citations or references where needed. Casey describes an instance where he believed he had plagiarized – although he is uncertain – and submitted his work with fear, yet hoped for a positive outcome.

Casey admits to paraphrasing the entire assignment and contributing nothing of his own thoughts; it was for this reason that he thought he had committed plagiarism. After discussing the specifics of the supposed plagiarism, Casey and the researcher determine that it was unlikely that any plagiarism occurred because he had included all citations and a full reference list. Finally, the paper received a good grade and he was never accused of plagiarism. Casey also admits to cheating in a midterm examination; he did not mention a specific instance, although he talks of a situation where he feels tempted to cheat and that he would cheat if he were sure he would not be caught. Casey feels that his values are strong and that honesty is important, and he admits to feeling scared or remorseful of any cheating behavior he had been involved in. Casey does not feel that he can avoid this behavior in a tempting situation.

Olivia is a first-year student who has completed a previous degree at her home university in Malta, as well as a post-graduate diploma from Red River College. Olivia has ten years of work experience and returned to university because she felt that opportunities at her former job were limited. Olivia also has a Canadian partner that contributed to her choice in studying at the University of Manitoba. Olivia expresses that her upbringing as well as her extensive work experience has created a strong sense of academic integrity in her. She has had no issues whatsoever with academic integrity throughout her university experiences, although she experiences difficulty articulating her thoughts on what attributed to this. However, Olivia does mention that she feels her maturity has attributed to her current position on academic integrity and ability to act with professionalism in all aspects of her studies.

Marcus is a first-year student from Pakistan. He has had no previous university experience in his home country; however, he appears to understand the concept of academic integrity and reports no issues to date. Marcus appears to be very confident in his studies and feels capable of managing his course load. When stressed or experiencing difficulty with a topic, Marcus says he leaves it and actually has dropped one course that he felt uncomfortable with. Marcus appears to

have a good grasp of the expectations of his professors and the University at large. He does not appear to have had difficulty transitioning to the academic environment here, although he does mention that he was initially scared of academic integrity. Ultimately though, he feels it was not something to be afraid of and it was easily learned.

Zane is a third-year student from Pakistan. He appears to be a conscientious and eager student. He acknowledges the importance of academic integrity and makes several references to its importance in his work, although he does not offer specific information on how it is applied or how it affected him. Zane is motivated by grades and seems to believe that academic dishonesty would affect job opportunities if he were to become involved in academic dishonesty. Zane also cites his religion as a reason for upholding strong values in terms of academic integrity.

Jack is in his second year and comes from South Korea. He chose Canada as a study destination because it offers him the opportunity to join a linguistics program. He is highly motivated to continue studies in language acquisition, linguistics, and, ultimately work in the area of English as a Foreign Language as an instructor or in curriculum development. Jack feels uncertain about his future in Canada, but hopeful that he'll find meaningful employment here. He is well aware of requirements surrounding academic integrity and suggests that this is easy to follow. Jack believes that harsh punishments should be dealt to students who are dishonest.

Max is completing the final semester of his degree. He is from the U.S.A. and has had previous university experience there. Max appears to consider himself a good student and one that has no issue with academic integrity. Max feels that he ought not to have had any issue, given that it has been his choice to study here and so he should follow the rules without question. He seems to think that he has an advantage over other international students, given that his educational background is Western and, in his words, stricter than the University of Manitoba. Max talks freely and openly about his ideas and is very good at articulating his thoughts and feelings surrounding academic integrity.

Ethics and Confidentiality

As suggested, participants are involved in this study on a voluntary basis and full disclosure was made regarding the researcher's positioning and the intent of the study. Participants were assured of full anonymity and were advised that they could terminate their involvement if they wished to do so at any point during the study. No participants requested withdrawal from the study.

Participants' names are changed in order to protect their anonymity. Furthermore, any other identifiers have also been redacted or changed to ensure confidentiality of the participants.

All recordings, transcriptions, and coding were kept on the researcher's personal computer that is password protected; consent forms were be stored in a locked cabinet. All data will be confidentially destroyed after seven years.

Limitations

This study benefits from a diverse group of participants who are from various backgrounds and whose previous educational experiences offer contrast from one participant to the next. Although eleven participants were recruited for this study, with additional time and resources, more participants might have joined which would have created a richer data set. In addition to the small participant group, the data collection and analysis in this study were both time consuming, as is generally the case in a qualitative study. Conducting interviews, transcribing the interviews, and coding the data each attributed to the time consumption.

Lastly, this study makes use of interviews as the data collection method, which garnered a rich data set. Although participants willingly volunteered for the study, they may have censored their words based on the methodological approach and on account of the topic that was discussed. An anonymous paper survey could have been used as a means of data collection to promote candor and reassure the participants of their confidentiality.

CHAPTER FOUR

Results

This chapter will present the results of the study based on the questions asked of the eleven international undergraduate students who participated in interviews. Participant responses are analyzed through the lens of Hofstede's six cultural dimensions. Among the cultural dimensions, four are found to have greater relevance to issues of academic integrity and are discussed in the following sub-sections. They are: 1) power distance, 2) individualism, 3) uncertainty avoidance, and 4) indulgence. The remaining two cultural dimensions, masculinity and long-term versus short-term orientation, are found to have less significance in the study. Towards the end of the chapter, these final two dimensions are discussed.

Power distance

Power distance is defined as the degree to which power relations are accepted within a group or organization (Hofstede, 1980; Hofstede et al., 2010; Signorini et al., 2009). This dimension presents itself through two themes that emerged from the data; they are: hierarchies and interactions with professors. The sub-section on hierarchies describes perceived hierarchies at the University of Manitoba and how the participants relate these with issues of academic integrity. Lastly, participants' interactions with professors are also discussed as power distance presented itself in these relationships and the role they play in academic integrity.

Hierarchies. Many of the participants understand that one element of writing and citing is to credit others for their contributions, thus showing respect to an original author. Fiona exhibits respect for the hard work of a researcher or scholar as assigning credit in one's academic writing has perceived importance to her. Fiona goes on to share that respect is shown by citing or paraphrasing a scholar, and she holds an understanding that both copying and plagiarism are unacceptable. She also mentions that crediting original authors is a means of informing scholars that they have valuable insight. In her words,

I think the important thing is... you want to be able to do something and be, um, award [sic]

the credits on it and, and you would know that people won't just copy your stuff and... don't

really give you any credits or don't reference you and it's like your efforts is in vain. It's like

nobody cares. Like once you get quoted, then you know - you know that people respect you

and you know that people take your idea because they think that you're good. And it

encourages people to do more study.

In addition, Bridget agrees that crediting the original author is a form of respect. Fred, on

the other hand, feels that certain situations might call for rule breaking; for example, when a patent

has been filed but the technology has yet to be developed. He feels that intellectual property should

not discourage innovation and believes that current practices in technology will stifle creativity.

Ultimately, Fred believes that whoever does the work and comes up with the idea should receive

credit for it. He states that there is a difference between students who are novices and innovators

who are in the field.

I don't think that many people in Bachelor can create some groundbreaking stuff, let's be

honest. And so at this point the rules should be pretty strict, but later on, when it comes to

actual inventions... you should look at every case separately to find out what's going on. You

can't just say "oh, this was copied... let's ban him or turn him away from academic

community or something"... Later on when it comes to really some special cases, they should

be treated specially.

Additionally, one participant specifically discusses the role of scholars in higher education.

Bridget feels that scholars are to be held to a higher standard than undergraduate students saying

that, "if you are a scholar you have to follow these rules strictly, but for undergraduate students…

that's just a rule." It seems she feels that students are not required to be held to such high standards

as professors and scholars. Bridget talks about a high profile case of a professor plagiarizing

another scholar's work at her home university in China. Bridget and her classmates viewed the

professor as good so they were in disbelief when the accusation was first made and, later on, felt

disappointment in the professor's actions. Then again, Fiona makes no mention of stricter rules for

students, although she feels that her workload as an undergraduate student should not be so

strenuous given that she is a novice.

In addition to different requirements for scholars and professors, participants also mention

that authority is related to prestige, privilege, and money. More specifically, Chad feels that

authority should be stronger and more influential in terms of the culture of academic integrity on

campus. He feels that perceived differences in strictness at universities in China are correlated with

prestige; that is to say that the more prestigious the institution, the stricter their policies on

academic integrity. Chad believes that cheating would be commonplace in a school that lacked

prestige. In his words,

> [T]he situation here is much worse than I thought [it would be when I was] in China, cuz I
>
> thought in Canada everything should be strict... I found it's not. But it's still, I think it's still
>
> better than China. I also have lots of [friends] in Chinese universities. For top universities,
>
> they have very strict regulations about this, like cheating or plagiarism. But for some
>
> average level, or maybe lower level, for them cheating is every day, every day's behavior.

Max offers that privilege might play a role in issues of academic integrity. He understands

that the system in the U.S. might allow someone of influence to be offered a lesser punishment (for

example, celebrities and political figures) and feels that this may occur in issues of academic

integrity, although he offers no examples of anything of the sort having occurred. Like Chad, Max

feels strongly that the system in place should be followed by everyone regardless of power or

influence, although he relates this more to following one's own moral compass than having strict

authority in place.

Lastly, in dealing with issues of academic integrity, third-party involvement is appreciated

by participants that score lower on the power distance index; that is, they are more inclined to

value a judicial-type system in issues of academic integrity. Although none of the participants admit to needing such support, Marcus, Max, and Zane – from the U.S. and Pakistan, respectively – each mention their appreciation of Student Advocacy or the University of Manitoba's Students' Union for the support they offer to accused students.

The participants do not appear to consider themselves above the rules of academic integrity as they stand at the University of Manitoba. They each feel that all students, to the best of their abilities, must adhere to academic integrity and that the consequences of rule breaking are justified. The participants also discuss their professors' role in academic integrity. Their interactions with them and how this has shaped their perspectives on academic integrity are discussed in the following sub-section.

Interactions with professors. Participants appear to be affected by their professors and the relationships they have with them. In turn, these relationships contribute to the participants' appreciation of academic integrity. For example, Zane and Yolanda feel the relationship with their professors has contributed to their enjoyment of a course; that is, a professor that makes use of humor and gives attention to each individual student would foster a more enjoyable learning environment. Conversely, Yolanda views different teaching styles without issue and appears to do well regardless of her level of interest in a course. Furthermore, Max understands a perceived utility in approaching professors for guidance in paper writing. In his experience, he has earned better grades by making himself known to professors; in this way, they are made aware that he is engaged and putting forth an effort in his work.

> I *always* check in with any paper. If it's any kind of major paper, five pages or more, I always talk to my professor about it. I always go in with an outline. I always try to go in with a rough draft, if I have the time. Just to get the office hours, to have them realize that even though I might not be the best author, I'm trying, and I'm interested and engaged. Which seems to be an effective thing.

Max also seeks help from professors rather than peers, because he feels that their help is better or more valuable.

Participants generally feel that the message of academic integrity is impossible to avoid and each of them has heard it from professors on numerous occasions. On one hand, Bridget feels that professors "regard this as a basic rule for students." On the other hand, Fiona describes a time where a professor's approach in delivering the academic integrity message was an attempt to understand the viewpoint of the students; she appears optimistic of this professor's capacity to lead empathetically. Fiona does not appear to revere her professors at her home institution; she describes them as old and outdated. Instead, she shows favor for tutors in Hong Kong or the "real" teachers that offered better notes and more practical teachings for students. Fiona feels that her professors at the University of Manitoba are supportive of students and no power struggle is apparent. She finds the University of Manitoba professors' delivery of the academic integrity message to be satisfactory, as long as "they're not… hostile."

Jack also holds the expectation that professors are well meaning and thorough in their delivery of expectations surrounding academic integrity. He says, "in my courses, like for example, the computer science course, since professor's instruction was really specific and clear, all I to do was just follow." In addition, Jack feels comfortable in approaching professors and suggests that his professors are good-natured and approachable.

Zane and Marcus also find the professors to be readily available and willing to answer questions. Fred, too, feels that he was given help in academic integrity when needed.

In addition, Casey and Marcus feel that engaging in academic dishonesty would cause the professors to view them in a negative light, which they want to avoid. By the same token, Casey does not want to be labeled a cheater and then targeted later on; more specifically, he feels that his professors might pay special attention to him if he were caught cheating. Marcus also feels that the

image the professor hold of him would be compromised if he were caught engaging in academic

dishonesty and this is an undesirable consequence in his mind.

Alternatively, Olivia finds the relationship between professors and students to be more

open at the University of Manitoba than at her home university in Malta. In her words,

Here... the interaction is much more open and there's lots of interaction between the

instructor and the students. It's not rigid like back home, it's much more flexible. And even

here at the University the instructors are there if you have any problem and they are there

to help you out.

Olivia relates this to differences between the education systems in Canada and in Malta,

describing the latter's system as more formal and lecture-based. Olivia has also experienced

contentious environments in her home faculty in Malta, where there were competing interests

among faculty members and students had to be careful not to get in the way of or involved in the

disputes. In addition, Fred and Chad have experienced abuse of power at universities in their home

countries. Specific to Fred's situation, he experienced corruption at his home university in

Azerbaijan; students copied, bought papers, and he also said that students could pay for their mark.

When speaking of bought grades at his home university, he says that "it's not actually about

academic dishonesty, it's more about paying money." He mentions that it was often dependent on

the dean, as some deans did not accept payment for grades; however, he feels that this corruption

was commonplace and generally accepted at the universities. Moreover, professors at his home

university also expected payment. This, again, was considered the norm and Fred says that a

student would not want to be the only one in the class that had refused to pay. He does not offer

this story with pride and feels that it is somewhat shameful; in fact, he appears to be grateful for

having been taught about academic integrity by his professors at the first institution he attended in

Canada.

Fiona talks about the elder professors at her former institution as being old and outdated in terms of teaching practice. In addition, she feels that expectations at her former institution may be too much, particularly for students at a novice level. In her words,

[Professors] just love to push us. And sometimes it feel[s] like it's too much because we're not bachelor degree students, we're just associate degree students,... And it's maybe too hard for us because we didn't have the kind of training for it.

In comparison, Fiona finds that the University of Manitoba has realistic expectations of her as an undergraduate student and feels that the lessons are practical; in other words, Fiona is enjoying the system at the University of Manitoba as compared to the system she experienced in Hong Kong. However, when speaking of the requirements of writing and citing at the University of Manitoba, she feels her professors' expectations to be somewhat taxing on the student. On the other hand, Fiona believes that their expectations are not to be questioned as they are on the mark with where they should.

Some participants feel that there are many cases where a professor would not act on observed cheating behavior; this compromises their confidence that the standards of academic integrity are being upheld. Casey finds that professors are passionate in the beginning but then take no action during an exam scenario to prevent academic dishonesty. He has witnessed invigilators lazily monitoring students during an exam and says that they sat at the front of the room on their computer and were not concerned with the students' behavior. By the same token, Jack feels that the professor is an intimidator in that the professor-invigilator relationship is bound by hierarchy. He describes a hypothetical situation where an invigilator and professor notice cheating behavior yet do nothing. The invigilator in that scenario might hesitate to point out the cheating behavior for fear of going against the professor. Jack feels that if hierarchical relationships are removed from the exam room - that is a professor and invigilator with no past history are responsible for invigilation - a more honest environment would present itself. Yolanda believes it is the professor's

responsibility to prevent cheating, although their ability to prevent it does not dismiss a student's culpability.

Max finds humor in a University of Manitoba professor's passionate discussion about plagiarism and subsequent assignment that required the use of Wikipedia. Ultimately, he thinks that this professor is difficult to take seriously by using a pop culture reference as a teaching moment in academic integrity. The same professor reported another case of dishonesty on the subsequent assignment and Max faults the professor because, despite his passion for academic integrity, he is not accurately communicating his message. Although he does admit that the students are responsible as well, he feels the professor could have done better in relaying his message.

Bridget is aware that issues of academic integrity may go up to the level of the dean at the University of Manitoba. In her experience, this does not occur in China, as issues are normally resolved with the professor or a lower-level person in the administration. In addition, Fred suggests that universities in his home country, Azerbaijan, lack leadership or people assigned with the responsibility of teaching and upholding academic integrity. When referring to citing and writing, he says that, "nobody teaches them that it's a wrong way" to copy and paste or to use sources that are not credible. It appears that leadership in academic integrity – or lack of – plays a role in Fred's views on academic integrity.

Individualism

Individualism is described as the degree to which people within a culture identify themselves individually or collectively (Hofstede, 1980; Hofstede et al., 2010; Signorini et al., 2009). Participants of this study have encountered various collaborative opportunities in their studies. They note that expectations within a group are often set by the group itself and leadership appears to be a quality that comes about naturally or not at all. To illicit responses involving experiences and interactions with others, participants were asked to describe group work situations they had been involved in. Among the experiences coded as individualism, three themes emerged: group-

work considerations, in the interest of the group, and shame. Each category is discussed in the following sub-sections.

Group-work considerations. Some participants feel indifferent towards group work, while others express a strong dislike for it. Fiona mentions that she hates group work for the reason that she finds it unfair and feels that some group members do not contribute an equal amount. Jack echoes this stating,

> I think the group project is kind of thing that hard [sic] to be fair… Just based on my
>
> experience, that whenever I do a group project, there is always someone who worked…
>
> harder than the other people and at the end you all get the same point.

> Casey, on the other hand, expresses that a recent group project of his had gone very

smoothly, where tasks were fairly divided and everyone did their part.

It is also noted that Fiona does not mind lack of productivity when it comes from within her in-group or immediate friends. On the other hand, when speaking of group work it seems that she is referring to people who are not members of her in-group.

The in-group is thought of as a source of influence in relation to academic integrity, in that it is thought that students might be more likely to engage in dishonest behavior if their friends are involved. Having unfamiliar group members is a common situation among the participants, who all appeared to speak of their group members as strangers. Marcus mentions that he feels that if his group members are immediate friends there may be some copying going on. Jack admits to seeking academic help from friends that have taken a course previously, although it is not determined whether or not his actions would be deemed as inappropriate or dishonest. In general, Jack approaches members of his in-group before seeking help from professors or teaching assistants. Yolanda also suggests that she would seek out friends for support in difficult situations related to her course work.

All participants believe they have a good grasp of what is appropriate in terms of sharing with your group members or with friends on an individual assignment. Zane offers a ratio comparing the amount of work that can be shared as well as the amount of work that has to be completed on one's own; he suggests that 60 percent of work could be completed collaboratively, whereas the other 40 percent has to be completed alone. Yolanda also offers a pragmatic approach to how she deals with group work in that it is very clear what each group member is expected to do and to what extent information can be shared.

Bridget expresses that relationships could be used to one's advantage in a cheating scenario in China; for example, if a student was caught cheating he/she could negotiate a lesser punishment or less severe write-up regarding the instance. Olivia shares a similar experience with abuse of relationships at her home university in Malta. Bridget and Olivia speak of the use of relationships as not having benefitted from them, even though it appears that for some it is beneficial to preserve one's in-group in these cases, which could be deemed as a collectivist ideal. Conversely, Bridget expresses an individualistic ideal in that her work is her own and she purposefully avoids a classmate that sought to copy her work. She shares this experience,

> We always complete the lab assignments by ourselves. But I found that there's this girl who's always sitting beside me and it seems that she didn't know how to complete the assignment each time… She will always ask me how to do the assignment, but she still didn't know how to do it and she asked me that if she could take a photo of my [work]… For the first time, I said yes because I think it will not be good if I reject... But at the second and third time, I think that it's not so good because… I made my own efforts to complete this assignment. And, you know, I went to the class each time, I take the classes all the time, and I complete the assignments, I take my own efforts. So this is the result of my own efforts, so I don't want… it to be copied each time. So when I went to the lab last time, I sat on another seat and I didn't sit beside her.

Bridget suspects that collaboration in this case is inappropriate and that she should not share answers with her classmate. Her response is also self-regarding in that she wants to protect the effort she has invested.

Olivia has experienced frustration with group members who were not able to produce their work in a timely manner, although she understands their positions. In addition, Fiona offers that group work is a compromise although there is no indication that this meant jeopardizing the academic integrity of the group or its members. She means that students need to collaborate in such a way that they can achieve a result together. This acceptance that others may do less while some do more does not appear to be a matter of academic integrity. In addition, Max expresses that group projects are a favored assessment of his and he prefers them to alternatives such as paper writing. Max also expresses that group work is an ideal scenario in that it has the capacity to bring together different skill sets and abilities. He mentions this regarding group work,

> ...Unless there's some egregious violation of expectations, you're going to be told to suck it up and work with them. So to concern yourself over divisions of labor, to concern yourself over, you know, am I doing more and they're doing less, is distracting and it's setting yourself up for failure. And I just don't believe in anything like that... And, frankly, if I have a skill and someone else doesn't, that's not their fault, they shouldn't be penalized for that. I can't write very well, should I be penalized because I can't write as well as someone else? I don't think so. I think that's the nature of group projects, they're trying to get you to work in the types of environments that you're going to work in the professional world.

Chad appears to benefit from collaboration and shows an appreciation for group members that have guided him and offered much-needed support to him as an international student whose first language is not English. Marcus also seeks help from professors, teaching assistants, and friends; he feels that help is readily available at the University of Manitoba and shows great appreciation for this. Fred, Zane, and Max also suggest that professors at the University of Manitoba

are easily accessible and approachable. Fred and Max mention that they generally do not accept

help from peers when the task is assigned to them alone; they more frequently seek the help of

their professors.

Alternatively, Olivia's work is often heavily based in software and she seeks the help of

forums or online tutorials rather than going to her peers or professors. Olivia mentions that she has

looked to others, in terms of papers or reports that have been written, to aid her in improving her

own writing. She also offers that she felt alone and inexperienced in her first undergraduate degree,

and that there was no guidance offered by her professor in Malta.

Zane understands the importance of collaboration in his field, however, he expresses that

there are circumstances where inappropriate collaboration does not apply. Zane says that all

students have to know the basics behind a concept or a theory, but what they are able build upon

that theory has to be their own.

In the interest of the group. Many participants identify with the larger academic

community and offer that it is in the best interest of the group that all stakeholders (namely,

students) adhere to the rules of academic integrity. Chad and Bridget talk about the danger where

cheating becomes the norm on campus, causing students to lose the motivation to work hard. They

appear to think that it's for the greater good - to be honest and to promote an honest environment.

Olivia demonstrates that the group environment had shaped her view of academic integrity when

she first came to study in Canada; she finds that all of the classmates in her program were very

serious about their studies at that time and academic dishonesty was not an issue.

Looking at the group as a whole in the academic community, Bridget feels that honesty is in

everyone's best interest - to promote respect and fairness.

Fairness also comes up in the interviews a number of times. Jack feels that fairness is a tenet

of university education; it is not in the interest of the group to act unfairly and it is imperative to

him. Jack expresses dissatisfaction with one of his group member's work and does not exhibit

solidarity with his group members; this could be because the group-members are not members of his in-group. However, it is contradictory to the national culture of South Korea in that South Koreans are described as having a tendency to focus on the group dynamics rather than results.

Bridget, Chad, and Yolanda also express that fairness among students, that is, an environment without cheating, is in the interest of the group. Fred and Max share that it's impossible to avoid because everyone talks about it – it's a shared concern.

On the other hand, Fiona appears to exhibit a respect for scholars as a member of the group (in the larger context of higher education) and describes an economic system of rewarding scholars for their efforts,

> Once you get quoted, then you know... that people respect you and you know that people take your idea because they think that you're good. And it encourages people to do more study... It's like a democracy and you get like your own rights and your own rights to own your business then people would do that business... but if you're like communism, like the government takes all your money, why would you invest? So it's the same thing in studying, like, if you get credits you get the reputation and all sort of good stuff that you get. You get the fame, whatever, and you love it, then you do it. It's like a reward thing.

She offers that crediting original authors will encourage further scholarly activity and that what's good for the author will also act in the interest of the community as a whole. Fred also offers that people should be appreciative of others and acknowledge them for the hard work they have done. Bridget feels that respecting other's efforts is important; think on their investment and honor it by acknowledging them in your work. Many of participants also express that all students have the personal responsibility to act with integrity during their academic careers.

Shame. Yolanda suggests that students may lose face if they are caught engaging in academic dishonesty and feels that this may have repercussions for their future. This suggests she believes that a student's personal interests are at stake when a student is academically dishonest;

furthermore, this is in line with cultures that are perceived as more collectivist, in that they view offences as shameful and disgraceful. Yolanda shares an experience related to public shame in China,

> I remember that when we have an exam in the high school the teachers caught some students cheating on the exam and then they, the teachers, make the students to write a letter or something and make them speak in front of the whole school – make them know that they shouldn't do this. And you know… it's very embarrassed or something more bad… All people know that you're cheating [sic].

Casey shares a similar experience of his own public shaming when he was caught cheating in primary school. He reasons that this was enough to set him straight until he experienced a group dynamic where cheating was the norm in high school. Bridget also discusses shame related to academic dishonesty as witnessed by her at her home university in China. Additionally, Marcus shares that members of an in-group might give other members a hard time if they are to be caught cheating and he suggests that this is a reason to avoid cheating behavior.

Cheating behavior is disheartening for a student who acts honestly, but whose friends may act without integrity. Chad expresses mixed emotions when speaking of time when his friends were caught cheating in an exam. He feels that they deserved the punishment, but he also feels sorry for them because they are members of his in-group. He mentions that if they had been strangers he would feel unapologetic and that they should be severely punished.

Uncertainty Avoidance

Uncertainty avoidance is described as the degree to which a person is accepting of ambiguity and changeability (Hofstede et al., 2010; Signorini et al., 2009). Participants of this study exhibit this in the interviews in a variety of ways and the data is categorized into three sub-sections: making comparisons, abiding by the rules, and accepted uncertainties in academic integrity. Furthermore, most of the participants feel that there is certainty in what is to occur in

higher education and that this is universal – that is, one comes to university to learn. Issues of academic integrity generally hold a sense of certainty as well, in that all students are expected to follow the rules.

Making comparisons. On one hand, many participants feel that if students are academically dishonest it means they are not learning what is intended; this is a general certainty held among the participants. On the other hand, participants' responses with regard to academic integrity – when compared against this index – show that academic integrity is often situational and contextual. Max understands the enforcement of academic integrity to be dependent on context and those involved. Likewise, several participants express that there is a difference in the importance of academic integrity between the University of Manitoba and their home countries. For example, Fiona says that she believes there to be a difference between students in Hong Kong and students in Canada. She feels that students in Hong Kong – herself and her classmates – had complained about academic integrity that it was a nuisance for students and a difficult task to endure, whereas students in Canada do not complain and are more accepting of academic integrity. Yolanda also believes that Chinese universities are not as strict as primary or secondary schools in China because it is necessary to attend university to improve your career outlook, and also because the students do not select many of the courses as the program requires them. Chad echoes this in that Chinese schools do not allow freedom to choose various topics and, in his experience, students there are restricted to a course load that is determined by the program or faculty.

Additionally, Casey finds the rules to be stricter here than he has experienced in India, although he understands that there is a period of adaptation that must occur for a student coming from a different educational background. Marcus also offers that academic integrity is not as serious a concern in his home country of Pakistan. He says,

Well in my country… it wasn't such a big thing. It is there, but, um, it's not really… focused

on or emphasized. But in here it's very serious, in this country, and almost every university.

So I see the difference. I do see.

Yolanda also feels that China and the University of Manitoba have similar expectations in

terms of academic integrity; however, she feels that China is not as strict as here, although she

believes that some schools or professors in China put more of a focus on academic integrity than

others,

I think it's the same. Just… not that strictly in Chinese universities. But maybe some school

they are different in different schools and I think the professors or the faculty of the school

they attend to make more specific rules or punishment of this academic plagiarism, or

cheating, dishonesty.

Similarly, Bridget feels that there is far more concern surrounding academic integrity in

Canada than what she has experienced in China. She believes that assignments could be fully

collaborated on in China, without repercussion, and she also believes that certain offences were not

as serious as others and did not require such harsh punishments as in Canada.

Fred, Marcus, and Zane say they were unaware of academic integrity prior to studying in

Canada and learned the rules of academic integrity once they arrived here; they did not realize this

difference among education systems until coming to study in Canada. Jack also feels that he knew

nothing of plagiarism before studying in Canada; although he appears appreciative and

understanding of the concept since beginning his studies at the University of Manitoba. Fred and

Zane also offer that academic integrity was not implemented in their home countries of Azerbaijan

and Pakistan, respectively. Fred admits to engaging in academic dishonesty in his home country,

although not proudly, because it was the norm there. Similarly, Casey admits to engaging in

cheating behavior in secondary school in India because it was the norm at that particular school.

Fiona shares that she had always searched for a way to get around academic integrity in her home country, as this was the norm in Hong Kong. She describes cheating or plagiarizing to a certain extent that it would not be detected,

> We know what kind of system they use to… make sure you apply the academic integrity
>
> thing. We know that it's always about if you have three words that is linked it together and
>
> you copied directly… then they would start counting your percentage… like copying
>
> someone else's stuff. So sometimes just go around it… If they started from four words, I
>
> don't know. Yeah. Then they would flag you. So just remember no more than four words in
>
> your paraphrase. And never do quoting.

Bridget, Casey, Chad, Jack and Yolanda express that the environment in which one is studying could contribute to cheating behavior. For example, Casey says that seating arrangements might promote cheating if students are placed in close proximity to one another that they could easily see each other's papers without being detected. In addition, Yolanda suggests that professors are responsible for refreshing course content and assessment practices so as to discourage cheating behavior. Bridget and Chad also say that if cheating becomes the norm on campus, students will feel that hard work is pointless, and Jack offers that he would feel as though he should engage in cheating behavior if it were the norm.

Abiding by the rules. One participant, Yolanda, says that she believes that students would only learn what they are intended to if they have followed the rules. All participants understand that academic integrity is in place for a reason and it should be acknowledged throughout the academic community. In fact, the participants feel that they have a solid understanding of what would be considered acceptable behavior in academics and that there should be consequences when and if students behave to the contrary. Some participants exhibit adaptability to the procedures and processes surrounding academic integrity at the University of Manitoba and many appear appreciative of the help they have received along the way. In addition, Marcus and Zane feel

that following the rules of the university is important and that repeatedly disobeying the rules

should result in punishment; rigid codes are known to be present and their strict adherence is

expected of everyone. Conversely, Fiona expresses distaste for the rules because they require more

effort on her part in terms of completing course work.

Some participants feel they have the knowledge to follow the rules and believe they are

doing the right thing. For example, Marcus offers an understanding of the accepted process for

collecting information and writing about it; although he is nonchalant in his discussion of it, he

believes it is very important to cite within one's writing. Upon arriving to study in Canada, Marcus

found that the topic of academic integrity was unavoidable and he quickly learned the expectations.

Although he has experienced mild fear surrounding these expectations in his first semester at the

University of Manitoba, he feels confident that he is doing the right thing and did not feel fearful of

academic integrity in his subsequent semesters. Similarly, Jack expresses that he has experienced a

fear of academic integrity and its strictness at the University of Manitoba. He since feels an

appreciation for clear and precise expectations; he also exhibits a concern for learning to navigate

expectations at the University of Manitoba.

Many participants offer that it is of their own canon that they are honest in academics. Fred

suggests that academic integrity is a worldwide standard and it is acknowledged everywhere and

by everyone. In addition, Jack offers that morals are reason enough to align one's behavior with the

concepts of academic integrity. Zane offers his perspective on his value system in terms of academic

integrity,

> In terms of my values and beliefs, this is something that our elders have told me... My
>
> mother has brought me up in a way that she has taught me not to cheat or not to do
>
> anything that would put you in trouble. And this is something that my religion teaches me as
>
> well... Every religion is pretty much on the same path, that cheating, stealing, or... being

dishonest about yourself is bad. And I think there are no second thoughts on that and I think everyone is aware of that.

Although rules and professionalism are important to Fred, he mentions that Azerbaijani universities lacked the necessary policies, and implementation of those policies, to promote a culture of academic integrity; he has experienced cheating and plagiarism as the norm at his home university. In contrast, Max believes that the rules, and more importantly the current concept of intellectual property, need to be reframed in the current era. Given the availability of information he feels that current practices and points of view on issues of academic integrity cannot withstand time and further advancement. Additionally, Max feels that innovation is stifled as a result of strict patent rules present today.

Jack expresses that following the rules is fundamental to maintaining fairness and order in academics. He also feels that academic integrity, when applied, creates a more professional environment. Professionalism, ethics and standards are also important to Olivia. She exhibits thoroughness in her work and appears to be a very diligent and detail-oriented student,

I always try to be professional. I think it's in my character that I try to be very professional. And I think I incorporate it also in my academic integrity. I think it goes back to more my work ethic, you know, and my work exposure… Even when I do my research I try to be careful which sites I go and how to approach… I always strive to provide a good product.

Olivia appears to be very conscientious in following the rules, even providing a reference list when it was not required. Zane has done this as well for an assignment, although he appears less concerned with the quality of the final product in this case.

Some participants share that they have either bent or broken the rules at some point in the past. Fiona admits to cheating on an in-class test, but justifies her behavior because of her novice status and also because she feels that success was not guaranteed to her in this action – based on her method of cheating and the assessment type. She recalls that she wanted to feel "safe" in

completing the assessment and accomplished this by her cheating behavior. Yolanda also says that, hypothetically, she might accept an old exam that was given to her by a friend as a study aid. She justifies this behavior in saying that she would still study hard for the exam. Similarly, Jack offers that he is more inclined to collaborate with other students when the subject is more difficult. He does not comment on whether or not he believes this increased collaboration to be inappropriate. Furthermore, Chad states that cheating is admissible in the case of "useless" topics and he supports teachers who have facilitated this cheating. He said,

> There's another thing you have to think about it, cuz in Chinese university, some subject is not valuable. For example, you have to learn politics… That's totally useless for me… Cuz you only have to remember them, cuz you have no any idea about how to apply them in your real life. So there's no connection between those concepts to our real life so it's just the sentence in the book you need to remember it, which is totally useless. Maybe after exam, maybe two weeks after your exam, you will forget all the things, like kind of quickly. Yeah, so for those exams, like the cheating are more heavier.

He later excuses this behavior saying that he can understand why teachers would allow cheating in the case of a useless topic because they are exhibiting benevolence towards the students and an understanding that these topics are useless to the students.

In addition, Bridget understands why students might cheat if the content is difficult. She describes a situation experienced by a friend at the University where the content of the course was so difficult that the students felt the only way to be assured a passing grade was to cheat. She mentioned this,

> Because if you don't cheat you may not pass it. And at that time, I think I could understand those students… If the lecture is extremely difficult and a few percentage of students who pass it, and I think that if I were her I may that, that maybe I could also take a paper at the exam [sic].

Furthermore, Casey believes that students are generally unconcerned with academic integrity because it often goes unnoticed or unpunished from his perspective. He also feels sure that he would not be caught given the manner in which he has cheated. Conversely, Fred feels that it is in bad taste to not assign credit where it is due. He suggests that this is an essential step in building on the knowledge base. Fred also offers that students who do not wish to conform to the rules as they are at the University of Manitoba should return to their home countries where this behavior is acceptable. In addition, Olivia believes that the University of Manitoba has a large stake in ensuring that students act with integrity as the institution's reputation is at stake in this regard.

Participants also feel that there should be some leniency for first-time offenders in instances of academic dishonesty. Many of them believe that a tiered penalty structure is in place at the University of Manitoba where first-time copying or plagiarism is not given as harsh a punishment as a repeated offence. Max suggests that students who exhibit a failure of capacity should receive a lesser punishment and undergo remediation.

Fiona understands that the rules surrounding academic integrity could be more lenient for a novice such as herself – she says this is especially the case for students in her degree program in Hong Kong. She also feels her beginner status justifies cheating behavior she has admitted to in the interview. Bridget echoes this idea that a novice student might take academic integrity less seriously. She feels that undergraduate students in China believe that academic integrity is not as important for them as it is for a scholar. When speaking of her thoughts as an undergraduate student in China,

> We always thought that we were just undergraduate students. That may be not so serious because our papers will not have any influence on this field… Our papers will just influence our own graduation, but it will [not] have any great influence on this academic field. So we don't think we need to follow these rules so strictly for ourselves.

Bridget expresses that it is less important to be diligent in writing and citing in China because of this belief held by undergraduate students.

Accepted uncertainties in academic integrity. Most participants accept the University of Manitoba as a stricter environment than experienced in their home country; although Olivia feels that the University of Manitoba is freer than in Malta, in terms of interactions with professors and the learning environment, and Max finds the University of Manitoba to be less strict than his home university in the U.S.A.

Some participants are unsure if their behavior or actions would be considered as academically dishonest. Casey offers that he believes he had plagiarized an assignment, yet he submitted it and even after feeling compelled to tell his professor about it, he did not. Instead, he waited to learn the result. Casey feels that if the topic had been known to him or of more interest, he would not have procrastinated and plagiarism would have been avoided. Similarly, Fiona mentions that she has cheated on an in-class test; however, she is unsure as to whether or not her actions are actually dishonest because her method of cheating was not guaranteed to help her succeed on the assessment.

Alternatively, Chad appears to have easily adapted to the rules surrounding plagiarism; although he says he is not as concerned as Canadian students in the minute details. Precision in citations is unappealing to him and he feels it is unnecessary. Similarly, Max offers that paper writing in university does not adequately represent what one can add to the knowledge base or that it is not achieving what it is meant to. He feels that if this is not working or has fallen off the path of what it is meant to achieve something needs to be changed in terms of the professors' teaching methods or the overall attitude towards academic work.

Moreover, some participants feel that academic integrity does not apply to the content of some courses, which shows a lack of understanding of the bigger picture among participants. Fiona shares this, "I don't think it affects me how I study. It only affects me when I write papers." In

addition, Marcus shares that academic integrity does not necessarily apply to certain subjects – he feels that application is mainly in writing courses alone. Zane mentions that citation or reference is not required when a theory is considered as common knowledge. He believes that citations are not required in the case where theory is believed to be common knowledge,

> This is something that he taught in the class so [the professor] expects that we students
>
> know. So if you mention some kind of theory... [the] professor is well aware of that, that this
>
> has been taken from this... textbook. He is well aware of that, because theory in [the faculty]
>
> is something that is common to everyone.

These participants appear to understand academic integrity as affecting their work only in certain areas or at the point of assessment. Conversely, some participants are aware of a linkage between academic integrity and their performance in all things related to their studies. For example, Jack exhibits a South Korean preference to avoid uncertainty in that he tries to prepare for class as best he could by reading ahead. He feels that preparedness improves his chances for success; however, he struggles with flexible course formats and schedules.

Furthermore, Olivia appears to understand academic integrity as an unwritten rule that everyone follows without question; Chad appears to hold this sentiment as well. Olivia feels that the content of certain programs does not require extensive discussions about academic integrity. Olivia has also experienced another higher education environment in Manitoba where academic integrity was not discussed at all – she attributes this to the content as well as to the student group that she perceives as very serious.

Max suggests that there are different ways of thinking throughout the world of different educational contexts; he feels that we should do a better job of acknowledging the various ways of thinking (for example, rote learning) and validate them within the university.

Many students understand basic processes related to academic integrity, and are able to offer some details on what is expected in scenarios such as test taking and paper writing. Fred does

not appear to be detail-oriented which could be attributed to a lower score on the uncertainty

avoidance index (a score has not been reported for Azerbaijan in this index). Jack is unsure of

whether or not an example of an offence he talks about would be considered cheating or plagiarism

– he appears to lack an operational definition for the case in question.

When asked if he could explain the importance of academic integrity, Max says that he could

not,

> It's the rules, so I follow them, but to me it makes much more sense if you take out the
>
> Internet. It makes much more sense if you take out communications like we have. It makes
>
> much more sense if you go back and read about Newton and Leibniz fighting over who made
>
> Calculus. Those things put it into context... You're going to get to a point where it would be
>
> impossible to have original language. It would be almost impossible to construct an original
>
> thought. So either you're heading for a future where you're literally just citing every little
>
> piece of everything, or we're going to have to rethink how we examine plagiarism, how we
>
> examine citation, how we examine research. And so, to me, I think it's a fine rule, there's
>
> nothing wrong with it, but I don't think it can stand up over the next 200 years like it has for
>
> the past 200.

In addition, Max feels that the underlying principles may be antiquated and need to be

reframed to better suit the context of today. He also expresses concern over a punitive system, "it's

sort of an expectation almost, I find, that *someone* is going to try something shady. Which it seems to

me to be like, well, if you know someone's doing that, why have you not redesigned your course?"

Max appears to stress that academic integrity and its position need to be put in the context of today.

Max and Fred feel that it is impossible for students to claim ignorance regarding academic integrity,

because once they have started classes the topic is impossible to avoid and it is heavily discussed.

In addition, prevention of cheating behavior is outlined as an uncertainty for Jack. He feels that due to various personalities and abilities, this is a very difficult task. This is contradictory to the national culture of South Korea that generally accepts a very rigid code and lives by rules.

Indulgence

Indulgence is described as the degree to which people in a society attempt to control their impulses (The Hofstede Centre, n.d.). To gather data on the indulgence index, participants were asked to discuss an instance where they may have felt tempted to engage in academic dishonesty. Most of the participants believe that they have not engaged in dishonest behavior at any time and that they are not tempted to do so. Nevertheless, Fiona and Casey admit to engaging in cheating behavior at some point during their time at the University of Manitoba. Both minimize these instances as they feel they were justified in their behavior for different reasons. With exceptions, the participant group appears to be restrained in terms of controlling impulses or feeling that the issue of academic integrity is not in their control and they are to follow it. In other words, ethical self-control presents itself on either end of the indulgence index. Restrained societies are known for greater self-regulation, as it is the norm, while indulgent societies enjoy leisure time more freely and openly (The Hofstede Centre, n.d.). The data is organized into three themes: leisure time, cheating, and exhibiting restraint. Each theme is discussed in the following sub-sections.

Leisure time. Many of the participants speak of indulging in leisure time as an alternative to studying or working on an assignment. Fiona expresses that she plans ahead in each term in order to prepare herself and ensure success. Other participants echo this notion that preparedness contributes to success; working hard and forgoing leisure time are necessary for academic achievement. Casey and Marcus are also aware that the time put in to a paper or assignment has a direct effect on the output. They believe that the more time spent, the better the finished product.

Although participants understand that indulging in leisure time is counterproductive, they feel it is out of their control as their friends often facilitate procrastination in their work. Fiona

exhibits indulgence in describing herself as "pretty lazy" and appears to desire more leisure time for socializing with friends or doing things that she enjoys. Casey also mentions that his friends are influential in his choosing of leisure time over schoolwork; he finds it easy to procrastinate with them. He says, "so instead of going and doing research I just go and have fun… we just waste time, to be honest." Marcus feels that leisure time is important to him in the same way his academics are important to him; he desires a balanced life but does not appear to let this compromise his integrity.

Many of the participants find that their level of interest in a topic is related to their time commitment to these topics. Casey finds that if the topic is interesting it is easier to maintain integrity. Yolanda expresses that certain topics, which are not of interest to her, have caused her to feel lazy and to care less about her final grade. However, she does not admit to engaging in dishonest behavior in the case of such topics. Olivia finds that her enjoyment in her work has increased with maturity and with having explored various fields that have led her to her current degree path.

Max has chosen his degree path as a "means to an end" so that he could graduate as quickly as possible. He wants to continue with his first career choice in some capacity, but understands it to be less stable than his new career path so he plans to keep it as more of a hobby.

Casey and Chad feel bored by the message of academic integrity and comment on its repetitive nature at the University of Manitoba. Casey mentions that he does not pay much attention to the academic integrity messages at the beginning of a course because he feels that he knows it well enough and is following it as best as he can.

Fred has experienced some difficulty in the previous term and is repeating a course he does not enjoy. He feels confident in the outcome this time around, however, he is discouraged by the fact that he has to repeat a topic that does not interest him.

Cheating. Although Fiona is uncertain as to whether or not it would be considered cheating, she admits to engaging in cheating behavior recently. She is not entirely sure whether or not what she did is wrong because the cheating method did not guarantee success on the assessment type (based on what she shares, the researcher believes it to be cheating). In addition, Fiona feels she could easily get away with it, so she feels there is no risk to her in what she had done.

Max also admits to cheating during a co-curricular event. He has experienced guilt after this event, but feels that given the scenario (i.e. a co-curricular event), it is not as serious as cheating in a curricular event. In fact, Max has never felt tempted to engage in academic dishonesty during his studies and feels that following the rules is an obligation he has willingly committed to.

Casey admits to cheating during opportune moments in a midterm examination. He feels tempted to look at another students' paper that is in his line of sight and he acts on this. He feels that he would do this again if the opportunity presented itself and justifies this behavior because he would study the topic later on when the exam has finished. Although he expresses that he has strong opinions against cheating, he feels that all his values leave him in moments such as these and he is unable to prevent himself from looking at another student's response. He later admits that perhaps he is not honest enough to exhibit restraint in such a situation.

Exhibiting restraint. Many participants feel that academic dishonesty is wrong and that students should not engage in such behavior. Fiona exhibits an expectation of restraining oneself when it comes to cheating in saying that "it's just not fair for you to just copy." Yolanda also agrees that breaking the rules of academic integrity is wrong and, therefore, she has not engaged in such behavior. Zane offers that constant reminders are needed to ensure that the rules are upheld. He also says that once the rules have been said it is expected that students understand them and adhere to them. Zane sees the strictness at the University of Manitoba as a standard across the country. Casey believes that as adults, students should know what is right and wrong and must accept the consequences that come with doing wrong. Max also feels that the parameters are clear

and, therefore, there should not be any cheating behavior to deal with at the University of Manitoba. Fred offers that strict punishments should be in place for students who are caught engaging in academic dishonesty. He understands that there are guidelines to be followed and follows them as best as he can. Olivia also does not understand the boldness she feels would be required for someone to copy and paste without properly citing. She said, "we hear that they copied and pasted. I don't know how they have the courage to do it, cuz it's so easy nowadays to check."

Some participants feel that they have been tempted to engage in academic dishonesty. Others find that they have given into this temptation. Jack mentions that in a very difficult course, in a topic he feels he was not good at, he had felt tempted to cheat. Bridget also expresses an understanding of those that would cheat in a course that is very difficult. Jack exhibits restraint in that he did not engage in dishonest behavior simply because the topic was difficult, he choses right over wrong. Olivia also finds that her enjoyment in her studies is possibly linked to the level of difficulty, although she makes no mention of ever feeling tempted to engage in academic dishonesty.

For Yolanda, hard work is habitual; she has always done so in her home country and this has carried over to her studies at the University of Manitoba. She says, "I think it's just I'm used to obey [sic] these rules and when I study I do not think much about it actually." Yolanda appears to believe that true success comes from hard work and good studying, but she feels that some students do not exhibit a level of restraint that makes them work hard at university. Chad also exhibits a good work ethic when he had to learn English during his school break before coming to study in Canada. He expresses that all other students at that time were on break from school and it was very difficult for him to be motivated in his English studies; he studied hard regardless. Marcus also considers himself a focused and hard-working student; he had to work hard in high school so he is used to it at university. He also seeks the answers from his professor or teaching assistants when he does not know them because this was part of his high school environment. Zane also feels that he is a hard-

working student and gives his all to his studies. Max mentions that the resources available to students are plentiful and easily accessible, rendering any reason for engaging in academic dishonesty as unfounded.

When speaking of the role academic integrity plays in his work Marcus adds, "I don't do anything which will hurt me, I would say. I'm on the safe side and I'm careful about it, like everyone should be." Fred also does not consider any form of academic dishonesty at the University of Manitoba, although he does admit to engaging in it back home in Azerbaijan.

Similarly, Chad is able to maintain integrity despite peer pressure from his friends to join in cheating on a midterm examination. He feels that cheating is wrong so he declined the offer from his friends and chose to sit alone during the exam in order to avoid the influence of his friends. He mentions that he prefers to sit away from his friends so they are unable to distract him,

> I even don't like my friends sit behind me, sit next to me in the examination. Cuz they just influence me... I spent lots of time to study, so I want to prove my abilities in the exam. So I don't like my friends to sit next to me. Even though they don't like me out there, but I still feel uncomfortable if they sit next to me... So I just like to sit with strangers.

Zane also exhibits a dislike for academic dishonesty and feels that students should refrain from engaging in such behavior because it is shameful. For Zane, following the rules comes easy. Casey also feels that there is shame associated with engaging in academic dishonesty. He believes that this would cause a student to lie about the reason for their received punishments. He says this,

> Nobody wants to get zero, or F, or they don't want to get suspension. And then you have to come up with lies, if you're suspended... "Why are you not going to school?" You know you have to come and, "no, no, no, no, I'm just taking off" and everything.

Bridget mentions that she was very surprised and scared when a classmate asked to see her exam paper in an exam scenario. She does not appear to understand such unrestraint from another student and feels that this is negative for the university environment:

I remember during the midterm test… a girl just behind me kicked my desk… And I don't

know what's the matter, I thought she may want to borrow a pen from me or something else

and I just like this [leans back in her chair], and she told me that *please, let me look. Please,*

let me have a look… I was so surprised and I was scared… And I, um, I did nothing, just

complete my paper.

Fred also mentions an experience where classmates attempted to cheat off of him in an

exam, but he says that he does not like people copying off of him. This behavior worries and

stresses him.

In addition, Yolanda, Zane, and Max believe that their work ethic and moral compass has

come from their upbringing. Bridget also feels that a person should have integrity in their day-to-

day life, not just in their university career. These participants believe that their parents have taught

them to be honest in all things, not just in academics. Zane also adds that his religion has taught him

to be an honest person and student. Bridget mentions that hard work and restraint are exhibited in

high school and, in her experience, students could relax once they reach university. Once in

university, the pressure to be successful is not as great and so she feels she got nothing out of her

four-year degree in China. And so, she hopes for a more rigorous university experience at the

University of Manitoba. Casey has also experienced a very strict system in his primary school in

India. He mentions that it was the norm for teachers to dole out physical punishments when a

student was caught cheating. This is generally accepted and acts as a strong deterrent for students.

Max has experienced a stricter environment at his former university in the U.S.. There were

strict honor codes in place and first-time offenders suffered extreme consequences such as

expulsion. Max feels that he is very well equipped to handle academic integrity at the University of

Manitoba given the strict system he has previously experienced.

Yolanda feels that the consequences of engaging in academic dishonesty at the University of

Manitoba are not a deterrent for her. She has no trouble following the rules as they are and feels

that she does not need to worry about potential consequences because she feels she is on the right path. Bridget can also manage the content without needing to resort to academic dishonesty. Furthermore, she does not want to be caught cheating so she has avoided this behavior. Marcus also feels that he does not want to engage in academic dishonesty because there is no need for him and because it could get him in trouble. At first, he has been intimidated by academic integrity but with experience he has learned that it is nothing to fear and it is actually quite easy to follow. In addition, Casey feels that fear of punishment prevents him from engaging in academic dishonesty. Max offers that despite his opinions or the reality of the situation (with respect to reframing intellectual property for the current era), he feels that he should abide by the rules and does not have any issue with doing so. Zane feels that he would apply what he has learned at the University of Manitoba – in terms of academic integrity – back home if he were to return to study there. Fred suggests that students who are not willing to follow the rules at the University of Manitoba should return to their country where such behavior is permitted.

Masculinity

Masculinity is described as the favoring of masculine characteristics, such as competition and aggression, over feminine characteristics, such as nurturing and humility (Hofstede et al., 2010, Signorini et al., 2009). The participants exhibit some drive and ambition to be successful in their studies and subsequent careers. Achieving good grades is vital for most of the participants; in fact, all but one expresses the importance of grade point average (GPA) at some point in each interview. Participants' keenness and inspiration in academics presents itself in themes within the masculinity dimension; they are success and doing the right thing. Each category is discussed in the following sub-sections.

Success. Bridget offers that students' scores reflect the effort they have put in. Moreover, Chad expresses that if grades are "fake" as a result of being earned dishonestly, he will lose motivation in his studies,

In university it's a part of my motivation to study. Cuz only if there's a fair academic

environment, then I have more motivation to study hard… If the grades are fake, I mean, if

the grades you can using cheating to achieve that, then there no meaning of the exam…

Better academic integrity can encourage the student to work harder for their studies, to

listen to lecture, to do homework.

Additionally, Chad and Fiona are highly motivated by grades and believe that they are all-important. Casey also feels that grades are important, as he is required to report to the benefactors of his education – his parents and brother. He is highly motivated to get good grades because they have to be shared. Furthermore, Zane believes that there are students who have gotten ahead by cheating and have earned higher GPAs than warranted.

Many participants are opportunity hunting in coming to Canada to study. They believe that better opportunities have awaited them here, as opposed to back home. Max is the only student to offer that his career opportunities are not limited by GPA; he believes that soft skills are equally as important as technical skills and that progression through life has somewhat of a natural flow to it where he will gain a good career regardless of his grades. Zane is also highly career-focused and has come to Canada because he feels there are greater opportunities than in Pakistan. He believes that good grades will open to him great career opportunities.

Conversely, many of the participants feel that you can jeopardize your career opportunities by engaging in academic dishonesty and getting caught. Olivia and Zane say specifically that a potential employer might not hire someone who has engaged in academic dishonesty. Chad says he is seeking a specific skill set that will give him a competitive edge in the working world. He is also highly motivated to gain work experience in his field during his studies. At first, he sought out Winnipeg to settle here because he believed he could find a great career here, but he now sees that there are vast opportunities throughout Canada.

Doing the right thing. Jack desires equality within academics, and although he understands that individual expectations vary from person to person, he and many of the other participants appear to hold the ideal that all students should share the same personal expectations of themselves when it comes to academic integrity. Fred offers that acting with integrity in university is about being a good person overall, it is not just to avoid punishment or to gain reward – it is about doing the right thing in the interest of fairness and equality. He shares the following,

> Do you know about this concept of humanism? It's like the person can be a good person for the sake of being a good person... I tend to think about it in this manner. So you do this because you know this is a good things to do. It's not because of, you know, you could be punished, or you could get in a bad situation. No. It's just for the sake of being good... I would say most of the people do good things because there's punishment if you don't do them, but for me doing good things is because you should do them, as a human being, as a good person. And this is what should be done. It's not because of some reason, it's just for sake of doing this. This is what makes us better.

Olivia appears to be a very driven person, motivated by doing well and submitting a finished product that she can be proud of. Marcus also exhibits a trait that doing the right thing is natural and should be the go-to, rather than earning an achievement by dishonorable means. Bridget expresses that someone cannot get something for nothing; hard work and time would get desirable results and this should be the only way that people get desirable results,

> We have to know that if we want to get something you have to pay something. So if we want to get a good score, if you want to pass the exam, we have to pay our time, our efforts for it.

Yolanda also suggests that true success comes from honest hard work and proper studying; for her working hard is habitual. Chad notices his motivation has decreased as a result of witnessing the cheating behavior of others; he feels that there is less reason to work hard when he sees his friends achieving good grades by dishonest means.

Fred suggests that he knows what it is to be hard working and that understanding has helped him to be a good person in academics. Furthermore, he believes that gratitude should be shown for the hard work of others by crediting them. Although he understands that the game of intellectual property can be unfair and, historically, people have been taken advantage of. In his words,

Nikola Tesla… He did so much work, he did so many good inventions for our society, especially in electricity. And, just now people start to remember him more and give him credit. While Thomas Edison, he was a nice inventor, but he wasn't as genius as Tesla, but he was better at advertising. And so for a long time, a *really* long time, Edison's name was more on the top than Tesla's. And even I know that Edison didn't even pay for Tesla when he was working on some projects. He didn't even pay his salary. That's the harsh nature of things. But again, *that's* why we need academic integrity or that's why we need to put these strict rules, so this wouldn't happen anymore that - we should have more Teslas than Edisons.

Jack believes that South Korea is not as strict as Canada in terms of academic integrity and this is consistent with South Korea's ranking on the masculinity index as a country that is known to be less concerned with enforcement than cultures that score higher.

Long-term Versus Short-term Orientation

Long-term versus short-term orientation is described as the moral standards in place in society. Long-term oriented societies are inclined to view life as circumstantial, whereas short-term oriented societies are bound by static tradition and value (Hofstede et al., The Hofstede Centre, n.d.). Participant responses are attributed to this index when they exhibit concern in regards to academic integrity and how they believe it can affect them professionally. Likewise, interviews were examined for participants' beliefs as to where and how rewards are given in an educational context.

All participants exhibit short-term orientation in that they accept the laws of academic integrity as they stand and follow them without question. They are traditionally so, and therefore, must be adhered to. In contrast, participants also exhibit characteristics of long-term orientation, in that academic integrity can be contextual although it presents itself as a methodology one can adopt to promote success. In other words, the participants are results-oriented when speaking of their academics – for example, getting good grades will get them a good job – and they understand that their behavior or degree to which they adhere to the policies of academic integrity heavily influence results. That being said, some participants understand academic integrity as a fundamental part of one's development as they relate academic integrity to their personal moral code and their upbringing, which lends itself more to the short-term orientation end of the spectrum. The presence of morals and understanding why one does what they do when it comes to academic integrity give similar responses across all participants.

Much of what is understood about academic integrity is rooted in tradition and the importance of rules is commonplace; the rules have always been as such, so one must abide by them. The following sub-sections will examine two themes: the perceived contextual nature of academic integrity; and the extreme ideologies surrounding academic integrity.

Contextual nature. Some participants express that academic integrity can be fluid and that it is dependent on the environment. For example, Chad shares a story where competitiveness among high schools in China led to blatant cheating on standardized testing. Chad expresses his view that high schools in China are highly results-focused in these types of situations, which often lead to cheating behavior among students as facilitated by teachers.

Learning what works and behaving pragmatically when it comes to academic integrity is also commonly expressed by the participants as theoretical considerations in academic integrity are not necessarily voiced by the participants. In addition, practical examples of what are considered good and bad sources are useful for participants, in order to best understand

expectations in a given scenario (i.e. among different courses or professors). Alternatively, one

participant, Chad, feels that the academic integrity message does not need to be repeated for all

students, only for those that do not care about the message or deliberately go against it. He says

this,

> Majority of students, I think, regards this issue very important. But only for some students,
>
> they don't care about this, so I think… if you focus on specific students it's more useful. Cuz
>
> it's hard to change their mind, but for majority of us we already have those knowledge, we
>
> already know it's very important.

Casey exhibits a fluid moral code when he admits to cheating on exams despite his point of

view that cheating was a very serious offense. When the opportunity presents itself, he said he has

glanced at other students' exam papers. Casey settles any guilt he experiences by referring to the

textbook immediately following the exam to learn about any items he has cheated on. He has no

fear in being caught because he is subtle enough and only cheats when he is certain it will go

undetected.

Underwriting the participant views of academic integrity are the perceived long-term

consequences of dishonest behavior. For example, Bridget has experienced an issue where a

classmate wanted to copy her work; she believes that to allow the copying would be a disservice to

the other student, as it would not provide her with the necessary information to be successful in the

future. Zane echoes this; in his words,

> If we are academically dishonest then it goes onto our file. Not only our student record, but
>
> also on our immigration status as well… After you are academically dishonest, when you
>
> apply for your permanent resident or your citizenship, they do consider these kinds of
>
> things. Because, obviously, Canada doesn't want their citizens to be dishonest…

Although Zane is incorrect in believing that his study permit or future immigration in

Canada would be affected by accusations of academic dishonesty, the perceived long-term

consequences are a great deterrent for the participants, particularly when paired with the

underlying principles of integrity and doing the right thing. This is where short-term orientation

presents itself in the participant's perspectives in that the moral standard with regard to academic

integrity is viewed as unchangeable. As an example, Jack believes that in the interest of living by

principle, students should not engage in academic dishonesty. Fred feels this too, that students

should be honest in their work for the sake of being a good person, not just because they are afraid

of punishment; they should do the right thing by virtue. Casey expresses admiration of a friend that

had not resorted to cheating; rather the friend had turned in a blank paper.

Jack, Marcus, and Zane mention tuition as a deterrent. Thrift plays a role for several

students who attribute tuition costs as a reason to not engage in academic dishonesty. Several

participants also feel that their money would not be put to good use if they were to cheat,

plagiarize, or engage in some other form of dishonesty, further emphasizing that education is

perceived as an investment that requires care. On this note, Zane shares the following,

> If I'll be caught, all my money go in waste. Because we pay like thousand, twelve hundred,
>
> thirteen dollars a course, right; and just to get an 'F' just because I couldn't do one small
>
> question, well it's not worth it. Because once you fail that course all your money in waste,
>
> plus you get a label on yourself that you were caught cheating.

Marcus and Zane also mention that they have to take care in academic integrity because of

their investment in a Canadian education and that as international students there may be harsher

consequences for engaging in academic dishonesty. In addition, Casey expresses that he has

travelled quite far to study and this fact motivates him to do well.

Fiona and Marcus also bring up tuition in the context of resources on campus, she has heard

people tell her that these resources are paid for by your tuition, so it makes sense to her to utilize

them. In fact, long-term goals play a factor for participants, as well as short-term goals, to not

increase current tuition costs by having to repeat a course failed on account of academic

dishonesty.

Extreme ideologies. An extreme ideology is exhibited by several of the participants when it

comes to academic integrity; this is consistent with a lower score on the long-term orientation

index, or short-term orientation. In addition, the participants appear to understand academic

integrity as an absolute truth that is applicable to everyone at the University of Manitoba. From

what she understood of North America before coming here, Bridget has believed it to be very strict

in terms of academic integrity so she was not surprised by the seriousness when she first studied at

the University of Manitoba. Olivia also expresses that academic integrity is an internal code that

students abide by and for those that do not follow it they need to be taught or reminded of the rules.

Many participants perceive academic integrity as fundamental for success and therefore do

not question its place in higher education. Ultimately, they appear to agree with the parameters of

academic integrity, which is consistent with short-term orientation; essentially, they understand

this academic ideology to be deep-rooted and unchanging. In effect, many participants have

polarized perspectives on issues of academic integrity and fundamental assessments of

wrongdoers. For example, Olivia believes that students should be able to apply academic integrity

to their lives as a general rule or principle and exhibits disdain in those who do not.

Participants are able to describe how it affects them in their immediate environment. Jack

offers that academic integrity is needed to maintain fairness among students,

> I want that exam to be reliable, but if someone cheat on somebody or plagiarize, I have to be
>
> the only one who really work hard and that tempt me to do the same thing if, you know, that
>
> doesn't stop…. It's just not fair and I like everything to be fair.

In addition, Jack feels that there is only right and wrong when it comes to academic

integrity. Jack appreciates a virtuous environment at a university, or rather a community of

learners who abide by the rules and promote equality – in fact, he has sought this out in coming to

Canada as he felt the situation would be better than it was in South Korea. In contrast, Max feels

that his home university in the U.S.A. was more "steeped in tradition" than the University of

Manitoba. He expresses that he feels Americans "really love having a good guy and love punishing

the bad guy." Essentially, he believes this has promoted harsh punishment in cases of academic

integrity at his home university in the U.S.A. He attributes this to the culture of private, American

universities.

While many of the participants believe that honesty and hard work are tenets of an

education (and life, for that matter), these traditions are inflexible in terms of academic integrity.

Many participants feel that their perspectives on academic integrity did not change, per se,

although their behavior and expectations may have required modification with the new

environment. As an example, Fred – who, in the previous sub-section, is noted to have appreciated

the softer landing he experienced – expects that by second or third year everyone should know the

ins and outs of academic integrity and punishments should be harsh for engaging in academic

dishonesty. Ultimately, it is believed that students should be expected to alter their behavior if this

is not in line with the new academic culture they find themselves in at the University of Manitoba.

In contrast, Max exhibits long-term orientation on this index in that he questions the underlying

reasons for academic integrity in the context of today, perhaps suggesting that traditions need to be

adapted to better suit a new reality.

Summary

Throughout the interviews, participants of this study reflect on issues of academic integrity

and how their experiences at the University of Manitoba are shaped by this concept. Participants

share their values in relation to issues of academic integrity and each one feels an appreciation for

integrity in education, although it might manifest itself differently in different scenarios. Overall,

participants of this study believe in the importance of integrity in education and some feel that their

cultural upbringing contributes to this appreciation. Furthermore, it is apparent to the researcher

that professors play a large role in student appreciation of academic integrity. In addition, there are several motivational factors for complying with the rules of academic integrity; these vary from moral reasons to risk of punishment. The participants of this study feel that they have a firm grasp of the expectations surrounding academic integrity at the University; although, some question whether or not specific actions are punishable. Lastly, the participants share that they are somewhat ignorant as to the seriousness of academic integrity at the University of Manitoba prior to enrolling at this institution.

CHAPTER FIVE

Discussion

This chapter will discuss the major themes that presented themselves in the interviews with international students at the University of Manitoba. Although, participants of this study came from a variety of backgrounds, they shared an appreciation for academic integrity and believed it to be an important topic. The discussion will include an examination of the extent to which culture is reflected in the perspectives of international undergraduate students on issues related to academic integrity. In addition, this chapter will link the findings of this study to the literature and discuss implications for future research.

Culture

Students understand that there is a right path that they should follow in their studies. This does not mean that all participants remain on this path; rather, they are aware that morals and integrity play a vital role in academic integrity; this is prevalent in all students regardless of cultural background. In fact, integrity is well understood by international students and they recognize the need to be honest, truthful, and respectful in their work as students. Contradictory to the claim made by the International Centre for Academic Integrity (2012), that integrity and education have separated over time, international students can relate moral behavior with academics and understand it as fundamental to the learning process. This understanding appears to exist regardless of cultural background and while international students, and possibly the rest of the University community, might believe that they are at a disadvantage with respect to academic integrity, they know that their education is defined by it. In other words, international students recognize that achievement and grades have more meaning if earned honestly.

Behaving honestly appears to be a strong desire in all participants. However, as Löfström (2011) mentions, translating this into practice can pose a challenge for students, given that there is some uncertainty over what constitutes academic dishonesty. For example, Fiona asked the

researcher if something she had done during a test would have been considered academic

dishonesty; she was uncertain if her actions were punishable since she did not believe what she had

done would guarantee her success on the test. Furthermore, other participants said that their

morals, as well as an inherent understanding of what constitutes being a good person, guided them.

Being a good person is related back to academics because participants understand that there are

things they ought to do and other things they ought not to do. However, just as Fiona's

understanding of ethics in education contradicted her actions, Casey's did as well. Casey has strong

beliefs against cheating and even said that his educational and familial upbringing has helped him

to appreciate honesty in education; however, he admits to cheating on exams when the opportunity

presents itself.

Fiona and Casey were from two different cultural backgrounds (Hong Kong and India),

which suggests that academically dishonest behavior is not necessarily culture bound, but is rather

an inability to translate intentions into action with the pressure of being a student. Can it then be

said that international undergraduate students possess a decreased ability to act with intent in the

face of the pressures of being a student? This study has not answered that question, and

international undergraduate students' intentions or reasons for engaging in cheating behavior

cannot be over-generalized to the broader population with only two participants admitting to the

act. What we can observe is that international undergraduate students face the regular pressures of

being a university student and may succumb to this regardless of their cultural background.

McCabe, Butterfield, and Treviño (2012), as well as McCabe and his colleagues (2001), found that

the pressure or worries can often lead to academic dishonesty among students; as was exhibited by

Fiona and Casey in this study.

It is also noted that international undergraduate students will observe what is going on

around them and if they see that academic dishonesty is commonplace, their integrity may be at

risk. Several participants in this study exhibit dissatisfaction with the level of integrity at the

University of Manitoba. Prior to studying at the University, they believed they would be attending a more serious and prestigious school in Canada and were surprised at some of the witnessed behaviors of other students. McCabe, Butterfield, and Treviño (2012) shared that peer behavior can affect academic integrity and the participants acknowledge that the overall culture of integrity on campus is important. In essence, international undergraduate students do not necessarily bring with them a tendency to behave dishonestly in university, although they may need to adapt to the new academic culture in which they find themselves, which may lead to dishonest behavior regardless of past behavior in their home country.

As mentioned, international students of this study are concerned with the status of academic integrity at the University of Manitoba and generally hold high expectations for the university community. As such, cultural background is not a means of determining which student group is likely to be dishonest or accepting of dishonest behavior. However, cultural background is reflected in perspectives on academic integrity, simply because academic integrity may or may not have been a social institution at a person's home country or home university. Many participants in the study reflect on their previous understanding of academic integrity prior to studying in Canada and it is mentioned by some that they knew very little or nothing at all of academic integrity prior to their studies at the University of Manitoba.

As mentioned in the literature review, Bradshaw and Baluja (2011) and Reynolds and Constantine (2007) suggested that international students do not view academic integrity as an important issue in their education and, therefore, may be ignorant to expectations at the host university; this is exhibited to an extent by some participants and appears to be a factor for them in studying abroad.

Academic integrity is institutionalized at the University of Manitoba where it may not be in another university and, therefore, it is not an established practice of the faculty and students there. As a result, international undergraduate students are faced with the challenge of learning a new

social institution upon arriving at the host university. What's interesting about this is that most

participants of this study feel that they have adequately mastered this piece of cultural learning at

the University of Manitoba, although they did go through somewhat of an acculturation process in

order to be able to meet the standards of academic integrity in their new educational environment.

It is apparent that the students, wherever they have come from, experience a period of adjustment;

they are required to adjust to their new surroundings and to the policies and practices of academic

integrity at the University of Manitoba. Although their understanding of the topic is varied, it is a

personal experience learned over time for each individual. This echoes Gullifer and Tyson's (2010)

observation that students learn about academic integrity gradually. This supports the notion that

preventative measures must be in place, as well as remediation for first-time offenders (Compton &

Pfau, 2008; Simon et al., 2003). Allowing international undergraduate students to interact with

issues of academic integrity, learn it over time, and build on past experiences will help tackle the

issue of increased cases of academic dishonesty among them.

　　　In some way, it seems that since international undergraduate students are aware that they

need to adapt to their new educational environment, they may be more careful in their academics,

paying closer attention to the rules and regulations. As such, they may fail to understand the bigger

picture; however, they may be better at operationalizing academic integrity within their own realm

and for their own needs, both in the long- and short-term. In other words, academic integrity instills

itself in various ways for each individual and to a various extent that is difficult to classify as right

or wrong, or has having shortcomings in terms of the extent to which academic integrity is applied

in any one student's academic life.

　　　Hofstede's cultural dimensions revealed the ways in which international students might

adapt or change their understandings of academic integrity based on their previous educational

environments and their experiences at the University of Manitoba. The following section will

further discuss the four cultural dimensions that proved most relevant to the study.

Cultural Dimensions

As mentioned previously in Chapter 4, four of Hofstede's six cultural dimensions were found to be more relevant to the study; they are each discussed in the following sub-sections and related to the literature on issues of academic integrity.

Power distance. Power distance presents itself in each of the participant's experiences in that rules and regulations hold a great deal of authority and must be observed. The participants all note that rules and over-arching ideals are essential in an educational environment, particularly to maintain standards of professionalism and to encourage the university community at large to act with integrity. The rules are accepted by all of the participants of this study and not one offers that they should be stricter or, on the other hand, more lenient. The participants did, however, interact differently with the rules and some exhibit a stronger preference for following rules because they are imposed, whereas others understood the rules as useful for the greater good of the university. This has implications for University administrators and faculty in that they must deal with the various notions surrounding rules and rule breaking. Furthermore, the understanding that compliance is multi-dimensional and potentially unique to each person presents a paradox within academic integrity, where expectations are over-arching across all students. However, tapping in to each student's own understanding of the rules will ultimately promote academic integrity. This is supported by the position of Compton and Pfau (2008), who suggest that student attitudes towards plagiarism will affect their appreciation of it and, consequently, help them avoid this behavior.

The participants of this study generally accept the concept of academic integrity as one that applies to everyone regardless of position or influence. There is some discussion around students as novices and that these types of students should be given the opportunity to make mistakes. Similarly, Ercegovac and Richardson (2004) suggest that students must be taught the ways of academic integrity. However, participants of this study generally exhibited a preference for an

autocratic system where someone upholds the rules; that being said, views on students' rights vary

among the participants' perspectives.

Löfström (2011) said that students generally do not appreciate the foundation upon which

the rules have been laid. While participants of this study believe that integrity is an important part

of living morally, they fail to relate academic integrity to building on an existing knowledge base.

Participants understand that rules are there for a reason and that they are to follow them, in

addition they are able to express that respect must be shown in crediting an original author.

International undergraduate students might then exhibit power distance in relation to academic

integrity because they understand their place in terms of how they are to interact with the rules. In

fact, they do not view themselves as equals or scholars, rather they view themselves as novices that

require guidance and the ability to make errors and learn from them. Macfarlane (2012) argues that

students ought to be viewed as scholars and not treated just as consumers of knowledge. However,

this study suggests that international undergraduate students also view themselves as novices and

if a more scholarly atmosphere is to be created the responsibility falls on both students *and* faculty

in order to create that atmosphere. It appears that students do view themselves as consumers of

knowledge and their relationships with professors, the literature, and the university community

lend to a hierarchical structure that might contribute to decreased appreciation of academic

integrity (Macfarlane, 2012). Keeping in mind that international undergraduate students may not

be the only student demographic to hold graduate students or professors to a higher standard in

relation to academic integrity, it may be that the university community as a whole is not doing an

adequate job of relaying its message that academic integrity is a principle that applies to all

members at all levels.

Professors can play an important role in relaying the message and promoting a culture of

academic integrity. Perhaps a step in the right direction, in instilling a sense of a "community of

integrity", begins in the lecture halls. Both a Chinese participant of this study and a Pakistani

participant express the desire to have a charismatic and caring professor. This relationship appears important to them in terms of the quality of their education as well as their interest in a course or topic. It can be concluded that students respond better to closer relationships with their professors, where more coaching or guidance occurs in relation to academic integrity. According to McCabe et al. (2012) and Stephens et al. (2010), students are less likely to cheat when they are genuinely interested in the topics they are studying. Professors and instructors who have the ability to hold the interest of students are better appreciated and are, therefore, inadvertently promoting academic integrity. While students may not be aware of this relationship between academic integrity and an instructor's capacity to be liked by the students, it acts as an excellent proactive measure in the battle against academic dishonesty.

Individualism. Participants of this study are encouraging in their discussion of the responsibility of academic integrity. Each participant agrees that it is important to them and should also be important to the rest of the university community. Unfortunately, several of the participants have witnessed dishonest behavior; some sharing that this behavior had gone unpunished. It is interesting to hear about this observed paradox – that the entire university community is responsible for upholding academic integrity, yet some students do not comply. It shows a surface understanding of individualized interests that students might not notice of themselves. In particular, individual factors in academic dishonesty are noted by McCabe and his colleagues (2012); students of this study spoke of personal factors that might contribute to academic dishonesty, such as spending time with friends or managing a work-school balance.

Alternatively, some participants are able to operate outside of their cultural disposition in the individualism dimension as it relates to academic integrity. For example, Chad spoke of his friends who cheated in a midterm exam and how they had tried to get him to collaborate with him. Although Chad comes from a collectivist culture, China, he exhibited individualistic tendencies when his academic integrity was compromised. It can then be said that international undergraduate

students are not predisposed to cheat or collaborate inappropriately if they come from a certain cultural background. This contradicts the research of Diekhoff et al. (1999) who found that collectivist Japanese students were more likely to rationalize cheating behavior than individualist American students. In this study, all students view academic integrity as a personal choice they have to make in their studies, and although some of them faltered, they believe it was ultimately in their power to do right or wrong. That being said, inappropriate collaboration does not appear to be well understood by the participants in this study. There appear to be a variety of opinions on what is acceptable and what is not, and, in the case where collaborating is acceptable, to what extent students can collaborate on an assignment.

In addition to individual responsibility in relation to academic integrity, fairness is a common theme that emerges from this study. Participants of this study, with the exception of Max, the American, feel that their fellow students should match their own endeavors and the university should enforce this; in other words, participants believe that one student's effort and integrity should be equal to that of another's. Standards appear to be of great importance, especially when cheating is discussed. It appears that regardless of cultural background, students believe that expectations are to be uniform; not necessarily among all levels of study and among all disciplines, but that within their level or their course, things should be fair. However, some participants make allowances for themselves and for their in-group. It appears that perhaps culture has some influence on student perspectives on academic dishonesty in that empathy is felt for those in their in-groups. In other words, students might be willing to turn a blind eye, so to speak, to cheating behavior if their friends commit it. This adds to the research that suggests that peer behavior can affect student perspectives on academic integrity (McCabe et al., 2012; Reynolds & Constantine, 2007). Students might make allowances for those they are closest to, although they maintain strong opinions against behavior that is academically dishonest. It is worthwhile mentioning that data from domestic students was not collected and, therefore, we do not know if they share the same

perspective. Furthermore, not all participants of the study share stories of friends who have been dishonest. Any student might act this way on account of collectivist tendencies, or rather, just societal pressure to remain silent in a situation that could prove damaging to someone.

On that note, shame is a large factor for several participants of this study with respect to academic integrity. More specifically, shame appears to be a great deterrent in engaging in academic dishonesty; however, once arriving in Canada, where anonymity and privacy rights are paramount, international undergraduate students may no longer experience great shame for engaging in academic dishonesty. At the University of Manitoba, students are entitled to confidentiality throughout the entire process if accused of academic dishonesty; although some participants note that they might be embarrassed to share this news with their friends, they did not express that shame would prevent them from dishonest behavior. Shame might act as a deterrent for some international cultures, whereas the researcher understands this to be an individual factor in the Canadian context, it may be a group or public factor in another educational context. That being said, international students might quickly learn to what extent shame can affect their behavior at a university in Canada.

Uncertainty Avoidance. As mentioned earlier in the chapter, there are several certainties in higher education; that students are there to learn, professors are there to teach, and every student in the community is, more or less, attempting to achieve the same end goal of graduation and embarking on a career. These elements of higher education are generally unchanging wherever in the world one goes as is exhibited by the participants of this study. Their approach to learning remains similar once arriving at a new university, although they must make some adjustments to their new environment especially in relation to rules and policies. As is mentioned by participants in this study, they generally find the University of Manitoba to be a stricter environment than their home universities. Blair (2009) suggests that students must learn how academic integrity is applied in the new educational context. In fact, some of them believe that expectations related to academic

integrity are much more serious than in their home country. However, the participants seem to understand in some way that it has been their choice to study in a new university abroad, so they are required to conform to the new rules. In contrast, some participants feel that the University of Manitoba is more open than their home universities in terms of interactions with professors and punishments related to academic dishonesty.

Whether or not the participants are aware of what they need to learn prior to coming to the University of Manitoba, this does not appear to affect their ability to adapt. Perhaps we, and the literature, are underestimating international undergraduate students and their ability to accept the new educational environment, as it relates to academic integrity. The literature appears to focus on the problem that international undergraduate students are different and come with different practices in their work. Perhaps the conversation should be framed around celebrating those differences and welcoming them more openly. After all, one key reason for bringing in a steady number of international undergraduate students to Canada is to create a richer learning environment at our universities (Association of Canadian Deans of Education, 2014). However, we appear to be very focused on aligning perspectives on academic integrity with our own. Can we go so far as to say this is a misguided approach in facilitating the integration of international undergraduate students? Likely not. The participants of this study appear to appreciate what they have learned about academic integrity and some believe their home countries to be too lenient or even ignorant of these issues.

Moreover, some participants of this study are understanding of certain situations in which a student might behave dishonestly; for example, when content is deemed to be invaluable, or when achieving a passing grade on an assessment is thought to be impossible no matter how much preparation or studying has been done. This echoes Diekhoff et al. (1999) and their research on students from Japan who were found to rationalize cheating behavior more so than American students; however, it cannot be determined in this study as the perspectives of Canadian students

are not available for comparison. Conversely, some participants of this study believe that no

excuses are acceptable in any scenario involving academic dishonesty. Consequently, asking all

students to share the same values in relation to academic integrity might be unrealistic because

their cultural backgrounds or lived experiences might make them more tolerant of certain

behaviors in a given situation. In addition, some students may be tolerant of another's dishonest

actions, all the while holding a higher, more rigid, standard of themselves. This illustrates just how

difficult it is to get all students on the same page in relation to academic integrity (Macfarlane,

2012).

Further to accepting dishonest behavior in others, on one hand, some participants express

that punishments should be severe and that the University is not as strict an environment as they

had expected. On the other hand, some participants of this study believe that some degree of

leniency must be applied for novices or first-time offenders. It seems that an educative approach is

important to international undergraduate students, as they understand that not all students will

immediately understand policies and procedures related to academic integrity. In order to

accurately teach those lessons, students who make mistakes should have the opportunity to learn

from them. That being said, continued efforts are needed to aid students in understanding the

bigger picture; in other words, teaching students that academic integrity is applicable to all facets of

life, including their careers and other future endeavors. Students must better understand that

academic integrity is not just something that needs to be learned by a novice.

Indulgence. Temptation to behave dishonestly does not appear to be a great factor for

participants of this study; in fact, most feel that they are never tempted to behave dishonestly

because they take the rules seriously and commit to following them. In contrast, two participants of

this study admitted to cheating although they minimized what they had done for different reasons.

These two participants did not equate their actions with temptation, per se, although they did

acknowledge that they may have been wrong in their actions and should have been able to do

better. This reiterates the research of McCabe and his colleagues (2012) who found that contextual factors are of greater influence in issues of academic integrity than individual factors.

The balance of personal life and student life is an important factor for many participants of this study; international undergraduate students must tend to their personal relationships while juggling their commitments to work and/or school. It is somewhat understood that choosing free time over studies means a lack of restraint by participants of this study. In general, some participants suggest that they care more for spending time with their friends than they care for studying. Does this mean that they are choosing an indulgent lifestyle over a restrained lifestyle? Perhaps in the context of academic integrity that may be true. If students are less rigorous in their schoolwork than they ought to be, perhaps their understanding of academic integrity is compromised in some way. In contrast, we do not punish students for lack of rigor in their studies – where rigor is effort put forth – we punish them when they have been caught engaging in a behavior that we deem as dishonest. More effort should be made to promote rigor; students must see an intrinsic benefit to hard work and also see it as a joy rather than an obstacle. The University of Manitoba does promote good study habits and offers services through the libraries and other offices; however, we may fail to help some students accurately translate intent into practice when it comes to study habits. Promoting interest in a topic and better relaying the value of what students are learning may help tackle issues of academic dishonesty that arise from a lack of restraint. This brings us back to power distance and the importance of relationships between students and their professors. If student-professor relationships become central to academic integrity, perhaps indulgence will be less of a concern in issues of academic integrity. These relationships might have the power to bridge the gap between a student who acknowledges that cheating is wrong but engages in this behavior when the opportunity presents itself. Stephens et al. (2010) suggest this as well; that students are less likely to cheat when they are engaged and interested in what they are studying.

Furthermore, fear of punishment is a large deterrent in issues of academic integrity. Students who are generally fearful of punishment, as well as understanding of what is right versus what is wrong, appear to struggle less with the temptation to engage in academic dishonesty. Perhaps more effort should be made to make it certain that students will get caught if they engage in academic dishonesty. Case in point, several participants note that they were surprised to witness cheating or other dishonest behavior at the University of Manitoba. This means that not enough is being done to prevent dishonest behavior and continued efforts should be made to support teaching assistants and professors in awareness and action.

Lastly, cultural background does not appear to directly affect restraint among participants of this study. That being said, students from more restrained societies, such as South Korea and Pakistan, generally believe that they are not tempted to cheat; even in the case where temptation presented itself, they were still able to restrain themselves. It may be that students from restrained societies are more likely to act with integrity in the face of temptation, however, further study into this phenomenon might reveal more about this linkage.

Overall, restraint in terms of academic dishonesty does not appear to be difficult for the participants of the study; they generally understand that their education comes with parameters and they are to follow these. It might be of interest for a future study to examine a specific element of academic integrity, for example, cheating, in order to better understand how students interact with this element in terms of indulgence and the degree to which they understand that engaging in this behavior exhibits a lack of restraint.

The following section will outline the main conclusions of the study.

Main Conclusions of the Study

This study sought to answer the question: How do we maintain high standards of academic integrity but also take into account the unique backgrounds of international students? In order to maintain high standards of academic integrity, policies and procedures must be consistent and

clear for administrators, faculty, and students. Furthermore, the faculty needs to ensure that they are following the policies carefully and treating all cases fairly and equally. This might mean that faculty may need to spend more time and effort to incorporate academic integrity into their teaching. To better support faculty in this, the administration should address any barriers to reporting cases of dishonesty – perhaps faculty should be empowered to directly address cases as they happen so that the reporting process can be less cumbersome. Students should never witness cheating behavior that goes unaddressed, as one participant, Casey, said he has witnessed in a midterm exam.

As for the students, they need to do their part in making the conscious choice to be a scholar and allowing their morals to guide them in their studies. Participants of this study understand there is a difference between right and wrong and that they ought to choose what is right; however, there is some confusion around certain behaviors and whether or not these are dishonest. To better understand these grey areas, students require space to experience academic integrity first-hand, through coursework, in the classroom, through research, and through constant support. Furthermore, students should be taught the implications of honest behavior more so than the punishments for dishonest behavior.

The following section will examine the theoretical framework overall and critique its applicability to the study.

A Critique of the Theoretical Framework

Hofstede's six cultural dimensions, "power distance", "individualism", "uncertainty avoidance", "indulgence", "masculinity", and "long-term versus short-term orientation", provided a useful conceptual framework with which to understand the data. Laced throughout the six cultural dimensions are value systems exhibited by people of various cultures in different ways. That being said, each culture has a common thread in that values are an inherent part of adult life regardless of culture. What is valuable to one person may have less value to another and how that value is

expressed in everyday interactions might vary. Alternatively, in an academic environment where students are expected to meet the same outcomes as the students next to them, a new set of values may be adopted, one that aligns students with their academic environments so as to ensure success; or to avoid punishment. While some of the participants in this study express that they have changed their perspectives in terms of the degree to which academic integrity is upheld at the University of Manitoba, they were able to adjust and understood that the new environment might call for some form of change within them. However great or small that change may be, it is somewhat accurately reflected in Hofstede's cultural framework with limitation.

Hofstede's six cultural dimensions provide a useful framework with which to categorize the data and offer explanation as to why participants hold certain beliefs with regards to academic integrity. For example, Jack is adamant that no rule should be broken at any time, which is indicative of his national culture, South Korean, and its high score on the uncertainty avoidance index. The cultural dimensions accurately pinpoint certain beliefs within the six dimensions and offered a landscape with which to compare the various cultural backgrounds represented in this study. Furthermore, they offer a useful lens with which to acknowledge the differences among students at the University of Manitoba and that these differences can contribute to their success.

Where the cultural dimensions seek to point out typical behaviors and responses of particular cultural groups in a given scenario, they fail to accurately reflect the changing perspectives or adaptability of people of a particular culture to a new environment. In this particular study, the researcher does not feel that the participants' adaptability is accurately represented by their cultural background as viewed through the lens of Hofstede's six cultural dimensions. Participants of this study exhibit traits of their national culture when sharing experiences related to academic integrity; for example, Jack, a South Korean student, exhibits strong uncertainty avoidance, as is typical of his culture, when he expresses that he is strongly

opposed to any student not following the rules of academic integrity and that dishonesty should not to be tolerated by the university.

Furthermore, the six cultural dimensions are found to be rather inflexible in their definition of culture and do little to acknowledge the give and take that occurs in an educational environment. The dimensions initially emerged from research on organizational behavior and while educational studies have made use of the framework, some themes from this particular study are not well represented. For example, a theme that emerges from the data that is not well represented is student ability to shift their way of thinking and align past views with current practices; in other words, the notion that culture is fluid and shaped throughout experience is not strongly supported by Hofstede's cultural dimensions. Another theme that is not well represented is the role of guilt and/or fear in issues of academic integrity; these present themselves as motivating factors and the researcher feels they are not adequately represented by any of Hofstede's dimensions.

Furthermore, although students are members of an organization (the university), they are not employees, they are intellectuals. A student's relationship with the university differs from that of an employee's relationship with the employer in that a very specific outcome (that is, career or graduate program) is expected at the point of exit. Their relationship with the university is for personal and educational gains and they have paid money for it.

Lastly, academic integrity may be, in and of itself, its own cultural dimension. Students of various cultural backgrounds learn value sets from their home countries and schools, and the translation of these values might be intertwined with the other dimensions, yet also stand alone. Consequently, the researcher feels that the cultural dimensions do not reveal culture as a strong influence on perspectives related to academic integrity, rather, it might present itself as a factor in the initial settlement phase for an international student but it does not affect their ability to behave with integrity.

The following section will discuss the implications of the study and suggestions for future research.

Implications for Practice

The participants in this study shared experiences that have shaped their current view of academic integrity. They admit to some fear, but overall, feel that they grasp the concept fully after having gone through one or more terms of study at the University of Manitoba. None of the participants fully believe that they have engaged in dishonest behavior intentionally or without valid reason. In fact, they believe that their actions are inconsequential in the greater scheme of their education. However, it is apparent through this study that expectations in terms of assignments and even the volume of tasks may be quite different at the University of Manitoba for some of the non-Western students. As such, every assignment's value should be explicit and students should be taught the importance of integrity in each one of them. In an effort to achieve this, current practices should turn toward what students are doing right rather than what they are doing wrong. There is an extensive taxonomy of dishonest behavior while integrity remains cloudy and complex to classify. Continued efforts should be made to reframe the classification of academic integrity to highlight positive or desirable behavior. To accomplish this, faculty members are integral in setting expectations that place students on the desired track.

In contrast, international undergraduate students cannot be perceived as ignorant of issues related to academic integrity; in fact, the participants of this study exhibit an understanding of moral behavior. That being said, a greater emphasis must be made to help students apply their moral awareness to the academic context, in a manner that is positive, interesting, and deemed as valuable by the students. Current practices appear to be somewhat repetitive and do not reflect a multi-layered educational approach to academic integrity. In order to best assist international undergraduate students with issues of academic integrity, we must first view them as students who possess integrity and not as students lacking integrity. Although trends and anecdotal evidence

suggest that the problem of academic dishonesty is increasing among them, we need to ensure that they are not vilified in the process. "Reciprocal and ethical knowledge exchange" is imperative in the context of academic integrity and if international undergraduate students feel that what they have to offer is valuable, they might gain a better understanding of their roles in the bigger picture, thus promoting the natural development of academic integrity (Association of Canadian Deans of Education, 2014, p. 7).

Moreover, international undergraduate students might require a softer landing at the University of Manitoba, in the sense that they have benefitted from the teaching of practical examples of what honesty means in their coursework on an individual basis. International undergraduate students should be given space to experience academic integrity first-hand, in order to allow them to fully understand and appreciate why and how the university functions in relation to academic integrity. Furthermore, allowing experiences to guide their understanding of academic integrity will promote a sense of scholarship and solidify their position as scholars, rather than consumers. Allowing experiences to form one's understanding of academic integrity is not lost on those who get it right immediately – for example, students who come from countries or universities where policies of academic integrity are similar to those of the University of Manitoba; their experiences can also shape their own understanding as they interact with issues of academic integrity and, ultimately, come to realize themselves as generators of knowledge. It is evident that a one-size-fits-all approach to academic integrity does not support the various educational backgrounds that students come with and while it may seem tedious, providing tailor-made guidance throughout their journey will benefit students and the University in the long term. Furthermore, this would allow students to develop as scholars in a way that that we hope they would.

While there are many supports in place at the University of Manitoba, an evaluation of their effectiveness is needed in order to better tailor services for international and domestic students

alike. For example, we need to ensure that new students are provided the necessary supports in terms of understanding policies and procedures, but also allow ensure they are given room to develop an appreciation. Perhaps this means offering second chances to students and coaching them through the processes related to academic integrity. Unless they come to understand why integrity is a vital trait during and after their studies, they may be reluctant to follow the practices of the University and apply them later in life.

In addition, dishonesty is known to be wrong, yet some students engage in dishonest behavior despite possessing this knowledge. Preventing students from behaving dishonestly is essential in the battle against academic dishonesty at the University of Manitoba. Several participants of this study note instances where cheating behavior has been observed yet a faculty member did nothing. Professors must be better supported so that they have the capacity to prevent and catch academic dishonesty with ease.

Moreover, integrity is a construct in that intention often shows one's integrity more so than actions in issues of academic integrity. Unfortunately, for those students whose intention does not match their actions, they may be met with harsh consequences. It is vital that greater efforts be made to alleviate the burden of cases of academic dishonesty from certain faculty members; the "burden" should be shared by all involved in a student's education: professors, advisors, peers, etc. Greater emphasis should be placed on a team-based approach to academic integrity. Some efforts at the University of Manitoba are already in place and promote academic integrity through a team-based approach. For example, library content specialists are in place to assist instructors in teaching proper research techniques and to assist students in their research endeavors. It is unknown if content specialists are trained in working with international undergraduate students who might not have experienced strict research requirements at their home university; specialists and the partner instructors must be adequately prepared to deal with varying background experiences in the type of research they require. Furthermore, "pedagogy and content should

reflect the contributions of different populations and ways of knowing" and this includes policies and practices in academic integrity (Association of Canadian Deans of Education, 2014, p. 8).

Conversely, an international undergraduate student's ability to adapt and excel should not be underestimated and the first step in adjusting campus culture to one of integrity is to believe that all students have the ability to act with integrity without question. Students may have bought into the way that the University of Manitoba operates; however, the university has also bought into those students. By accepting them, the university says that they meet the requirements whatever their educational background and that what they have done previously will allow them to be successful at the University. Granted, the onus is also on the student to ensure that success is achieved, however, the University of Manitoba has a stake in each person and must do the most it can to facilitate success. To say that integrity in the Western context is the only way that one can contribute to the knowledge base may be incorrect and should be reframed in the context of a multicultural university environment.

Lastly, a consistent message is imperative. If every student, faculty, and administrative unit is not on the same page with respect to academic integrity, it confuses the message and the students in the process. In order to build a culture of integrity, a positive frame of mind should be established from the top down.

Recommendations for Further Research

Continued research is vital to improve our understanding of the phenomenon of international undergraduate student perspectives on issues related to academic integrity. Further research endeavors might focus on larger sample sizes to gain wider perspective and to include nationalities that are not represented in this study. Moreover, specific cultural groups could be interviewed to better understand their position within the context of academic integrity at a large, Western-Canadian university.

In addition, further research endeavors might explore international undergraduate student perspectives on issues related to a specific element of academic integrity. The term itself is very broad and often not fully understood by the participants of this study; a future study could focus on student perspectives on citations or collaboration, as examples. Exploring a specific element of academic integrity would help to improve our understanding of how international students interact with the element and in what ways it impacts their studies.

Lastly, a quantitative or mixed methodology in a similar study might also augment the research on academic integrity. This study draws on a qualitative research method that prevents generalization to the larger international student body. The following section will discuss further the limitations of this study.

Limitations

The researcher conducts this study through the lens of her own national culture (Canadian) and, inevitably, imposes her background and experiences on the data. What is noticed in the data is noticed because of the researcher's understanding of Hofstede's cultural dimensions. Also, the researcher could easily point out ideologies that align with her own or that are opposite; others in between may not have been so noticeable and would not have been included in the findings. In an effort to reduce bias, the researcher avoided summarizing the participants' experiences to ensure their true voices remain intact. In addition, the researcher's acknowledgement of bias was a present thought throughout the coding process and observations were carefully thought over to reduce bias as much as possible.

Furthermore, participants in this study are compared to a national cultural index, within which there can be vast differences and variations of personal preference within each of the six cultural dimensions. To say that a participant exhibits a certain score on any index without that participant having gone through the World Values Survey to determine his/her score is guesswork

at best. Although we can learn from the participants' perspectives in this case, suggestions for future study include a larger sample size and increasing the number of countries represented.

Moreover, some countries with large populations of students at the University of Manitoba are not represented in this study, such as Nigeria. It would be of value for a future study to include such populations in the sample. Furthermore, some populations in this study are represented by one student, such as Azerbaijan and South Korea; one participant cannot accurately represent and entire cultural group and, therefore, the data is limited.

Lastly, the researcher believes that social desirability reporting may have tainted the data (Macfarlane et al., 2012). While candor was encouraged in each interview and participants were assured the strictest confidentiality, some participants may not have been willing to share experiences that reflect poor behavior in terms of academic integrity. In addition, shared experiences of academic dishonesty may have been slightly changed to highlight desirable elements of the story and minimize the undesirable elements. There is no direct evidence that social desirability reporting is present in the interviews; however, the researcher believes that some participants may want to appear as highly conscientious in terms of academic integrity. Other students may have viewed the recruitment posters and were deterred from participating in the study on account of the topic.

Conclusion

We must first acknowledge the work that is being done at the University of Manitoba to support and promote academic integrity. There are several services in place that seek to support academic integrity across all groups at the University. Furthermore, participants of this study express that they appreciate what has been taught to them with respect to academic integrity at the University of Manitoba. This implies that the University's efforts are not futile and it should continue what is currently being done to support students in issues of academic integrity.

Furthermore, we should not underestimate a person's ability to adapt to their surroundings. We should acknowledge that a period of adaptation for every student is unique in length and degree of learning. That being said, students from different educational contexts, and not necessarily, from different culture backgrounds, might require a period of adaptation and extra support in relation to academic integrity. Experience is the best teacher, particularly in the case of a concept that is difficult to adequately describe and appears to have changing meaning in various contexts. International undergraduate students are not beyond learning the policies and procedures surrounding academic integrity at the University of Manitoba, and we must believe that they have the ability to act with integrity first, rather than assume they are an increasing problem.

References

Abasi, A. R. & Graves, B. (2008). Academic literacy and plagiarism: Conversations with international

graduate students and disciplinary professors. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes,*

7(4)*,* 221-233. doi:10.1016/j.jeap.2008.10.010

Altbach, P. G. & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and

realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11*(3), 290-305.

doi:10.1177/1028315307303542

Anderson, G. (1998). *Fundamentals of Educational Research*. Retrieved from

http://www.myilibrary.com?ID=13929

Asper School of Business. (n.d.). Appendix A of *Academic dishonesty: It's just not worth it*. Winnipeg,

MB: University of Manitoba.

Association of Canadian Deans of Education. (2014). *Accord on the Internationalization of Education*.

Atkinson, P., Coffey, A., & Delamont, S. (2003). Key themes in qualitative research: Continuities and

changes. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Beykont, Z. F. & Daiute, C. (2002). Inclusiveness in higher education courses: International student

perspectives. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 35*(1), 35-42. doi:10.1080/713845250

Bhattacharjee, Y. (2013, April 26). The mind of a con man. *The New York Times.* Retrieved from

http://www.nytimes.com/2013/04/28/magazine/diederik-stapels-audacious-academic-

fraud.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0

Blair, C. H. (2009). Panic and plagiarism: Authorship and academic dishonesty in a remix culture.

Media Tropes, II(1), 159-192. Retrieved from

http://www.mediatropes.com/index.php/Mediatropes/article/view/15768/12863

Bontrager, B. (2004). Enrollment management: An introduction to concepts and structures. *Colleges*

and University Journal, 79(3), 11-16. Retrieved from

http://registrar.iupui.edu/emc/ppt/bontrager_concepts_structures.pdf

Bradshaw, J. & Baluja, T. (2011, September 2). Why many international students get a failing grade in academic integrity. *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved from http://www.theglobeandmail.com

Canadian Bureau for International Education. (2015). *Facts and Figures*. Retrieved from http://www.cbie.ca/about-ie/facts-and-figures/

Chapman, K. J. & Lupton, R. A. (2004). Academic dishonesty in a global educational market: a comparison of Hong Kong and American university business students. *The International Journal of Education Management, 18*(7), 425-435. doi:10.1108/09513540410563130

Charmaz, K. (2008). Constructionism and the grounded theory method. In J. A. Holstein & J. F. Gubrium (Eds.), *Handbook of Constructionist Research* (pp. 397-412). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Chen, Y., & Van Ullen, M. K. (2011). Helping International Students Succeed Academically through Research Process and Plagiarism Workshops. *College & Research Libraries, 72*(3), 209-235. Retrieved from http://crl.acrl.org/content/72/3/209.full.pdf+html

Choudaha, R., Chang, L., & Kono, Y. (2013, March 1). International student mobility trends 2013: Towards responsive recruitment strategies. *World Education News & Reviews*. Retrieved from http://wenr.wes.org/2013/03/wenr-march-2013-international-student-mobility-trends-2013-towards-responsive-recruitment-strategies/

Christensen Hughes, J. M. & McCabe, D. L. (2006). Understanding Academic Misconduct. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 36*(1), 49-63. Retrieved from http://proxy2.lib.umanitoba.ca/

Clarke, R. (2006). Plagiarism by academics: More complex than it seems. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems, 7*(2), 91-121. Retrieved from http://www.uj.ac.za/EN/Faculties/humanities/about/HumanitiesStaff/Plagiarism1/Documents/plagiarism%20by%20academics%20Roger%20Clarke.pdf

Compton, J. & Pfau, M. (2008). Inoculating against pro-plagiarism justifications: rational and

    affective strategies. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 36*(1), 98-119.

    doi:10.1080/00909880701799329

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*

    (Second Edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*.

    Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Creswell, J. W., Hanson, W. E., Plano Clark, V. L., & Morales, A. (2007). Qualitative Research Designs:

    Selection and implementation. *The Counseling Psychologist, 35*(2), 236-264. doi:

    10.1177/0011000006287390

Davis, S. F., Grover, C. A., Becker, A. H. & McGregor, L. N. (1992). Academic dishonesty: Prevalence,

    determinants, techniques, and punishments. *Teaching of Psychology, 19*(1), 16-21. Retrieved

    from http://web.a.ebscohost.com.proxy2.lib.umanitoba.ca/

Diekhoff, G. M., LaBeff, E. E., Shinohara, K., Yasukawa, H. (1999). College cheating in Japan and the

    United States. *Research in Higher Education, 40*(3), 343-53. doi:10.1023/A:1018703217828

East, J. (2006). Proper acknowledgement? *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice,*

    2(3), 1-11. Retrieved from

    http://ro.uow.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1029&context=jutlp

Ehrich, L. C. (2003). Phenomenology: The quest for meaning. In T. A. O'Donoghue & K. F. Punch

    (Eds.), *Qualitative Educational Research: Doing and reflecting* (pp. 42-69). New York, NY:

    RoutledgeFalmer

Ercegovac, Z. & Richardson, J. V., Jr. (2004). Academic dishonesty, plagiarism included, in the digital

    age: A literature review. *College & Research Libraries, 65*(4), 301-318. Retrieved from

    http://crl.acrl.org/content/65/4/301.full.pdf+html

Giorgi, A. (1997). The theory, practice, and evaluation of the phenomenological method as a

      qualitative research procedure. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology, 28*(2), 235-261.

      doi: 10.1163/156916297X00103

Government of Canada. (2014, January 14). Harper government launches comprehensive

      international education strategy. *Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Canada.* Retrieved

      from http://www.international.gc.ca/media/comm/news-

      communiques/2014/01/15a.aspx?lang=eng

Grief, A. (1994). Cultural beliefs and the organization of society: A historical and theoretical

      reflection on collectivist and individualist societies. *Journal of Political Economy, 102*(5),

      912-950. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/2138652

Gullifer, J. & Tyson, G. A. (2010). Exploring university students' perceptions of plagiarism: A focus

      group study. *Studies in Higher Education, 35*(4), 463-481.

      doi:10.1080/03075070903096508

Halupa, C. M. (2014). Exploring student self-plagiarism. *International Journal of Higher Education,*

      3(1), 121-126. doi: 10.5430/ijhe.v3n1p121

Harding, T. S., Carpenter, D. D., Finelli, C. J., & Passow, H. J. (2004). Does academic dishonesty relate

      to unethical behavior in professional practice? An exploratory study. *Science and*

      Engineering Ethics, 10(2), 311-324. doi: 10.1007/s11948-004-0027-3

Heggins, W. J., III & Jackson, J. F. L. (2003). Understanding the collegiate experience for Asian

      international students at a midwestern research university. *College Student Journal, 37*(3),

      379-391.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values.* Beverly

      Hills, CA: SAGE Publications.

Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*

      [Kobo version]. Retrieved from Kobo.com.

International Center for Academic Integrity. (2012). *Integrity: Statistics*. Retrieved from

      http://www.academicintegrity.org/icai/integrity-3.php.

Jones, G. A. (2009). Internationalization and higher education policy in Canada: Three challenges. In

      Trilokekar, R. D., Jones, G. A. and Shubert, A. (Eds.). *Canada's Universities Go Global* (pp. 355-

      369). Toronto, ON: Lorimer. Retrieved from

      http://www.oise.utoronto.ca/hec/UserFiles/File/Research/GoGlobal%20Intro.pdf

Ladd, P. D. & Ruby, R., Jr. (1999). Learning style and adjustment issues of international students.

      Journal of Education for Business, 74(6), 363-367. doi:10.1080/08832329909601712

Larsen, L. (2012, December 12). Private Manitoba college misleading students, some say. *CBC News*.

      Retrieved from http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/manitoba/private-manitoba-college-

      misleading-students-some-say-1.1234870

Lee, J. (2009a, February 9). The broader scope of academic integrity. *Queen's Gazette*. Retrieved

      from http://www.queensu.ca/academicintegrity/news/feb09gazette.html

Lee, J. (2009b, May 25). Cultural influences can affect academic integrity. *Queen's Gazette.* Retrieved

      from http://www.queensu.ca/academicintegrity/news/may25gazette.html

Lee, J. J. & Rice, C. (2007). Welcome to America? International student perceptions of

      discrimination. *Higher Education, 53,* 381-409. doi:10.1007/s10734-005-4508-3

Liu, D. (2005). Plagiarism in ESOL students: Is cultural conditioning truly the major culprit? *ELT*

      Journal, 59(3), 234-241. doi:10.1093/elt/ccio43

Löfström, E. (2011). "Does plagiarism mean anything?" LOL. Students' conceptions of writing and

      citing. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, *9*(4), 257-275. doi:10.1007/s10805-011-9145-0

Macfarlane, B. (2012). Re-framing student academic freedom: A capability perspective. *Higher*

      Education, 63(6), p. 719-732. doi:10.1007/S10734-011-9473-4

Macfarlane, B., Zhang, J. & Pun, A. (2012). Academic integrity: A review of the literature. *Studies in*

      Higher Education, 39(2), doi:10.1080/03075079.2012.709495

Mandal, S. & Wilkinson, L. (2008, June). *The settlement intentions of post-secondary international students in Manitoba*. Paper presented at the Canadian Sociological Association Annual Meeting, Vancouver, BC.

Marcus, J. (2011, October 6). Foreign student rule-breaking: Culture clash or survival skills? *Times Higher Education.* Retrieved from http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk

McCabe, D. L. (1993). Faculty responses to academic dishonesty: The influence of student honor codes. *Research in Higher Education, 34*(5), 647-658. doi:10.1007/BF00991924

McCabe, D. L., Butterfield, K. D., & Treviño, L. K. (2012). *Cheating in College: Why students do it and what educators can do about it.* Retrieved from: http://ebrary.com

McCabe, D. L., Treviño, L. K., & Butterfield, K. D. (2001). Cheating in academic institutions: A decade of research. *Ethics & Behavior 11*(3), 219-232. doi:10.1207/ S15327019EB1103_2

McGowan, S. & Lightbody, M. (2008). 'Another chance to practice': Repeating plagiarism education for EAL students within a discipline context. *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 4*(1), 16-30. Retrieved from

http://www.ojs.unisa.edu.au/index.php/IJEI/article/view/193/148

Merit Motion Pictures. (n.d.). *Faking the grade*. Retrieved from http://meritmotionpictures.com/

Moore, H. (2014, February 24). Cheating students punished by the 1000s, but many more go undetected. *CBC News.* Retrieved from

http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/manitoba/cheating-students-punished-by-the-1000s-but-many-more-go-undetected-1.2549621

Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi: http://dx.doi.org.proxy2.lib.umanitoba.ca/10.4135/9781412995658

Munro, M. (2012, September 11). Top Canadian scientist and award-winning student caught in 'blatant plagiarism' of text. *National Post.* Retrieved from

http://news.nationalpost.com/2012/09/11/university-of-waterloo-researchers-issue-

retraction-and-apology-after-using-u-s-experts-text-and-information/

Nazir, M. S. & Aslam, M. S. (2010). Academic dishonesty and perceptions of Pakistani students.

International Journal of Education Management, 24(7), 655-668.

doi:10.1108/09513541011080020

Office of Institutional Analysis. (2011, March 21). *Students by citizenship: Fall term 2010 (as of*

November 1). Retrieved from

http://umanitoba.ca/admin/oia/media/distr_citizen_students_fall10.pdf

Office of Institutional Analysis. (2012, June 7). *Students by citizenship: Fall term 2011 (as of*

November 1). Retrieved from

http://umanitoba.ca/admin/oia/media/Students_by_Citizenship_F11.pdf

Office of Institutional Analysis. (2013, April 25). *Students by citizenship: Fall term 2012 (as of*

November 1). Retrieved from http://umanitoba.ca/admin/oia/media/Students_by_

Citizenship_F12.pdf

Office of Institutional Analysis. (2015a, June 3). *Students by citizenship: Fall term 2013 (as of*

November 1). Retrieved from http://umanitoba.ca/admin/oia/media/Students_by_

Citizenship_ F13_rev_2015_06_03.pdf

Office of Institutional Analysis. (2015b, July 3). *Students by citizenship: Fall term 2014 (as of*

November 1). Retrieved from http://umanitoba.ca/admin/oia/media/Students_by_

Citizenship_F14.pdf

Office of Institutional Analysis. (2016, May 5). *Students by citizenship: Fall term 2016 (as of*

November 1). Retrieved from http://umanitoba.ca/admin/oia/media/Students_by_

Citizenship_F15.pdf

Reynolds, A. L. & Constantine, M. G. (2007). Cultural adjustment difficulties and career development of international college students. *Journal of Career Assessment, 15,* 338-349. doi:10.1177/1069072707301218

Rhoades, G. (2006). The higher education we choose: A question of balance. *The Review of Higher Education, 29*(3), 381-404. doi:10.1353/rhe.2006.0015

Roig, M. & Caso, M. (2005). Lying and cheating: Fraudulent excuse making, cheating, and plagiarism. *The Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied, 139*(6), 485-494. doi:10.3200/JRLP.139.6.485-494

Roslyn Kunin & Associates, Inc. (2012). *Economic impact of international education in Canada -- an update: Final report.* Retrieved from http://www.international.gc.ca/education/assets/pdfs/economic_impact_en.pdf

Scher Zagier, A. (2011, November 17). Want to record a lecture? Think again. *Huffington Post.* Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/11/17/want-to-record-a-lecture-_n_1100130.html

Shaw, J., Moore, P., & Gandhidasan, S. (2007). Educational acculturation and academic integrity: outcomes of an intervention subject for international post-graduate public health students. *Journal of Academic Language & Learning, 1*(1), A55-A67. Retrieved from http://www.journal.aall.org.au/index.php/jall/article/viewFile/23/40

Signorini, P., Wiesemes, R., & Murphy, R. (2009). Developing alternative frameworks for exploring intercultural learning: A critique of Hofstede's cultural difference model. *Teaching in Higher Education, 14*(3), 253-264. doi:10.1080/13562510902898825

Simon, C. A., Carr, J. R., McCullough, S. M., Morgan, S. J., Oleson, 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. doi:10.1080/02602930301669

Starobin, S. S. (2006). International students in transition: Changes in access to U.S. higher

education. *New Directions for Student Services, 2006*(114), 63–71. doi:10.1002/ss.207

Stephens, J. M., Fomakin, V., & Yukhymenko, M. (2010). Academic motivation and misconduct in two

cultures: A comparative analysis of US and Ukrainian undergraduates. *International Journal*

for Educational Integrity, 6(1), 47-60. Retrieved from

http://www.ojs.unisa.edu.au/index.php/IJEI/article/view/674/503

Tadaki, M. & Tremewan, C. (2013). Reimagining internationalization in higher education:

International consortia as a transformative space? *Studies in Higher Education, 38*(3), 367-

387. doi:10.1080/03075079.2013.773219

Taras, V., Kirkman, B. L., & Steel, P. (2010). Examining the impact of culture's consequences: A

three-decade, multilevel, meta-analytic review of Hofstede's cultural value dimensions.

Journal of Applied Psychology, *95*(3), 405-439. doi: 10.1037/a0018938.supp

The Center for Academic Integrity. (1999). *The fundamental values of academic integrity.* Retrieved

from http://www.academicintegrity.org/icai/assets/FVProject.pdf.

The Hofstede Centre. (n.d.). [Graph illustration and comments]. *National cultural dimensions*.

Retrieved from http://geert-hofstede.com.

"The International Education Act." In *Continuing Consolidation of the Statutes of Manitoba*. (2016, c.

I75). Retrieved from http://web2.gov.mb.ca/laws/statutes/ccsm/i075e.php

Thomas, J., Raynora, M., & McKinnon, M. (2013). Academic integrity and oral examination: An

Arabian Gulf perspective. *Innovations in Education Teaching and Learning*, 1-11.

doi:10.1080/14703297.2013.796724

University of British Columbia. (2014). *Vancouver Academic Calendar 2014/15.* Retrieved from

http://www.calendar.ubc.ca/vancouver/index.cfm?tree=3,54,111,959

University of Manitoba (2015, November 17). *Fall term enrolment (as at November 1): Summary*

report. Retrieved from http://umanitoba.ca/admin/oia/media/summary_report_F15.pdf

University of Manitoba (2014a). *2014-2015 Academic Calendar*. Retrieved from

    http://crscalprod1.cc.umanitoba.ca/Catalog/ViewCatalog.aspx

University of Manitoba. (2014b). *Academic Learning Centre.* Retrieved from

    http://umanitoba.ca/student/academiclearning/index.html

University of Manitoba. (2014c). *Advocacy Services for Students*. Retrieved from

    http://umanitoba.ca/student/resource/student_advocacy/1042.html

University of Manitoba. (2014d). *University of Manitoba international strategy: Manitoba's gateway

    to the world.* Retrieved from

    http://umanitoba.ca/research/international/media/UM_International_Strategy_2014_FINA

    L_September_2014.pdf

University of Manitoba. (2013a, June 25). *Strategic enrolment management: Planning framework

    2013-2018*. Retrieved from

    http://umanitoba.ca/admin/vp_academic/media/SEMP_Framework_BOG_approved_final_(

    2).pdf

University of Manitoba. (2013b, September 5). Another record for first-day enrollment numbers.

    UM Today. Retrieved from http://news.umanitoba.ca/another-record-for-first-day-

    enrollment-numbers/

University of Saskatchewan. (2003). *Globalism and the University of Saskatchewan: The foundational

    document for international activities at the University of Saskatchewan.* Retrieved from

    http://www.usask.ca/ipa/documents/new_International_Plan_FINAL_ApprovedbyCouncil.

    pdf

University of Toronto. (n.d.). *Teaching topics: Audio and video recordings of lectures and class

    sessions.* Retrieved from http://www.teaching.utoronto.ca/topics/strategies/classroom-

    management/recording-lectures.htm

University of Waterloo. (2010). *Policy 71 – Student Discipline.* Retrieved from

    https://uwaterloo.ca/secretariat-general-counsel/policies-procedures-guidelines/policy-

    71

Van den Hoonard, D. K. (2012). *Qualitative research in action: A Canadian primer.* Don Mills, ON:

    Oxford University Press.

Van Manen, M. (1990) *Researching lived experiences.* London, ON: The Althouse Press.

Walker, J. (2010). Measuring plagiarism: Researching what students do, not what they say they do.

    Studies in Higher Education, 35(1), 41-59. doi:10.1080/03075070902912994

Yeo, S. (2007). First-year university science and engineering students' understanding of plagiarism.

    Higher Education Research & Development, 26(2), 199-216.

    doi:10.1080/07294360701310813

Zhou, Y., Jindal-Snape, D, Topping, K., & Todman, J. (2008). Theoretical models of culture shock and

    adaptation in international students in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education, 33*(1),

    63-75. doi:10.1080/03075070701794833

Appendix A

WARNING

ACADEMIC DISHONESTY
IT'S JUST NOT WORTH IT!

ONCE CAUGHT, YOU WON'T FORGET IT ALL YOUR LIFE!

Here are some examples of recent academic dishonesty cases in the Asper School and the penalties awarded. These are typical penalties, not just severe ones. "F-DISC" on transcript means the F is noted as being awarded for disciplinary reasons.

ACADEMIC DISHONESTY CATEGORY	WHAT THE STUDENT DID	PENALTY AWARDED
PLAGIARISM	Produced material from Internet without citing source	F-DISC in course, Suspension from Asper School for 1 year, Notation in Transcript citing academic dishonesty
PLAGIARISM	Handed in paper bought online	F-DISC in course, Suspension from Asper School for 2 years, Notation in Transcript citing academic dishonesty
PLAGIARISM	Copied material for assignment from another student	Both students got F-DISC in course, Suspension from Asper School for 1 year, Notation in Transcript citing academic dishonesty
PLAGIARISM (group work)	Plagiarism on group project	F-DISC in course for all group members, Suspension from Asper School for 6 months, Notation in Transcript citing academic dishonesty
CHEATING	Had class material concealed during exam	F-DISC in course, Suspension from Asper School and Faculty of Science for 1 year, Notation in Transcript citing academic dishonesty, has to complete Academic Integrity tutorial
CHEATING	Talked to another student during test	F-DISC in course, Suspension from Asper School for 8 months, Notation in Transcript citing academic dishonesty
CHEATING	Peeked at another student's answers during exam	F-DISC in course, Suspension from Asper School for 6 months, Notation in Transcript citing academic dishonesty
CHEATING	In possession of cell phone during test, although prohibited by instructor	F-DISC in course, Suspension from Asper School for 6 months, Notation in Transcript citing academic dishonesty
CHEATING	Altered answer on returned exam and asked for re-grading	F-DISC in course, Suspension from Asper School and Faculty of Arts for 1 year, Notation in Transcript citing academic dishonesty
IMPERSONATION	Wrote exam for friend	Reported to Winnipeg Police and facing criminal charges, student expelled from university and banned from entering campus

For information on the Academic Integrity policy, contact the Associate Dean.

Better to fail with honour than succeed by fraud.
– Sophocles

ASPER SCHOOL OF BUSINESS

UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

Appendix B

Interview Guide

Each participant was asked the following questions:

General information

1. Can you tell me what country you come from and why you chose to study in Canada?

2. Please tell me about your major or your area of study.

3. In what year are you currently studying? When do you plan to graduate?

4. Can you tell me about your aspirations after graduation?

Power distance

5. Can you tell me about a time when your professors talked to you about academic integrity? What approach they take?

6. How would you describe the university administration's views on academic integrity?

7. How do you think issues of academic integrity are dealt with?

Individualism

8. Can you tell me about a time when you were asked to work on a group assignment or project? What was expected of you?

9. Can you describe a time when you had to write a research paper? What types of sources did you use and what was required of you in terms of citing these sources?

Masculinity

10. Can you tell me what motivates you to do well at university? Please describe how you can or will ensure success in your studies.

Uncertainty Avoidance

11. Are you able to explain the importance of academic integrity?

12. How important is academic integrity to you? Please describe how it affects the work you do in your courses.

Long-term versus Short-term Orientation

13. Can you tell me about your perspective on academic integrity before you studied in Canada? Has this perspective changed?

14. Can you tell about experiences your friends at home or at other universities have had with academic integrity?

Indulgence

15. Have you ever considered any form of academic dishonesty? What were your thoughts in this regard?

16. Do you know of anyone who has been involved in any other form of academic dishonesty? If so, can you tell me about it (without revealing names)? What did you think about this?

Closing Questions

17. How would you describe your values and beliefs when it comes to academic integrity?

18. Do you have any other thoughts you would like to share in regard to academic integrity?

Appendix C

Recruitment Poster

Appendix D

Information and Consent Form

UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA | Faculty of Education

Information and Consent Form

Study Name: International undergraduate students' perspectives on academic integrity: A phenomenological approach

Researcher: Miriam Christoph, Masters Student, Faculty of Education
▬▬▬▬▬ / miriam.christoph@umanitoba.ca

Research Supervisor: Dr. David Mandzuk, Dean, Faculty of Education
204.474.9001 / david.mandzuk@umanitoba.ca

This consent form, a copy of which will be left with you for your records and reference, is only part of the process of informed consent. It should give you the basic idea of what the research is about and what your participation will involve. If you would like more detail about something mentioned here, or information not included here, you should feel free to ask. Please take the time to read this carefully and to understand any accompanying information.

Miriam Christoph is conducting this study as her Master's Thesis, under the supervision of Dr. Mandzuk. The purpose of this study is to examine the perspectives of international undergraduate students on issues related to academic integrity, and how their perceptions have evolved at the University of Manitoba. This research will hopefully identify some of the ways in which we can better support international undergraduate students with respect to issues of academic integrity.

Participants have been chosen based on their classification as international undergraduate students at the University of Manitoba. There are no known risks associated with this study. If you disclose an incident of academic dishonesty please be assured that full confidentiality will be maintained. For questions or advice related to an incident of academic dishonesty, students are encouraged to visit the Student Advocacy office in room 520 University Centre. The benefits of participating in this study include new information regarding student perspectives on issues of academic integrity.

Your consent is requested for participation in a 60-90 minute interview. The time and location of the interview will be mutually agreed upon between a two-month period (March and April 2015). The interview will be audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim. The questions asked are related to your perspectives on academic integrity. The researcher will ask you to share your thoughts on this topic and how your perspectives may have evolved while studying at the University of Manitoba. The researcher is also interested to know how your perspectives on issues of academic integrity have impacted you as a student. Please note that direct quotations may be used in the research analysis.

The transcribing of interviews will be done by the researcher. A copy of the interview transcript will sent to you by email for your review, and you will be asked to check the transcription for accuracy. This will take approximately one additional hour.

umanitoba.ca/education

Your full anonymity will be preserved as all names and identifying information will be changed by the researcher. Only the researcher will know your true identity. All digital files will be kept on a password-protected computer and any hardcopies will be kept in a locked cabinet in a locked room. Audio files and all other data will be securely destroyed after a period of 7 years (paper shredded and electronic files permanently deleted).

You may withdraw from the study at any time without prejudice or consequence. All data collected will be immediately and permanently destroyed. Please be assured that your full anonymity will be preserved. If you choose to withdraw from the study, please contact Miriam.

Once all data is collected and analyzed, it will be submitted to the Faculty of Education as a Master's Thesis. It will available online via the University of Manitoba Libraries. An article summarizing the results of the study may be written up as a scholarly journal and submitted for publication at a later date. At the present time, there are no future plans for a related study.

Please do not hesitate to ask questions before, during, or after this study. You may request a copy of the results of this study by completing the portion below the dotted line.

Your signature on this form indicates that you have understood to your satisfaction the information regarding participation in the research project and agree to participate as a subject. In no way does this waive your legal rights nor release the researchers, sponsors, or involved institutions from their legal and professional responsibilities. You are free to withdraw from the study at any time, and /or refrain from answering any questions you prefer to omit, without prejudice or consequence. Your continued participation should be as informed as your initial consent, so you should feel free to ask for clarification or new information throughout your participation.

The University of Manitoba may look at your research records to see that the research is being done in a safe and proper way.

This research has been approved by the Education/Nursing Research Ethics Board (ENREB). If you have any concerns or complaints about this project you may contact any of the above-named persons or the Human Ethics Coordinator (HEC) at 474-7122. A copy of this consent form has been given to you to keep for your records and reference.

_____

Participant's Signature   Date

_____

Researcher's Signature   Date

- -

If you wish to receive a summary of the results, please leave your email address or other preferred means of contact below. This information will be stored separately from your experimental data. A summary of results will be sent to participants by August 2015.

_____

Appendix E

PANEL ON
RESEARCH ETHICS
Navigating the ethics of human research

TCPS 2: CORE

Certificate of Completion

This document certifies that

Miriam Christoph

has completed the Tri-Council Policy Statement:
Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans
Course on Research Ethics (TCPS 2: CORE)

Date of Issue: **30 May, 2013**

Appendix F

Education/Nursing Research Ethics Board (ENREB) Approval Certificate

Human Ethics
208-194 Dafoe Road
Winnipeg, MB
Canada R3T 2N2
Phone +204-474-7122
Fax +204-269-7173

UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA | Research Ethics and Compliance
Office of the Vice-President (Research and International)

APPROVAL CERTIFICATE

March 11, 2015

TO: **Miriam Christoph** (Advisor D. Mandzuk)
Principal Investigator

FROM: **Nicole Harder, Acting Chair**
Education/Nursing Research Ethics Board (ENREB)

Re: **Protocol #E2015:008**
"International undergraduate students' perspectives on academic integrity:
A phenomenological approach"

Please be advised that your above-referenced protocol has received human ethics approval by the **Education/Nursing Research Ethics Board**, which is organized and operates according to the Tri-Council Policy Statement (2). **This approval is valid for one year only.**

Any significant changes of the protocol and/or informed consent form should be reported to the Human Ethics Secretariat in advance of implementation of such changes.

Please note:

- If you have funds pending human ethics approval, please mail/e-mail/fax (261-0325) a copy of this Approval (identifying the related UM Project Number) to the Research Grants Officer in ORS in order to initiate fund setup. (How to find your UM Project Number: http://umanitoba.ca/research/ors/mrt-faq.html#pr0)

- if you have received multi-year funding for this research, responsibility lies with you to apply for and obtain Renewal Approval at the expiry of the initial one-year approval; otherwise the account will be locked.

The Research Quality Management Office may request to review research documentation from this project to demonstrate compliance with this approved protocol and the University of Manitoba *Ethics of Research Involving Humans.*

The Research Ethics Board requests a final report for your study (available at: http://umanitoba.ca/research/orec/ethics/human_ethics_REB_forms_guidelines.html) **in order to be in compliance with Tri-Council Guidelines.**

umanitoba.ca/research