A COLLEGE DEPARTMENT'S APPROACH TO PLAGIARISM: A CASE STUDY OF MICROPOLITICS

by

Alexandra A. Escobar

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Educational Leadership

University of Phoenix

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

The Dissertation Committee for Alexandra A. Escobar certifies approval of the following dissertation:

A COLLEGE DEPARTMENT'S APPROACH TO PLAGIARISM: A CASE STUDY OF MICROPOLITICS

Committee:

Debbie Ritter-Williams, PhD, Chair

April Flanagan, EdD, Committee Member

Michelle Witherspoon, PhD, Committee Member

Debbie Ritter-Williams

April Flanagan

Michelle Witherspoon

Jeremy Moreland, PhD
Academic Dean, School of Advanced Studies
University of Phoenix

Date Approved: April 14, 2015

ABSTRACT

This single qualitative case study was an exploration of the various ways elements of micropolitics influenced college department administrators and faculty members in their approach to plagiarism prevention, education, and response. The study parameters involved a purposive sample of seven education faculty members, one department chair, and two university administrators, along with an examination of artifacts related to academic integrity, and participant observation of applicable segments of the university's new student orientation. Five themes emerged from the data: shared mission is balanced with individual approach, formal policies accompanied by informal approaches, faculty serves as gatekeeper to the teaching profession, unused potential for maximizing resources, and faculty feel only limited direct and indirect pressures. The micropolitical considerations relative to each theme revolved around faculty members' collaboration; gaps between formal and informal policies; faculty members' self-pressures to support students and the teaching profession; tensions relative to how teaching loads impact faculty members' time; and faculty collegiality. Given the collaborative nature of the department faculty members and the rather limited tensions that arose between them relative to their approach to plagiarism, the micropolitical perspective was deemed only marginally useful as a lens to examine plagiarism within this college department. Two main recommendations were presented. The first was the importance of creating spaces for faculty members to discuss academic integrity regularly and purposefully. The second was to re-examine formal policy and informal practice to help bridge some of the gaps identified in the study.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my wonderful husband, Jose, and my two amazing children, Juan Pablo and Isabella.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To give thanks is one of life's greatest gifts. By giving thanks, I am reminded of how fortunate I am to be surrounded by extraordinary people who have helped me in so many ways! I would first like to acknowledge my husband, Jose, for supporting me throughout this long journey. Without his love and unwavering support, I would not have been able to reach my goal.

My second acknowledgment undoubtedly goes to my doctoral chair, Dr. Debbie Ritter-Williams. Dr. Deb's guidance throughout the entire dissertation process was phenomenal. Her detailed feedback, high expectations, and encouraging words helped me work through the rigorous revision process and make it to the finish line. I would also like to thank my doctoral committee members, Dr. April Flanagan and Dr. Michelle Witherspoon. Their input on my dissertation proposal and final draft were invaluable. I am also very appreciative of my editor, Dr. Julie Conzelmann, for her professionalism, attention to detail, and revisions to my dissertation. Her feedback was outstanding.

This study would not have been possible without the support of the wonderful education faculty members and department chair at the university in which I conducted my research. They welcomed me wholeheartedly and took time from their busy schedules to support my research. I was truly amazed at their commitment and dedication to their students and the teaching profession. My sincere thanks!

To my parents, I would like to thank them for always believing in me and for teaching me as a young child that I could do anything I set my mind to! Their unconditional love and wonderful life lessons of perseverance and optimism have made me what I am today. My amazing children, Juan Pablo and Isabella were the best

cheerleaders a mom could ask for! I did it; mommy is finally a doctor! I would also like to thank the Alvarez Arango Family, Lanza Arango Family, Arango Soto Family, and my extended family members for believing in me and for always sending me positive thoughts and energy from near and far!

I am also very thankful for my phenomenal work family at University of Phoenix. My special thanks to the Academic Affairs team for their encouragement, scholarly critique, and continuous support. Thank you, Dr. Gail Ali, soon to be Dr. Richard Dettling, Jerry Kaber, Judi Fernandez, Dr. Yamil Guevara, Patte Neville, Amanda Chipman, and honorary AA member, soon to be, Dr. Danny Perez.

Several other individuals provided me with valuable support and feedback with my dissertation whom I would like to acknowledge. Dr. Jade Keller, for her support and encouragement, especially early on in my program and during my dissertation proposal stages. I am also grateful to Dr. Rebecca Glazier for her helpful comments on my proposal, and to my professional colleagues who provided me with valuable feedback on my interview questions for my pilot study.

Lastly, I would like to thank my family and friends in Florida for their encouragement and for the many special moments our families have shared. A very special thank you to the Escobar Rojas Family, the Rodriguez Granados Family, the Pinto Family, and the many special families at First Steps International Academy; you all have opened your hearts and homes to me and my family, bringing joy and warmth to us all.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1

Introduction

The widespread nature of plagiarism among college students (McCabe, 2009; McCabe, Butterfield, & Treviño, 2006) has obligated school administrators and faculty members to revisit their current approaches to addressing plagiarism in higher education. Two large-scale studies of college students in the United States and Canada found that close to half of the students surveyed admitted to having participated in some level of academic dishonesty over the past year (McCabe, 2009; McCabe et al., 2006). The presence of academic dishonesty compromises the integrity of the academic institutions and if not addressed in college, can translate to subsequent cheating in the workplace (Reingold & Baratz, 2011). Plagiarism exists within a larger cultural, social, and political context and attempts to curtail plagiarism should involve a system-wide response, rather than isolated solutions (Gallant & Drinan, 2006b; Macdonald & Carroll, 2006). Largely ignored in the literature are the micropolitical considerations influencing the field of education (Bush, 2011; Chen, 2009; Flessa, 2009). Although higher education leaders understand the need for a more comprehensive approach to plagiarism, there are micropolitical considerations influencing the development of a system-wide approach to plagiarism prevention, education, and response.

Context of the Problem

The context of the problem of plagiarism is vast and includes multiple dimensions. For the purposes of this research, the context is organized in five parts: (a) understanding of plagiarism, (b) authorship in the digital age, (c) faculty and student perceptions, (d) micropolitics in education, and (e) systemic approaches. These five

components provide an important backdrop for understanding plagiarism as a complex issue that merits a closer study of all its parts.

Understanding of Plagiarism

The findings from several research studies have shown part of the problem in combating plagiarism is that no universal definition of plagiarism exists (Kaufman & Still, 2010; Paterson, Taylor, & Usick, 2003; Pritchett, 2010; Roig, 2001). To address this gap, a working definition of plagiarism was identified for this study. The authors of the Academic Integrity Handbook at Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) (2010) outline four types of academically dishonest behavior: (a) cheating, (b) plagiarism, (c) unauthorized collaboration, and (d) facilitating academic dishonesty. Using this categorization, plagiarism is catalogued under the larger umbrella of academic dishonesty. Plagiarism is further defined in the handbook as "[occurring] when you use another's words, ideas, assertions, data, or figures and do not acknowledge that you have done so" (MIT, 2010, para. 4). Under the definition, MITs handbook offers four specific examples of plagiarism:

1. Copying ideas or exact wording and not giving proper credit to the author of the original work.
2. Paraphrasing a text without including proper citation.
3. Copying from another person or submitting their work.
4. Buying an assignment or having a person complete an assignment for the student (MIT, 2010).

These definitions and corresponding examples will serve as the working definition of plagiarism for this study.

Authorship in the Digital Age

With the advent of the Internet, authorship has evolved into an ambiguous concept, with fewer clear boundaries than those that previously existed (Cvetkovic & Rodriguez, 2010). The increased availability of information available online and the ease in which information is accessed have contributed to a belief that information accessed online belongs to everyone and can be used however the user sees fit (Kutz, Rhodes, Sutherland, & Zamel, 2011; Park, 2003). The notion that words do not belong to any one person and that authorship is a social phenomenon is further supported by our "sampling culture" (Williams, 2007, p. 352), where the Internet and social networking sites reflect a compilation of pictures, songs, videos, and text. Information is combined, used, and reused, and the owner of the ideas is less important than the ideas themselves.

The speed and availability of data have contributed to the rise in plagiarism within higher education (Comas-Forges & Sureda-Negre, 2010; Park, 2003; Paterson et al., 2003). In a study by Babalola (2012) of 169 undergraduate students in Nigeria, 60% admitted to copying information from the Internet without proper citation. Wilkinson (2009) conducted a study of 48 faculty members and 237 nursing students and found that 41.7% of the faculty members and 30.9% of students believed it was common place for students to copy a few paragraphs from a book or website without citation. Some students may not consider copying and pasting a portion of their paper from a website as problematic, especially because they often easily and without cost or permission download information from the Internet (Wilkinson, 2009). This notion of blurred authorship is important because it situates plagiarism in its current context, a post-modern, digital age where information is both easily accessible and abundant.

Faculty and Student Perceptions

The lack of consistency among students and faculty members regarding their perceptions about plagiarism also makes plagiarism prevention, education, and response efforts more challenging. Roig (2001) found that faculty members across disciplines understand plagiarism differently, especially as it relates to detecting plagiarism from incorrectly paraphrased texts. Roig (2001) found that faculty members are generally consistent in their responses to students when obvious cases of plagiarism arise, but significantly differ in their responses when plagiarism is less egregious. These various inconsistencies among faculty members increase student confusion (Wilkinson, 2009). When faculty members vary in their approaches to plagiarism, students struggle in determining what plagiarism is and how to best to avoid it.

Student confusion also stems from differences between how well faculty members believe they have taught students to avoid plagiarism compared to how students rate their own understanding. Wilkinson (2009) found a disconnect between faculty members and students in this regard, with 78% of faculty members feeling they had adequately taught students about plagiarism, compared to 43% of students who stated they understood plagiarism. There is a need for a comprehensive and system-wide approach to plagiarism prevention, education, and response given the differences between how faculty members perceive the effectiveness of their instruction on plagiarism and students' own views on the matter.

Micropolitics in Education

Examining the role micropolitical considerations play in a college department's approach to plagiarism allows for a new perspective not examined through this lens in the

literature on academic integrity. Micropolitics refer to the "immediate, ongoing, and dynamic interaction among individuals" (Blase & Blase, 2002, p. 9). According to Flessa (2009), "The study of politics within the school – micropolitics – is sometimes understood as the study of how things *really* work, not how an organizational chart or a principal's action plan would like them to work" (p. 331). Micropolitics relates to how people use authority and influence to protect their unique interests (Eiltersten, Gustafon, & Salo, 2008) by examining how power, conflict, coalition building, and resources influence school innovations, culture, and practices (Chen, 2009). Micropolitics is part of everyday life in schools (Björk & Blase, 2009). As stated by Willower (1991), "Much can be gained by looking at schools using a micropolitics perspective. Its concern with political processes can furnish some alternative ways of seeing, interpreting, and explaining what goes in those organizations" (p. 442).

Some studies relating to academic integrity include aspects of micropolitics, without this label. Gallant (2011) researched systemic approaches to academic integrity and focused on the "structure, processes, and culture" (p. 13) in academic integrity institutionalization; but the lens used to view the problem was not a micropolitical lens. As a result, other elements essential to understanding the role of micropolitics such as power relations may be overlooked. Power relations among stakeholders may be complex and can at times be manifested unconsciously in everyday professional practice (Eilersten, Gustafson, & Salo, 2008). The lens of micropolitics was integrated with the selected theoretical framework in Chapter 2 to illustrate how this lens, coupled with political theory, is best suited to examine micropolitical considerations within a college department at a University in Southeastern United States, renamed Esperanza University,

for the purpose of this study. The focus of this study was an exploration of the role of micropolitical factors in a school's approach to plagiarism prevention, education, and response.

Systemic Approaches

Plagiarism is addressed differently at each college and university. Some schools attempt to adopt a systemic approach involving multiple stakeholders, while others focus primarily on single solution responses, such as an increased focus on deterring students from plagiarizing by instituting harsh penalties for students found guilty of academic misconduct. Kutz et al. (2011) eloquently argued for a balanced response and discouraged more punitive approaches, as evidenced by their statement, "...catching potential offenders is a very narrow and limited response to a much more complex pedagogical issue" (p. 16). In today's interconnected world students share resources with ease (Kutz et al., 2011). It is important for faculty members to have a more comprehensive view of plagiarism beyond telling students not to plagiarize.

A systemic approach, or what Macdonald and Carroll (2006) refer to as a holistic approach, involves a joint effort and shared responsibility of students, faculty members, and administrators to uphold academic integrity (Macdonald & Carroll, 2006). For Macdonald and Carroll, this involves deliberate teaching, planning, and assessment. Similarly, Gallant (2011) encouraged schools to institutionalize academic integrity by integrating the proper values of academic honesty into the school's "structure, processes, and culture" (p. 13). The differences in single-solution approaches and systemic approaches were an important contextual factor of emphasis to situate this study and its area of focus better.

The contextual factors identified, understanding of plagiarism; authorship in the digital age; faculty and student perceptions of plagiarism; micropolitics in education; and systemic approaches to plagiarism are all important in understanding plagiarism as a dynamic and complex phenomenon. This problem included a closer examination of the topic by looking at the various micropolitical considerations that influenced the development of a system-wide approach to plagiarism prevention, education, and response within higher education.

Problem Statement

The general problem is that, despite the best efforts of administrators and faculty members at institutions of higher learning to curtail plagiarism, almost 50% of students are engaging in some form of academic dishonesty across departments and universities in the United States and Canada (McCabe, 2009; McCabe et al., 2006). Student cheating [including plagiarism] is an "adaptive challenge" (Gallant & Drinan, 2006b, p. 839), rather than a technical one (Gallant & Drinan, 2006b). To address adaptive challenges, attitudes, values, and behaviors must change, thus requiring a comprehensive system-wide approach. Many universities are currently addressing plagiarism by pursuing one-solution responses rather than looking at the system as a whole (Gallant & Drinan, 2006b; Macdonald & Carroll, 2006), and the examination of interactions among the system's stakeholders using a micropolitical lens has been absent. The specific problem is that despite the best efforts of university administrators, even when using a system-wide approach to plagiarism prevention, education, and response, plagiarism continues to rise suggesting additional measures are necessary.

Ineffective approaches to plagiarism are a matter of concern due to the many negative consequences to students and the institutions of higher learning. Students who frequently engage in academically dishonest behaviors may develop questionable ethics (Harding, Carpenter, Finelli, & Passow, 2004) and may not develop the necessary academic skills and content knowledge in college (Postle, 2009). Over time, plagiarism and other forms of academic dishonesty translate to unethical practices in the workplace that negatively impact the community at large (Anitsal, Anitsal, & Elmore, 2009; Harding et al., 2004; Nonis & Swift, 2001). The micropolitical considerations relative to plagiarism were examined to explore the problem among the education department faculty members and administrators at Esperanza University.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore the micropolitical considerations that influence the development of a systemic approach to plagiarism prevention, education, and response within the education department at Esperanza University. The study involved a purposive sample of seven education faculty members, one education department chair, and two university administrators who oversee faculty development at a university in the southeastern United States. The education department was considered the case in this single case study.

The qualitative method is the most appropriate for examining phenomena in need of in-depth exploration (Neuman, 2003). The case study design is well suited to examine the *how* and *why* of a social phenomenon (Yin, 2009). In particular, the case study method allows a close examination of an organization using various sources or artifacts (Salkind, 2003). The process for conducting this study included the review of additional

primary sources, including faculty syllabi, plagiarism training materials, statements and policies on academic integrity, statistical data on the prevalence of plagiarism and academic dishonesty, and other documents related to plagiarism to help explain and understand plagiarism in the education department at Esperanza University. This approach may provide higher education leaders a rich understanding of the complexities involved in planning a system-wide approach to plagiarism prevention, education, and response. In this qualitative study, the researcher acted as the tool of data collection.

Although a significant amount of research exists on plagiarism, limited work has been done on evaluating the factors that form a system-wide approach to plagiarism prevention, education, and response through the lens of political theory. The intent of this study was to evaluate those factors by examining student cheating as a problem akin to organizational corruption (Gallant & Drinan, 2006b). Specifically, the findings from this study added to the knowledge gap on the role micropolitical considerations have in addressing academic integrity. This case study used the lens of micropolitics combined with the political theory from Gallant and Drinan (2006b) to serve as a platform to move beyond the sharing of faculty members' best practices in reducing plagiarism. Instead, this approach lent itself to the exploration of the complex interactions among faculty members, students, and administrators as they relate to plagiarism.

Contributions of the Study

Studies applying political theory to understand academic dishonesty as a form of organizational corruption are rare (Gallant & Drinan, 2006b). This framework addressed the knowledge gap of the role of micropolitical considerations in institutionalizing academic integrity. This focus provided a new perspective in helping understand

academic integrity institutionalization by recognizing the complex interaction that exists among key stakeholders and the role of structures, people, politics, and symbols in this process. From a practitioner standpoint, the findings from this study may help develop a better understanding of the factors that influence the development of a system-wide approach to plagiarism prevention, education, and response. This knowledge may help educational administrators and faculty members more effectively address potential barriers and capitalize on strengths to pave the way for a more comprehensive and holistic approach to plagiarism within higher education.

Importance of the Study to Leadership

Paramount to a university's mission is its commitment to academic rigor and quality in the classroom. If university leaders fail to provide students with a quality education, the integrity of the education provided is compromised. In addition, scandals related to academic dishonesty can negatively influence public perception and the reputation of the university may be called into question, thus negatively impacting the university's stakeholders (Crisp, 2004). Plagiarism and academic dishonesty in general is an important concern for post-secondary institutions because studies have shown a positive correlation between levels of dishonest behaviors in college and future unethical decision making in the workforce (Blum, 2009; Gallant & Drinan, 2006a; Harding et al., 2004).

In the 21st century, where scandals involving unethical business practices have negatively impacted the lives of many, it is paramount that colleges emphasize the importance of academic integrity and ethical decision making in their classes and among the student body as a whole. By examining the micropolitical considerations that

influence the development of system-wide approaches to plagiarism prevention, education, and response, the study may contribute to enhanced ethics of students. By discouraging unethical decisions in college, faculty members and administrators may help shape the moral compass of our future workforce. The findings from this study may serve as an important roadmap for college administrators and faculty members to guide them on ways they can increase academic integrity within their campuses and institutionalize a system-wide approach to plagiarism prevention, education, and response.

Methodological Approach

While the use of a quantitative study may have helped determine the prevalence of plagiarism and the characteristics of students who plagiarize and their faculty members, that design is limited because data alone do not help gain a deeper understanding of how faculty members and administrators approach plagiarism prevention, education, and response and the role of micropolitics in these interactions and processes. Due to the exploratory nature of this contemporary research, a qualitative method was best suited to approach the study's research question.

The qualitative case study design is well suited to examine the *how* and *why* of social phenomenon (Yin, 2009). A case study is also appropriate when the subject is contemporary, and the researcher has minimal to no impact on the social phenomenon (Yin, 2009). A case study is the study of a bounded system or case, using multiple sources of evidence to understand a complex phenomenon (Yin, 2009). The process for this study involved conducting a single case study of a representative or typical case. The other single-case study rationale includes the critical case used to test a theory, an

extreme case to look at unique cases, a revelatory case to study phenomenon not previously accessible to social scientists, and a longitudinal case study to study a case at more than one point in time (Yin, 2009). While there may be another rationale for selecting a single case, the education department at Esperanza University was representative of the typical case, rather than the other cases aforementioned.

A phenomenological study was not chosen because this type of study is appropriate when studying individuals' lived experiences (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010). The goal of performing this study was to examine the positions of faculty members and administrators and evaluate additional supporting artifacts that pertain to the role of micropolitical considerations in plagiarism prevention, education, and response. The focus was not on individuals' lived experiences, but rather the complex interaction of all elements relating to plagiarism in the department. Ethnographic studies are well suited when the focus is on the way culture affects the way a group behaves and its interaction (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010; Merriam, 2009). This study was an exploration into how faculty members and administrators approach plagiarism rather than the culture in depth. Grounded theory is focused on creating a theory from the data collected (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010). Additionally, the focus of this study was to determine the way faculty members and administrators interact in their approach to plagiarism, rather than create a theory. The review of the varying qualitative approaches supported the decision to select the case study method to examine the micropolitical considerations that influence the development of a system-wide approach to plagiarism prevention, education, and response. The study involved a purposive sample of seven education faculty members, one department chair, and two university administrators who oversee faculty

development at a university in the Southeastern United States. The data collection process included examining faculty syllabi, plagiarism training materials, statements and policies on academic integrity, statistical data on the prevalence of plagiarism and academic dishonesty, and other documents related to plagiarism to help understand plagiarism in the education department at Esperanza University.

Theoretical Framework

This qualitative case study is grounded on the concept of micropolitics and a theoretical framework from the research findings of Gallant and Drinan (2006b) for understanding organizational change at the organizational level using political theory. By looking at plagiarism using political organizational theory and examining the concept of micropolitics, it is possible to gain a more holistic understanding of the systemic factors and micropolitical considerations that shape the education department's approach to plagiarism at Esperanza University.

Organizational/Political Theory

This qualitative case study of the education department at Esperanza University was grounded on the concept of micropolitics and framework from the research findings of Gallant and Drinan (2006b) for understanding organizational change. The connections between micropolitics and the framework of Gallant and Drinan (2006b) are illustrated as their model is explained. Gallant and Drinan (2006b) examined two political theories, Bolman and Deal (1997) and Huntington (1968), and they combined both theories to offer a framework to understand change and the institutionalization of changes within an organization. Several cultural, structural, political, and individual-based forces (Gallant, 2008; Gallant & Drinan, 2006a) influence how administrators and faculty members

approach plagiarism and the degree of influence of these factors are evolving. Given the primary focus on the micropolitical considerations involved in addressing plagiarism, a political theory lens using organizational change as its foundation served this study well.

Gallant and Drinan (2006b) claimed that current approaches to student cheating (including plagiarism) are based on the sharing of best practices among faculty members to deter students from plagiarizing, rather than a strategic and well-coordinated response to student cheating. By moving beyond a *piecemeal* approach to organizational response, the combined theories help provide educational leaders a roadmap to reduce academic dishonesty and achieve positive long-term organizational change (Gallant & Drinan, 2006b). By using political theory as a lens, Gallant and Drinan (2006b) moved beyond student deterrence measures alone to promote academic integrity in the system and to examine important power and resource considerations among stakeholders. Understanding the role micropolitical considerations play in addressing academic integrity is an important knowledge gap in the literature that this researcher addressed.

Bolman and Deal (1997) introduced four frames that can be used to understand change and, for the purposes of this study, to understand the current status of the education department's approach to plagiarism prevention, education, and response and the role micropolitics has played in the formation and execution of this approach. The four frames are: (a) structural, (b) human resources, (c) political, and (d) symbolic. Even though only one frame is called a *political* frame, all the frames contain elements that might be recognized as micropolitical.

The structural frame provides an explanation for structural considerations, including rules, roles, goals, policies, and the environment (Gallant & Drinan, 2006b) and

how these affect the creation of an institutional framework for advancing academic integrity in schools. This frame relates well to micropolitics, which addresses policies and procedures and explores how these are adopted and implemented (Iannaccone, 1991). The human resources frame focuses on the relationship between the organization and its employees assessing their needs, skills, and relationships (Gallant & Drinan, 2006b). This frame explains initiatives such as values education and faculty training (Gallant & Drinan, 2006b). The human resources frame taps into micropolitical considerations because micropolitics explores the relationships and power influences among stakeholders (Brosky, 2011). The micropolitical perspective complements the human resource frame because it can provide a deeper understanding on the selection process of professional development programs and curriculum.

The third frame involves political considerations including power, conflict, competition, and organizational politics (Gallant & Drinan, 2006b). This frame focuses on the interests and perspectives of different stakeholders (in this case, faculty members and administrators) and directly addresses many micropolitical considerations. This lens supports the joint efforts of these stakeholders to help plan and develop a system to promote academic integrity within the institution. The literature on the role micropolitical considerations play in addressing academic integrity is limited; therefore, exploring academic integrity using this frame helped to close the knowledge gap that currently exists in this area. The symbolic frame constitutes a view of organizations as cultures that rely on their own stories, meaning, metaphor, myths, ritual, stories, and heroes (Gallant & Drinan, 2006b). Micropolitics complements this frame as rituals, symbols, and myths can illustrate some of the internal and external forces that influence

decision-making, especially as related to power and resources that are not always readily apparent. In the context of academic dishonesty, cultural symbols include articles in university publications, learner-oriented curriculum, and the area given the most attention in research on academic dishonesty, honor codes or modified honor codes (Gallant & Drinan, 2006b). Gallant and Drinan (2006b) asserted that educational leaders should use the four-frame model to create their own comprehensive approach to addressing academic dishonesty within the organization.

Through his theory of political institutionalization, Huntington (1968) helped explain how organizations can help socialize new changes so that the new initiative becomes part of the way the organization operates. By focusing on four criteria, organizational adaptability, autonomy, complexity and coherence, the organization is more likely to institutionalize new initiatives. These four criteria also connect well with the concept of micropolitics.

Adaptability relates to the ease in which the organization adapts to its changing environment (Qian, 2009). In the context of higher education and academic dishonesty, this relates to the ease in which a university can respond to new trends in increased student plagiarism/cheating, such as the vastness of information available on the internet (Comas-Forgas & Sureda-Negre, 2010; Klein, 2011; Sutherland-Smith, 2010) and its impact on student perspectives of authorship (Anderson & Cvetkovic, 2010, Cvetkovic & Rodriguez, 2010). The adaptability criteria relate well to the topic because micropolitics taps into the conflicting interests people may have, and these factors may influence how adaptable an organization is to changes. Organizational autonomy relates to the organization's ability to be independent and not have other stakeholders impose their

agendas (Qian, 2009). In the context of higher education and academic integrity, universities should adopt a strong commitment to academic integrity, even if this means having to deal with potential conflicts arising from addressing plagiarism charges with students and imposing the applicable consequences. These tensions and competing interests among stakeholders are key considerations in micropolitics (Eilersten et al., 2008). Complexity involves an organization's elaborate functions and structures (Qian, 2009). According to Huntington (1965), systems that are more complex are able to adapt to new demands quicker and are more stable. As it relates to higher education, organizational complexity can refer to the different sub-units within a college both hierarchically and functionally. When colleges and universities approach academic integrity from the perspective of multiple departments and stakeholders they are more likely to adapt to new challenges more easily than schools that do not approach the problem from multiple perspectives (Huntington, 1965). Coherence relates to organizational unity, or morale (Rhoda, 1978). In the context of higher education, coherence would be represented by abiding by academic integrity within the institution. This relates directly to the topic because micropolitics are the examination of competing interests among stakeholders, and the process of adopting and implementing policy and procedures. These criteria relate well to the micropolitical focus on how competing interests among stakeholders can lead to conflict or coalitions.

Gallant and Drinan (2006b) acknowledged that addressing academic dishonesty is complex due to its dynamic nature. By combining four frame theory to understand organizational change (Bolman & Deal, 1997) and political institutionalization theory to understand how changes become institutionalized (Huntington, 1968), Gallant and

Drinan (2006b) offered a framework to approach adaptive challenges, addressing organizational and structural components, rather than individual based solutions. Coupling this framework with the construct of micropolitics provided a solid foundation to study micropolitical considerations in a college department's approach to plagiarism prevention, education, and response.

Research Questions

The research questions for this study were designed to explore the micropolitical considerations influencing the development of a system-wide approach to plagiarism prevention, education, and response in the education department at Esperanza University. Research questions are broad questions that help guide the line of inquiry of a study (Merriam, 2009). These broad questions tapped into the main focus of the study and the responses from the participants reflected the information expected to gain understanding from conducting the study (Merriam, 2009).

The research questions were grounded in two theoretical approaches, including the theoretical framework of Gallant and Drinan (2006b) that combines the approaches of Bolman and Deal (1997) and Huntington (1968) to organizational change and the institutionalization of changes within an organization and the construct of micropolitics guiding this study. There was one main research question, supported by five sub research questions. The research questions aligned to this framework are:

RQ1) In what ways might elements of micropolitics influence college department administrators and faculty members in their approach to plagiarism prevention, education, and response?

RQ1a) What degree of formal and/or informal power and influence do college administrators and faculty members have and how does this influence the department's approach to plagiarism prevention, education, and response?

RQ1b) How do college administrators and faculty members interact to address plagiarism prevention, education, and response within the education department?

RQ1c) How is academic integrity socialized within the education department?

RQ1d) How are policies and procedures relating to plagiarism prevention, education, and response adopted and implemented within the education department?

RQ1e) What roles do rituals, myths, and symbols play in informing the department's approach to plagiarism prevention, education, and response?

Assumptions

Prior to conducting this study, a series of assumptions required attention. According to Neuman (2003), assumptions are statements about "the nature of things that are not observable or testable" (p. 49). Assumptions influence the way a researcher understands a concept; therefore, his or her articulation prior to engaging in the study is important. Initial assumptions were that the university is responsible for educating students on plagiarism and that students plagiarize for diverse reasons. Other key assumptions were that faculty members and administrators have vested interests in reducing student plagiarism, but they do not follow any uniform approach to address plagiarism prevention, education, and response. Another guiding assumption of the study was that a system-wide organizational approach will effectively curb plagiarism and that micropolitical considerations matter and are important in formulating an effective

approach. The final assumption was that the participants in the study would be honest in the interviews and that all artifacts examined for this study were authentic.

Scope, Limitations, and Delimitations

The case study design allows for the study of complex social units (Merriam, 2009). The case study is used to approach research holistically, resulting in a rich description of the phenomenon studied (Merriam, 2009). This qualitative case study was an exploration of micropolitical considerations that influenced the development of a system-wide approach to plagiarism prevention, education, and response in the education department at Esperanza University.

Scope

The scope of this study was limited to the education department and select university administrators at Esperanza University. Geographic convenience and the interest of a school administrator in supporting this research determined the site selection. The data collection process included interviewing faculty members and administrators and a review of documentation, including course syllabi, training documents on academic integrity, related university and faculty policies, statistical data on the prevalence of plagiarism and academic dishonesty, and other documents related to plagiarism. The decision to focus on the education department at Esperanza University was due to the department's progressive approach to education and social justice issues as reflected in the department's mission statement and in faculty members' backgrounds and research interests. This philosophical orientation may have manifested itself in interesting ways when examining elements relating to micropolitics such as power and resources. In addition, the education department had the unique advantage of being the home to

varying levels of academic programs at the undergraduate, masters, and doctoral level, which shed a possible additional level of complexity and breadth to the study.

Limitations

Limitations of the study refer to the characteristics of the design or methodology of the study that impact its findings (University of Southern California, 2013). As is typical in case study research, the study focused on a small number of participants in a delimited subset (or case), and the results cannot be generalized to the larger population. The data collected are representative of the views of the participants at the moment in time they were interviewed and the artifacts representative of the materials and resources used for plagiarism prevention, education, and detection at the time. There were no longitudinal implications; although future efforts and strategies of the department's approach to plagiarism were noted, their successes were not examined in this study. Researcher bias is another limitation of case study research (Salkind, 2003). The limiting of bias occurred by stating the researcher's assumptions and theoretical orientation at the onset of the study (Merriam, 2009), as outlined in this chapter, and by purposefully building and addressing alternative explanations as part of the data collection process (Merriam, 2009; Yin, 2009). The researcher's own level of knowledge and experience in interviewing, observing, and writing a case study was also a limitation of the study (Merriam, 2009). This limitation was addressed by consulting the germinal texts on case study and qualitative research and learning from the experienced scholars chairing the researcher's dissertation committee.

Delimitations

Delimitations refer to considerations that limit the scope of the study (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010) as imposed by the researcher. Specific delimitations include the research focus, research questions, and selected theoretical framework. Additional delimitations include the case selected for the study. Interviews were limited to only education faculty members and staff at Esperanza University. Data collection included the consultation of documents related to academic integrity policies, procedures, training sessions, and statistical data on the prevalence of plagiarism. The study did not include student interviews or records.

Chapter Summary

In Chapter 1, a high-level overview of the extent of plagiarism in academia, including the reasons why the expansion of plagiarism negatively impacts universities and students was presented. The various contextual factors shaping the understanding of plagiarism were an integral part of the overview. Using the lens of political theory, combined with the lens of micropolitics, this case study was an examination of the micropolitical considerations that influence the development of a systemic approach to plagiarism prevention, education, and response with the goal of reducing plagiarism.

Chapter 2 contains a review of the literature related to historical views of plagiarism; consequences of plagiarism; motivations for plagiarism; prevalence of plagiarism; micropolitics and its role in understanding approaches to plagiarism; current literature on plagiarism prevention, education, and response approaches in post-secondary institutions; theories understanding organizational change and the construct of micropolitcs; and the use of case studies in academic dishonesty research. The literature

review also provides insights for college administrators and faculty members to understand student plagiarism better and to begin to explore possible alternative interventions to help reduce plagiarism in higher education.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore the micropolitical considerations influencing the development of a systemic approach to plagiarism prevention, education, and response. Understanding plagiarism, micropolitics, and system-wide approaches to academic dishonesty in higher education was the focus of this literature review. Information contained in this literature review includes historical and current research on this topic. This chapter is organized into ten sections. These are: (a) title searches, articles, research documents, and journals; (b) historical view of plagiarism; (c) consequences of plagiarism; (d) motivations for plagiarism; (e) prevalence of plagiarism in academia; (f) micropolitics and its role in understanding approaches to plagiarism; (g) approaches to plagiarism prevention, education, and response; (h) related theories; (i) case study research; (j) conclusion.

Title Searches, Articles, Research Documents, and Journals

The research obtained in this study on academic dishonesty in universities came from peer-reviewed journals and books on plagiarism and academic integrity. The University of Phoenix library databases, EBSCOhost, Proquest, and GalePowerhouse, were used to gather research. The research included the consultation of books via the University of Phoenix's library and Nova Southeastern University's library. White papers were accessed via the Internet, using Google scholar as a search engine. Key terms used in the search included: academic dishonesty, plagiarism, academic integrity, micropolitics in education, micropolitics in higher education, micropolitics and academic integrity, micropolitics and academic dishonesty, micropolitics and plagiarism, holistic

and academic integrity, system and academic integrity, plagiarism and prevention, plagiarism and education, plagiarism and response, and combinations of these terms. The majority of sources were from the last 10 years, 2005-2015, with some older sources for historical references and germinal works. Table 1 illustrates a summary of the references consulted in this literature review.

Table 1

Summary of References

Topic	Peer-reviewed Articles	Book or Book Chapters	Online Magazines, Newspapers, Pamphlets, or Encyclopedias	Dissertations & Theses	Other
Historical view of plagiarism	2	5	0	0	0
Consequences of plagiarism	4	0	0	0	0
Motivations for plagiarism	16	0	0	2	0
Micropolitics and its role in understanding approaches to plagiarism	11	1	2	0	0
Prevalence of plagiarism in academia	17	0	0	1	0
Plagiarism prevention, education, and response	34	4	4	0	1
Organizational/ Political Theory	4	2	1	3	0
Uses of case study research	6	0	0	4	0
Total	94	12	7	10	1
Percentage	75.80%	9.70%	5.60%	8.10%	0.80%

*Note. Othe*r category includes technical reports, white papers, unpublished research reports and papers, manuals, and statistical databases.

Historical View of Plagiarism

Understanding the history and etymology of the concept of plagiarism is important to situate plagiarism within current society. According to Kolich (1983), the word plagiarism comes from the Latin word *plagiarius*, which means a person who steals slaves. The first use of the term was by Martial, an early Roman poet who was born somewhere between 38 A.D. and 41 A.D., with the exact year being unknown (Sullivan,

2005). Martial was the first person known to use the term plagiarism after fellow poet, Fidentinus, borrowed his poetry. Martial asserted that his "...poems shall rise like rebellious slaves and demand their freedom" (Kolich, 1983, p. 143). Martial contended that Fidentinus was making a fool of himself by representing Martial's poems as his own. Despite this initial introduction of the concept of plagiarism in history, the concept of originality and authorship did not fully develop until the 1700s after the notion of possessive individualism became part of early English society (Sutherland-Smith, 2008). The concept of possessive individualism refers to the belief that people have the right to protect themselves and the fruits of their labor (Sutherland-Smith, 2008).

The invention of the printing press in 1445 and the subsequent increase in literacy levels of society contributed to an environment where possessive individualism could flourish (Sutherland-Smith, 2008). The notion of the ownership of ideas would not have emerged without the technical ability for written words to be mass distributed and a literate public to read. In the early 1500s, the concept of possessive individualism went beyond tangible goods and was extended to include ideas and thoughts (Sutherland-Smith, 2008). Following this shift, the first copyright law, the Statute of Anne, was passed in England in 1710 (Sutherland-Smith, 2008). This legal statute helped authors retain their rights over their own original written work, including the right to claim infringement for partial copyright violations (Marsh, 2007). Individuals who misappropriated the written texts of others could face legal consequences. The concept of plagiarism then took root, thus creating the environment where misrepresenting the written work of others was considered wrong.

Moving forward in the early 1800s, plagiarism was seen from more of a literary perspective. In Britain during this epoch, also known as the Romantic period, two forms of plagiarism existed, culpable plagiarism and poetical plagiarism (Mazzeo, 2007). Culpable plagiarism referred to intentional plagiarism which was considered a moral concern and almost impossible to prove (Bailes, 2009; Mazzeo, 2007). For culpable plagiarism to occur, the work had to meet four criteria, the borrowed text had to be unacknowledged, unimproved, unfamiliar, and the act of borrowing the text had to be conscious (Mazzeo, 2007). Poetical plagiarism was more common during this time (Mazzeo, 2007), and it was considered an aesthetical violation against conventional norms of literature (Bailes, 2009; Mazzeo, 2007). Poetical plagiarism addressed concerns with tone, style, and voice more than the strict reuse of exact phrasing without attribution. People accused of poetical plagiarism were also considered poor writers. If a writer borrowed a text and the original author was unacknowledged, but the new work was successfully improved, then according to the standards of plagiarism and writing at the time, this act was justified and not considered a matter of concern (Mazzeo, 2007). During this time, historical and scientific texts were considered forms of knowledge and were considered by some as implicitly authorless, and reproduction of the texts without attribution was not an issue (Mazzeo, 2007).

Modern notions of plagiarism have shifted since the 1800s. Accusations of plagiarism are now due more to similarities in the phrasing of texts, versus aesthetics and style (Mazzeo, 2007). With the increased availability of information and the ease of accessing this information via the Internet, authorship has become a fluid and collaborative concept (Baetz et al., 2011; Kutz, Rhodes, Sutherland, & Zamel, 2011).

With the advent of digital technology, plagiarism has become much easier as the information is easy to access and abundant. Cvetkovic and Rodriguez (2010) argued that educators and administrators needed to rethink their notions of plagiarism given this new reality and align their responses accordingly.

Consequences of Plagiarism

Central to the concept of plagiarism is the understanding that students who are engaging in plagiarism are not following the standards of academic writing (American Psychological Association, 2010). Individuals who plagiarize falsely represent their own abilities and undermine the validity of their assigned grades (Passow, Mayhew, Finelli, Harding, & Carpenter, 2006). This leads to fundamental concerns with equity, as students engaging in academic dishonesty can benefit from an unfair advantage compared to their peers if they receive higher grades than they deserve (Whitley & Keith-Spiegel, 2002). If there are little to no consequences for plagiarism and other acts of academic dishonesty, other students may also decide to engage in academic dishonesty because students' perception that other students are cheating may impact their own likelihood to cheat (McCabe, Butterfield, & Treviño, 2006).

Plagiarism is also detrimental to students because it negatively impacts student learning. If a student plagiarizes and a faculty member is unaware, that educator will not have an accurate understanding of the student's true skills and understanding of the course objectives (Passow et al., 2006). Without an accurate representation of a student's academic level, faculty members are limited in their teaching approach (Harding, Carpenter, Finelli, & Passow, 2004). Academic dishonesty impedes the teaching process and the transfer of knowledge, which are fundamental purposes of institutions of higher

learning (Whitley & Keith-Spiegel, 2002). Academic dishonesty leads to diminished academic quality and negatively impacts the institution (Staats, Hupp, Wallace, & Gresley, 2009; Waithaka & Gitimu, 2012). The value of the academic degree diminishes, and the reputation of the student and the institution diminishes (Caldwell, 2010; Whitley, 1998).

Plagiarism is of concern for colleges and universities because schools have the duty to prepare skilled graduates who will positively contribute to society. Studies have shown that engaging in unethical behaviors in school, such as cheating and plagiarizing, can lead to unethical practices in the workforce (Blum, 2009; Harding et al., 2004; Gallant & Drinan, 2006a). Unethical practices in the workplace can lead to business decisions that hurt the community at large. As a result, it is paramount for schools to emphasize the importance of academic integrity, professionalism, and ethics to prepare students for the workforce and to help students develop as ethical citizens.

Plagiarism has consequences for students and institutions of higher learning. Plagiarism hinders the learning environment (McCabe et al., 2006; Passow et al., 2006; Whitley & Keith-Spiegel, 2002) and is against the fundamental values of honesty, trust, and integrity (Gallant, 2006). Although plagiarism is wrong and negatively impacts student learning, students continue to resort to plagiarism in college (Hard, Conway, & Moran, 2006; Martin, 2008; McCabe, 2009; McCabe et al., 2006). The reasons why students engage in this behavior are varied and discussed in the next section.

Motivations for Plagiarism

Research shows that students engage in academic dishonesty for a variety of reasons. McCabe, Trevino, and Butterfield (2001) classified some of these reasons into

contextual and individual factors. Although the research conducted by McCabe et al. (2001) looked at academic dishonesty from a broader perspective, including both cheating on tests and papers, using their overall framework for examining the motivations for students engaging in plagiarism is helpful. Contextual factors refer to factors that are part of the institutional culture, whereas individual factors relate to factors associated with the individual student. Both types of factors influence students' motivations to engage in plagiarism (McCabe, Treviño, & Butterfield, 2001).

Contextual Factors

Contextual factors refer to the characteristics of the external environment within the institution and culture, some of these include the degree to which an honor code is socialized on campus, the school culture, the level of competitiveness on campus, students' perceived likelihood of being caught if they engage in dishonest behaviors and the severity of the consequences they potentially face if caught, and peer pressure among students (McCabe et al., 2001). Honor codes and school culture influence a student's actions, as research shows that schools with honor codes who actively promote academic integrity have fewer cases of academic dishonesty than schools without formal codes (Gurung, Wilhelm, & Filz, 2012; McCabe & Trevino, 2002). Honor codes help reduce student cheating because they increase the likelihood of detection when incidents occur, and students have a greater awareness of the consequences of engaging in this practice (Dufresne, 2004). Research yields evidence that the existence of honor codes alone is not sufficient. The honor code must also be embraced and socialized by faculty members, administrators, and students within the college community to be effective (Bing et al., 2012; O'Neill & Pfeiffer, 2012).

Perceived peer behavior (Hard et al., 2006; McCabe et al., 2006; Montuno et al., 2012; Rettinger & Kramer, 2009), increased competitiveness on campus, and heavy workloads (McCabe et al., 2006; Wideman, 2011) also play a role in motivating students to cheat. Students who believe many fellow students are cheating on campus often feel pressured to engage in similar behavior to keep up with the heavy workloads. When students perceive that everyone is doing it, then socially it becomes less of a stigma to engage in the same behavior in order to compete effectively with others.

The increased availability of information online can also be considered a contextual factor because it shapes the environment in which students operate. Research has shown that the abundance of information on the Internet and its accessibility contributes to increased plagiarism among students (Babalola, 2012; Chao, Wilhelm, & Neureuther, 2009; Comas-Forgas & Sureda-Negre, 2010). Students who struggle on an assignment may feel tempted to cheat, using online materials, due to the overwhelming amount of information available and its accessibility.

Individual Factors

Individual factors relate directly to the students' attributes and their dispositions. One of the most common reasons why students engage in plagiarism as cited in the literature is a lack of understanding of what plagiarism is and limited knowledge of the conventions of academic writing (Chao et al., 2009; Ferree & Pfeifer, 2011; Perry, 2010). The lack of understanding is especially a concern for international students who may not be as familiar with Western notions of authorship and conventions of academic writing (Gilmore, Strickland, Timmerman, Maher, & Feldon, 2010; Martin, Rao, & Sloan, 2011; Volkov, Volkov, & Tedford, 2011). The reasons why students do not have this

knowledge in college vary and can stem from limited exposure to academic writing in high school, a belief that all information that is accessible online is public domain and can be used freely without citation, and limited instruction on academic integrity by college instructors in the classroom (Moeck, 2002). Mastering academic writing and its conventions, including proper citation, paraphrasing, and referencing can be challenging. Students who often unintentionally plagiarize do so as a result of not being fully aware of the norms of academic writing (Granitz & Lowey, 2007).

Additional important internal factors, as they relate to plagiarism, are students' own attitudes toward plagiarism and their approach to time management. Some students may be indifferent toward academic integrity, largely due to societal pressures of getting ahead (Robinson-Zañartu et al., 2005). People who are poor managers of their time may also have a greater incentive to plagiarize as they may run out of time to complete their assignments and then revert to plagiarizing in order to complete the task (Comas-Forgas & Sureda-Negre, 2010; Ferree & Pfeifer, 2011; Howard & Davies, 2009; Lehman, 2010; Roig & DeTommaso, 1995). Students' pressure for grades can also play a role in a student's decision to plagiarize (Babalola, 2012; Ferree & Pfeifer, 2011; McCabe et al., 2001) and time constraints can heighten these pressures.

Intentional plagiarism is often associated with the personal integrity of the student (McCabe et al., 2001). Students who deliberately plagiarize are often searching for a short cut for their own advantage (Hutton, 2006; Insley, 2011). Students who intentionally engage in academic dishonesty may weigh the costs and benefits of plagiarizing and opt for plagiarizing if the potential gain is higher than the risk of detection. Understanding students' motivations for plagiarizing and the related

contextual and individual factors that influence students is important because it helps inform plagiarism prevention, education, and response strategies. Knowing the factors that influence a student's decision to engage in academic dishonesty is essential in order to embark effectively on any strategies to curtail the problem.

Prevalence of Plagiarism in Academia

The degree of plagiarism and dishonesty in academia varies depending on the criteria used for its measurement. Based on an extensive review of 107 studies, Whitley (1998) found rates of cheating ranging from 9% to 95% and plagiarism rates ranging from 3% to 98% (Whitley, 1998). Although this is a somewhat dated study, it is a germinal study illustrating why plagiarism rates vary so much. Thus, this knowledge is important as a backdrop to understanding data on the prevalence of plagiarism. The differences in the prevalence rates are due primarily to the way studies define academic dishonesty; differences in how studies gather data, including self-disclosed rates of academic dishonesty versus observed academic dishonesty; and differences in the time range students are asked to report on, such as plagiarism over the last year versus plagiarism over the student's college career (Jocoy & DiBiase, 2006). Despite the differences in the exact numbers, the trends do support that academic dishonesty and plagiarism is commonplace in institutions of higher learning and increasing (Hard et al., 2006; Martin, 2008; McCabe, 2009; McCabe et al., 2006).

Large-scale studies highlighting the prevalence of academic dishonesty in the United States support the assertion that academic dishonesty is present in American universities. During the 1990s, Davis and Ludvigson (1995) surveyed over 2,000 undergraduate juniors and seniors and found that the average percentage of cheating

ranged from 40-60% and almost 50% of students admitted to engaging in cheating behaviors more than once during their college careers.

The findings from a large-scale study by McCabe, Butterfield, and Treviño (2006) yielded similar results. McCabe et al. (2006) surveyed more than 5,000 graduate students attending 32 post-secondary schools in the United States and Canada, using data from 2002-2004. McCabe et al. (2006) found that 56% of graduate business students and 47% of non-business graduate students admitted to having participated in some level of academic dishonesty over the past year (McCabe et al., 2006). McCabe (2009) found similar results in a survey of 1,098 nursing students and 169 nursing faculty members at 12 colleges in the United States in 2007. Over 50% of the nursing undergraduate students and almost 50% of the graduate nursing students admitted to some type of academic dishonesty (McCabe, 2009).

Studies within the last 4 years have had smaller sample sizes but also supported the notion that academic dishonesty is widespread among college students. In a study by Witherspoon, Maldonado, and Lacey (2012) of 186 undergraduate students in 11 general education courses at one large urban college in the United States, 79.7% of students admitted to having cheated at least once during their college careers, with only a small number of students engaging in cheating offenses repeatedly. Baetz et al. (2011) conducted a survey of 412 undergraduate sophomores, juniors, and seniors in 15 business classes. Only 7.5% of the students surveyed said they had never cheated in any way; 29.9% of the students admitted to copying a few sentences from the Internet without attribution once or twice, and 13.4% admitted to doing this more than three times (Baetz et al., 2011). Although there are variations in the results of the studies on the prevalence

of plagiarism in higher education, it is clear that academic dishonesty is common and a matter of concern for schools.

Micropolitics and its Role in Understanding Approaches to Plagiarism

Understanding how prevalent plagiarism was among college students was an important starting point to understand the context of academic integrity in schools. The focus of this study was to examine this problem using the lens of micropolitics. In this section of the literature review, definitions for micropolitics and the micropolitical perspective were provided.

Micropolitics Defined and the Micropolitical Perspective

According to Chen (2009), micropolitics in schools can be best described as "an analytic framework which examines the dynamic and complex interpersonal context of a school in order to understand the school operations" (p. 23). Micropolitics provides a framework for examining the interrelationships among stakeholders, including positive relationships that lead to collaboration and coalition-building, and negative relationships that lead to conflict among parties (Björk & Blase, 2009; Chen, 2009; Eilersten et al., 2008; Marshall & Scribner, 1991). Although a plethora of studies have focused on aspects addressed in micropolitics, such as influence and leadership, these studies are largely under the umbrella of organizational literature, not situating micropolitics as a unique area of study (Hoyle, 1999).

In the germinal text by Blase (1991), the author described the value of incorporating the micropolitical perspective as its own area of scholarly research,

> The micropolitical perspective on organizations provides a valuable and potent approach to understanding the woof and warp of the fabric of day-to-day life in

> schools. This perspective highlights the fundamentals of human behavior and purpose. Micropolitics is about power and how people use it to influence others and to protect themselves. It is about conflict and how people compete with each other to get what they want. It is about cooperation and how people build among themselves to achieve their ends. It is about what people in all social settings think and have strong feelings about but what is so often unspoken and not easily observed. The micropolitical perspective presents practicing administrators and scholars alike with fresh and provocative ways to think about human behavior in schools. (pp. 1-2)

Using micropolitics as a lens to understand a college department's approach to plagiarism prevention, education, and response provides a new perspective on a problem that has been part of history for centuries. Although examining the problem through the lens of micropolitics will not eradicate plagiarism, it will help uncover new views not previously explored in the literature.

Schools as Political Organizations

Largely ignored in the literature is the use of a micropolitical lens to understand schools as political organizations (Bush, 2011; Chen, 2009; Flessa, 2009) and even more so in the field of higher education (Haag & Smith, 2002). According to Brosky (2011), schools as organizations can be best recognized as political systems, given the nature of their internal and external relationships. "Each group within the organization has a different view of who has formal power (authority), who has informal power (influence), or who should have the power to make organizational decisions" (Brosky, 2011, p. 2). Within schools, there are political forces that influence how things have been done, how

they continue to be addressed, and how they will be addressed over the long-term, yet the micropolitical perspective is not commonly used to address individual and group dynamics within educational organizations (Brosky, 2011; Chen, 2009).

Iannaccone (1991), one of the germinal researchers in the field of micropolitics in education, illustrated the view of schools as political systems best. Iannaccone (1991) argued that schools can be seen as a polity and its stakeholders, administrators, teachers, and students, as its constituents. As a polity, the school system, according to Iannaccone (1991), is best described as a caste system where its largest constituency group, students, do not have the same rights as the other members of the system to formally influence policy nor is there a path for students to gain these rights.

This viewpoint of an educational organization as a caste system provides a new way to view policy formation in higher education. When applied to the context of academic integrity, typically within the university settings, adjunct faculty members do not have the same influence on policy and school governance as tenured faculty members and administrators. Furthermore, although students may take part in a student council or a student advisory board, the power and influence of their membership is often relatively limited and their presence and participation more symbolic than influential. As a result, not all stakeholders within the university setting have the same power and influence to establish and implement policies and procedures as related to academic integrity.

Conflict Among Stakeholders

Formal influence to establish policy is important, and the lack of influence can lead to conflict among stakeholders. Iannaccone (1991) stated, "A politics perspective's unique focus is on processes for producing policy from conflict" (p. 467). In addition to

the differing levels of influence a school's stakeholders have on policy issues, some of the other conflicts that may arise in the context of a college's approach to plagiarism are faculty members' and administrators' perceptions of plagiarism. Significant inconsistencies exist among faculty members on how they respond to plagiarism (Carroll, 2009; Robinson-Zañarthu et al., 2005; Vandehey, Diekhoff, & LaBeff, 2007) and this may lead to increased tensions. Tensions exist between educators who believe that plagiarism is a serious concern and a threat to student learning, and those educators who advocate for a more relaxed approach to plagiarism, citing the benefits that come from idea and information sharing from the Internet. Further tensions exist among educators who stress prevention and education measures to plagiarism, and those who focus on punitive responses (Roberts, 2008).

Conflicts may also stem from differing viewpoints on how to address plagiarism from administrators. Studies have shown that some faculty members do not report issues relating to academic dishonesty because of their unwillingness to go through the formal and lengthy reporting process (Auer & Kruper, 2001; Brown & Choong, 2005; Gallant, 2008). Conversely, faculty members may feel indirect pressure to be more lenient on student plagiarism in the face of declining student enrollments and a greater pressure to retain the existing student base. Reporter Maffly (2012) described a scandal that arose at Southern Utah University where a faculty member resigned in frustration due to what she perceived to be leniency toward overt plagiarism among international students at her institution. The faculty member cited the $20,000 per year revenue stream each student brought to the university as a possible reason why students continued to be passed on to their next courses in spite of their blatant plagiarism. These types of conflicts are

examples of micropolitical influences that can shape a college's approach to plagiarism prevention, education, and response.

Behrendt, Bennett, and Boothy (2010) conducted research with 158 faculty members. The research findings indicated that not all faculty members feel supported when formally addressing issues of plagiarism. Behrendt et al. (2010) found that 6.3% of faculty members did not feel supported after reporting an incident to their chairperson and 4.4% did not feel supported after reporting an incident to their dean. Of the faculty members surveyed, 6.3% stated they did not feel the judicial process and final outcome of the incidents they did report were fair (Behrendt et al., 2010). These data support the notion that although small in size, there are a number of faculty members who are discontent with the reporting process of academic dishonesty issues.

Another important consideration is the number of faculty members who are following the school's process for reporting. Behrendt et al. (2010) found that one-fifth of the faculty members reported encountering student plagiarism in their courses but did not formally report it. A closer examination of the relationship among faculty members and administrators and faculty members and students is merited to explore what additional underlying reasons may help explain why faculty members are not formally reporting incidents of plagiarism that occur in the classroom.

Resources

Another important aspect of micropolitics in education relates to the allocation of resources (Blase & Blase, 2002; Flessa, 2009; Marshall & Scribner, 1991). Colleges and universities have differing resources for addressing academic integrity. Resources can include but are not limited to dedicated personnel to address issues relating to academic

dishonesty and the promotion of academic integrity, plagiarism detection software, training sessions for faculty members and students, financial and monetary resources for targeted activities to promote academic integrity such as orientations, events, guest speakers, posters, and newsletters, among others. Schools such as the University of California San Diego (UCSD) have their own Academic Integrity Office, led by prominent academic integrity scholar, Dr. Bertram Gallant (University of California San Diego, n.d.). A visit to the Academic Integrity Office's website at UCSD shows many resources for students and faculty members on academic integrity, three staff members devoted to academic integrity issues, including the role of students as peer educators and academic integrity awards for students and faculty members. This compares to a report written by Maffly (2012) of the University of Southern Utah that did not have plagiarism detection software nor targeted training for its faculty members to address issues relating to academic dishonesty.

Time is also a scarce resource for many faculty members and administrators. Without designated personnel to address academic dishonesty, there is a risk that issues relating to academic dishonesty may not always be properly addressed due to lack of manpower and/or system support. Facing many papers to grade and conflicts to resolve, overworked faculty members or administrators may not properly pursue all cases of academic dishonesty they encounter and/or receive. Faculty members may be hesitant to report plagiarism if the process is a manual one, as is the case with schools where there is no centralized system or way to report academic dishonesty incidents or an automated way to check students' previous history of plagiarism cases. This painstaking reality is

largely ignored in the literature on academic integrity and one this study was designed to address.

The micropolitical perspective helps situate schools as political organizations, with their own unique challenges relating to power differentials, conflict among stakeholders, and struggles regarding how to distribute limited resources. The literature on academic integrity does not include an examination of this topic through the micropolitical lens, and this was the gap addressed in the conduction of this study. Examining a college department's approach to academic integrity in the context of micropolitics provided a new perspective on the understanding of plagiarism prevention, education, and response that has been previously unexplored.

Approaches to Plagiarism Prevention, Education, and Response

University leaders that respond holistically to plagiarism acknowledge that mitigating plagiarism is a shared responsibility of students, faculty members, and administrators (Hrasky & Kronenberg, 2011; Macdonald & Carroll, 2006; Whitley & Keith-Spiegel, 2001). To support this effort, much of the literature for this chapter was organized surrounding the three categories of plagiarism: prevention, education, and response. Plagiarism prevention relates to the measures faculty members and administrators can institute to help discourage plagiarism from occurring among students. Plagiarism education relates to the specific training that can be instituted for faculty members, staff, and students to help encourage academic integrity on the college campus. Plagiarism response relates to how plagiarism is addressed in higher education once it occurs. The prevalence of plagiarism and the negative consequences it has for students,

the faculty members, and the university merits a coordinated institutional response involving all three areas.

Plagiarism Prevention

A review of the literature found many researchers advocating for a greater focus on preventive measures to reduce plagiarism, rather than punitive approaches (Boehm, Justice, & Weeks, 2009; den Ouden & van Wijk, 2011; McMahon, 2009; Wheeler & Anderson, 2010). Preventive strategies can range from faculty members including the policy on academic dishonesty on their syllabus and reviewing it the first day of class with students, to the adoption of an honor code at a college. An analysis of the literature that addresses preventative approaches can be grouped into five main areas: (a) instructional design, (b) school/classroom culture, (c) commitment to values and the honor code, (d) policies, and (e) technology.

Instructional design. Instructional design considerations relate to the assignments and assessments faculty members use in their classes. Faculty members who purposefully design student assignments to elicit critical thinking and original thought can help reduce the incidents of plagiarism among their students (Davis, 2011; den Ouden & van Wijk, 2011; Heckler, Forde, & Bryan, 2013; Hrasky & Kronenberg, 2011; Macdonald & Carroll, 2006). Assignments that are unique and require students to integrate their personal experiences are harder to plagiarize because the information for the assignment is not easily accessible online. Purposeful planning of class assignments is an important, and simple preventative measure faculty members can take to reduce incidents of plagiarism.

Faculty members can also help prevent plagiarism through their instruction by the number of times they use the same assessment and the parameters they set for assignments. Faculty members can alter their assessments (and assignments) yearly to help reduce plagiarism (Hrasky & Kronenberg, 2011). Not altering the assessment can increase its availability among the student body, and possibly, the chances for students to cheat. Faculty members can also support students early in the writing process by reviewing and offering feedback to students on their notes, outlines, and/or drafts as part of the submission process (Spencer, 2010). Faculty members can require students to submit their notes (Davis, 2011) or the articles they used as references in their paper (Heckler et al., 2013) as part of the final submission of their work. These measures can signal to students that faculty members will hold them accountable for completing their own work throughout the entire writing process.

Instructional design also relates to assessment decisions in the classroom. Macdonald and Carroll (2006) advocated for purposeful design of assessments in class to help reduce incidents of plagiarism. Specifically, the use of formative assessment can help faculty members ascertain students' knowledge of note taking, paraphrasing, and referencing so that the instructor can modify his or her instructional approach accordingly. Macdonald and Carroll (2006) emphasized the importance of using low stakes assessments to help reduce students' incentives to cheat in class and to enhance the faculty members' instruction. The authors recommended faculty members focus more on the assessment *for* learning through formative assessment than the assessment *of* learning through summative high-stakes exams.

To research the effectiveness of formative assessment in addressing plagiarism at an Australian university, Volkov, Volkov, and Tedford (2011) implemented a formative referencing assignment in two college accounting courses of 528 total students. The formative task required students to complete a 750-word essay with at least three references from different sources. The students then received detailed individualized feedback on their assignment from the faculty member on the students' referencing skills. A post-assessment survey was returned by 138 students, representing a 26% response rate. The results showed that the undergraduate and graduate students gained greater confidence in their referencing skills, writing skills, and an overall improved understanding of plagiarism from this formative assessment task, supporting the usefulness and applicability of formative assessments to proactively address plagiarism.

Faculty members' instructional design plays an important role in plagiarism prevention. Assignments and assessments that promote critical thinking enhance students' understanding of plagiarism and help build students' writing and referencing skills are an important part of a holistic approach to a complex problem. Beyond instructional decisions, faculty members have an important role in contributing to an environment that promotes academic integrity within their own classroom and institution of learning. This leads to the next categories of preventative measures, school, and classroom culture.

School and classroom culture. Preventing plagiarism involves more than faculty members designing assignments and assessments that are original and formative. Faculty members and school administrators also have a critical role in creating an environment where plagiarism is dealt with proactively and an emphasis is placed on

plagiarism prevention (Boehm et al., 2009; Davis, 2011; McMahon, 2009; Morris, 2009). Strategies to create this culture involve a mixture of approaches at both the school level and the individual classroom level. At the school level a strong commitment to values and the adoption of an honor code are important initiatives colleges and universities are embracing to socialize academic integrity on campus (Christensen, Hughes, & McCabe, 2006; McCabe & Trevino, 2002). At the classroom level, the faculty members' general approach (Carroll, 2009; Martin, 2008; Smith, 2012) and their expectations of students' behavior in the classroom as it pertains to plagiarism (Allemand, 2012; Hard et al., 2006; Martin, 2008; McCabe & Pavela, 2004; Power, 2009) also contribute to the school's efforts to reduce academic dishonesty on campus.

School level: Commitment to values and the honor code. Academic integrity is more than the absence of academic dishonesty. The International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI) (2013) described academic integrity as,

> a commitment to five fundamental values: honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility. We [ICAI] believe that these five values, plus the courage to act on them even in the face of adversity, are truly foundational to the academy. Without them, everything that we do in our capacities as teachers, learners, and researchers loses value and becomes suspect. (p. 2)

This approach lays an important foundation and helps foster a campus culture where academic integrity is expected and demanded by the major stakeholders, including students. Through regular and honest dialogue with students and faculty members on these values, the culture over time can be changed to have a positive influence on the academic environment, peer culture, and the students (Martin, 2008). The active

socialization of these broader values aligned with academic integrity sets the foundation for a more systematic approach to promoting academic integrity, mainly through school-based honor codes.

An honor code on campus is an important way colleges and universities promote a culture of academic integrity on campus. Traditional honor codes are based on the values of honor and integrity and are dependent on all stakeholders creating a culture where academic dishonesty is not accepted. The basic pillars of traditional honor codes are un-proctored exams, a judicial process run primarily by students, a written student pledge requiring that students attest to the originality of the work they are submitting, and a requirement that students report incidents of dishonesty (McCabe & Treviño, 2002). Creating the culture needed for a full honor code may be challenging for large schools and/or schools with a large student body of part-time commuter students (Jocoy & DiBiase, 2006). As a result, some schools may opt for a modified honor code which includes some of the basic pillars, but not all. Although modified and traditional honor codes are different, they share two elements, a commitment to academic integrity at the highest level of the university and student participation in the judicial process (McCabe & Trevino, 2002).

McCabe and Trevino (2002) researched the effectiveness of honor codes in studies spanning 14,000 students across 58 different campuses. The authors found that overall academic dishonesty is significantly lower on campuses with honor codes or modified honor codes compared to schools without them. More students cheated at non-code campuses and those that did, cheated more often. McCabe (2005) acknowledged that high levels of academic dishonesty can exist at schools with honor codes, and low

levels can characterize non-code schools. The honor code alone must be accompanied by a student culture of academic integrity at the campus for it to be effective. The significant influence of peer culture on the levels of academic dishonesty was also a major finding from Bower's germinal study surveying college deans, student body presidents, and students at 99 colleges in the United States (Bowers, 1966). Decades later, peer culture continues to influence the decisions people make in college. A peer culture that disapproves of academic dishonesty helps promote a culture of academic integrity on campus (Bowers, 1966; McCabe, Butterfield, & Treviño, 2003).

At the school level, a school culture that discourages academic cheating and has an honor code can play a significant role in reducing plagiarism among students (Bowers, 1966; McCabe et al., 2003). Faculty members and administrators are also important influences on helping to prevent academic dishonesty through their approach in class with students. The next section includes a discussion of the influence faculty members play in preventing plagiarism.

Individual level: Faculty approach. Faculty members and administrators can take two approaches when attempting to change a cheating culture (Gallant & Drinan, 2006a; Roig & Caso, 2005). The first is based on distrust, and the premise is that students will cheat. Under this approach, the focus is on making cheating more difficult, including proctoring exams, specific seat assignments, different versions of tests, not allowing bags in the class, requiring a photo identification to sit for a test, among others. This approach is illustrated by Badke (2007), "if we can train the catchers to be plagiarism detectives and show the would-be deliberate perpetrators how easy it can be to catch them, we're halfway toward eradicating plagiarism" (p. 50). Cole and Kiss (2000)

argued that this approach will not bring forth the desired results because a competition can ensue between faculty members and students on who can outwit the other with unique approaches to cheating or curbing cheating.

The second approach faculty members can take is educational. Under this approach, the instructor focuses on teaching students why they should not cheat and why academic integrity is important (Roig & Caso, 2005). Essential to this approach is a focus on instilling values such as trust and integrity through meaningful and open discussions, and promoting students' ethical and intellectual growth as a powerful preventive strategy to minimize academic dishonesty (Levine, 2001; Roig & Caso, 2005). This approach is in contrast to the rhetoric based on the imminent detection and reporting of plagiarism (Levine, 2001).

Faculty members' approaches also involve the expectations faculty members have of students as it relates to academic integrity. In a study by Hard et al. (2006) of 421 students and 157 faculty members at a medium sized state university in the northeastern United States, the authors found that a faculty member's belief that student academic misconduct frequently occurs will have a direct impact on the actual levels of misconduct that occur. Hard et al. (2006) argued that faculty members who believe academic misconduct is common place will make more of an effort in creating assignments which are hard to plagiarize, while also being more vigilant in their detection of plagiarism. Research by Hard et al. (2006) found that this proactive approach by faculty members contributes to less academic dishonesty among students.

Research on academic integrity that spanned over 20 years by Vandehey, Diekhoff, and LaBeff (2007) supported Hard et al. (2006) and found that students' fear of

being caught and punished was an effective deterrent to students engaging in academic dishonesty. Among the external deterrents identified in the study, faculty members' vigilance was also listed. The way a faculty member approaches academic dishonesty appears to have a role in curbing plagiarism.

By studying the micropolitical considerations that are part of a college department's approach to plagiarism, this researcher examined faculty members and administrator expectations and approaches more closely to determine the primary approach each adopts when addressing plagiarism (i.e., punishment, educational, combination of both, or no approach) and the degree of alignment among faculty members and between faculty members and administrators. The research revealed valuable insight on how faculty members and administrators' expectations and approaches conflict or coincide, an area currently in need of more exploration in the literature.

Policies. Faculty members and institutional policies related to academic integrity are important in plagiarism prevention. Two of the frequent themes related to academic integrity policies are the degree to which the academic integrity policy is defined and understood by faculty members (Allemand, 2012; Bouman, 2009; Power, 2009; Wilkinson, 2009) and the inclusion of policies on academic integrity on the course syllabi (Allemand, 2012; Bruwelheide, 2010; Davis, 2011). As preventative measures, these are important because faculty members are in the classroom with students and the faculty member's own understanding of academic integrity and general approach to the topic can set the tone and expectations for the course.

Study findings have shown that discrepancies exist among faculty members in both their understanding of plagiarism in the classroom and how they enforce and train students on this topic (Bouman, 2009; Power, 2009; Wilkinson, 2009). It is important for faculty members to have a clear understanding of the school's academic integrity policy and the definition of academic dishonesty to minimize inconsistencies among faculty members and increased confusion for students (Bouman, 2009; Power, 2009; Wilkinson, 2009). In a three-part study of faculty members and students at public and private institutions in New York, Roig (2001) found that faculty members' and students' views on plagiarism did not differ on clear cases of plagiarism. In more unclear matters related to plagiarism, though, more variability appeared from both a student and faculty member perspective (Roig, 2001). A more consistent approach would likely minimize student confusion and redefine faculty members' and students' understanding of academic integrity, thus contributing to a more optimal environment for learning.

One way members of the faculty can minimize inconsistencies in the approach to plagiarism is by clearly outlining expectations as they relate to plagiarism and originality on the course syllabus. The syllabus serves as the learning contract between the faculty members and students. As a result, it is important to include class and university policies pertaining to academic integrity in the course syllabus (Bruwelheide, 2010; Davis, 2011). Baetz et al. (2011) also found that it is important for faculty members to stipulate what academic integrity is and is not on the syllabus, especially on how this relates to group work.

Technology. Another preventative approach to plagiarism is the use of technology tools, including plagiarism detection services such as Turn-it-In™ to detect

plagiarism and improve students' writing ability, in addition to online educational tutorials (Biggam & McCann, 2010; Marshall, Taylor, Hothersall, & Pérez-Martín, 2011). Technology has played an interesting role in this context because it has been simultaneously used to enhance faculty members' ability to detect academic dishonesty, while also providing students access to an abundance of online sites, including paper mills that are easily accessible by students to plagiarize assignments if desired (Belter & Pré, 2009; Park, Mardis, & Ury, 2011). Studies have shown that Turn-it-In™ and other similar detection programs can help students avoid plagiarism if used as an educational tool (Biggam & McCann, 2010; Chao et al., 2009; Davis, 2011; Davis & Carroll, 2009; Kostka, 2012); although, faculty members and students alike have misinterpreted the results of the similarity reports by relying too narrowly on the percentages themselves, rather than carefully evaluating the report findings (Koshy, 2009).

In addition to plagiarism detection software, online tutorials have been successfully used to help students understand and prevent plagiarism (Hrasky & Kronenberg, 2011; Paterson, Taylor, & Usick, 2003; Pritchett, 2010; Robinson-Zañartu et al., 2005). The use of technology, including plagiarism detection services and online tutorials, are important ways faculty members and students can prevent plagiarism. Further efforts are also needed and essential to mitigate plagiarism in schools. This case study provided a systematic analysis and understanding of plagiarism prevention efforts between the education department faculty members and administrators at Esperanza University and contributed to the literature in this area.

Plagiarism Education

Plagiarism education is an important component of a university's approach to promoting academic integrity on campus. As succinctly stated by McMahon (2009), "Students don't need threats; students need pedagogy" (p. 65). Some of the major themes in the literature relating to educational efforts include discussing what plagiarism and originality are and why they matter (Batane, 2010; den Ouden & Van Wijk, 2011; Power, 2009) and a focus on some of the fundamentals including citations, paraphrasing, note-taking (Belter & Pré, 2009; de Ouden & Van Wijk, 2011; Macdonald & Carroll, 2006; McMahon, 2009). What is evident is that telling students not to plagiarize on its own is an ineffective strategy, and the reasons students plagiarize are varied and complex. In addition, efforts should be made to educate faculty members appropriately to ensure they understand plagiarism, what they can do to help prevent it from occurring, and how to respond when it does occur.

Students. Power (2009) presented a call to action to academics to refrain from immediately judging students who plagiarize as immoral, but rather Power encouraged faculty members to spend more time with students to ensure they fully understand what plagiarism is and why it is important. This involves discussing intellectual property and what it means (McMahon, 2009), and teaching the importance of ownership and how plagiarizing text/words from an author is unfair to the original author (Batane, 2010). Incoming college students, especially some international students, who do not understand the meaning of plagiarism and why it is considered inappropriate in higher education in the United States, need formal teaching about academic integrity (Paterson et al., 2003).

Instruction on avoiding plagiarism starts with direct instruction on what it is and why it matters.

Plagiarism education also involves a focus on the fundamentals, including note-taking, citation conventions, and paraphrasing skills. Paraphrasing, in particular, can be a challenge for both students and faculty members. Walker (2008) researched some of the difficulties students face when addressing plagiarism and found that students sometimes engage in unintentional plagiarism due to unclear notions of what plagiarism is and how to paraphrase text. Classroom discussions, student workshops on academic integrity, orientations, and academic codes of integrity (Davis, 2011; McCabe & Pavela, 2004) are some of the ways students receive instructon on what plagiarism is and how to avoid it.

Faculty. Direct instruction on how to avoid plagiarism is not just for students. Training sessions for faculty members on how to recognize plagiarism and address it in the classroom are essential and according to one study, deemed by administrators as the most effective way to address plagiarism (Boehm et al., 2009). Formalized instruction on academic dishonesty for faculty members is important because there is a wide variation in the consequences faculty assign to students (Robinson-Zañartu et al., 2005). Training is especially important when it comes to addressing less obvious cases of plagiarism as various studies have shown significant discrepancies exist among faculty members in their understanding of plagiarism in the classroom and how they enforce and train students on this topic (Bouman, 2009; Power, 2009; Wilkinson, 2009). This case study included the examination of plagiarism education efforts, as they relate to faculty members and student training sessions. The findings from this case study contributed to the literature on plagiarism education for both faculty members and students. Limited

research on faculty training, in particular is available in the literature, and the intent was for the findings from the study to help fill this gap.

Plagiarism prevention and education are important because they help proactively prevent plagiarism from occurring in the classroom. This is an important component, but it is also critical to examine how faculty members react when incidents do occur. This leads to the next section, plagiarism response.

Plagiarism Response

Preventive and educational approaches are essential, but not sufficient for addressing academic dishonesty. Consistent enforcement of policies, when infractions occur, is also a vital component (Jocoy & DiBiase, 2006). Not addressing plagiarism can contribute to a negative peer culture that can encourage increased academic dishonesty within the student body (Heckler et al., 2013).

Plagiarism response can be examined using two lenses: faculty response and institutional response. Faculty response refers to how faculty members sanction students in the classroom when plagiarism occurs. Institutional response examines how administrators address plagiarism within the college/university and its approach to promoting academic integrity and reducing academic dishonesty.

Faculty response. According to research studies, there is a wide variation on how faculty members view and respond to plagiarism in terms of the consequences assigned to students. Robinson-Zañarthu et al. (2005) conducted a survey of 270 faculty members to examine the extent to which they detected plagiarism and how they felt addressing plagiarism incidents. Robinson-Zañartu et al. (2005) found a wide variation in the consequences faculty members assign to students. Specifically, although faculty

members appeared not to have difficulties addressing plagiarism in their own classroom, they hesitated in reporting the issue to the university directly. Less reluctance was evident when the plagiarism offense was severe (Carroll, 2009; Robinson-Zañarthu et al., 2005; Vandehey, Diekhoff, & LaBeff, 2007). Even in these circumstances, there were high variations in the sanctions the faculty members chose (Robinson-Zañarthu et al., 2005). Additional studies that show that students perceive faculty members to be inconsistent with their approach, teaching, and sanctioning of student's plagiarism (Bouman, 2009; Power, 2009; Roig, 2001; Wilkinson, 2009) support these findings. Robinson-Zañarthu et al. (2005) argued that these inconsistencies are likely due to unclear definitions of plagiarism. The results of their quantitative study did not have the scope to explore this issue more deeply. Since plagiarism can best be seen as an adaptive challenge, rather than a technical one, there may be micropolitical considerations that are yet to be examined that can account for the significant variance in faculty members' response found in the Robinson-Zañarthu's et al. study. Issues relating to the relationship between faculty members and administration, direct or indirect pressures to act in a certain way, adequate resources to support faculty training and adjudication hearings, among others, may also be possible explanations. The focus of this case study of the education department at Esperanza University was to discover new meanings relative to the role micropolitical considerations may have in plagiarism prevention, education, and response.

The variations in faculty members' responses are also fueled by how faculty members perceive the students' intent to plagiarize (East, 2010; Flint, Clegg, & Macdonald, 2006; Paterson et al., 2003). If faculty members view plagiarism as an

immoral act, they are more inclined to react with emotion (East, 2010). Emotional responses can lead to a harsher sanction (East, 2010). If faculty members perceive plagiarism to be an issue related to convention, then they approach students differently, focusing more on providing students additional training, versus sanctions (East, 2010). Similarly, in a qualitative study of nursing students conducted by Paterson et al. (2003), the findings indicated that faculty members relied mainly on students' perceived intent to determine how they sanctioned their students, with harsher sanctions being issued for students the faculty members thought intentionally plagiarized.

Faculty members also respond differently to instances of plagiarism based on their own understanding of institutional procedures and their willingness to spend time going through the process of reporting and confronting the student (Auer & Kruper, 2001; Brown & Choong, 2005; Gallant, 2008). Some faculty members may not report incidents because they do not feel they have their administration's support and/or they fear some type of student retribution or harassment (Gallant, 2008). In addition, some faculty members hesitate to report students because they do not want to tarnish the students' record and/or they would rather address the issue in their own classroom, rather than through the formal institutional process (Auer & Krupar, 2001; Liebler, 2009). Some faculty members do not report plagiarism incidents at all due to their own level of discomfort in approaching the student (Singh & Bennington, 2012). Additional factors which influence how faculty members respond to plagiarism incidents include poorly defined university policies relating to unclear plagiarism cases; absence of a commonly accepted and socialized definition of plagiarism; discrepancy in the way faculty members from different disciplines approach plagiarism; and the lack of clarity on the statute of

limitations in plagiarism cases and the processing time (Paterson et al., 2003). While the reasons may be different, what is clear from reviewing the literature on faculty members' responses to plagiarism is that faculty members' responses to student plagiarism are inconsistent. This case study of the education department at Esperanza University helped further explore possible variations in the response from faculty members and administrators to student plagiarism and assessed what influence micropolitical considerations have in these responses. This leads to institutional responses, which address a school's broader response to incidents of academic dishonesty.

Institutional response. The research indicates clearly that plagiarism and academic dishonesty is a concern for institutions of higher learning. University leaders have responded to these allegations and problems differently, mostly aligning with two general schools of thought, rule compliance, and integrity (Bruwelheide, 2010; Hrasky & Kronberg, 2011; Mahaffey, 2010). The rule compliance strategy focuses on responding to plagiarism while the integrity strategy focuses on prevention and education through training, character development, and ethics (Auer & Krupar, 2001; Liebler, 2009).

The rule compliance strategy developed over the last 60 years and was prevalent in colleges and universities in the 1960s through the 1980s (Gallant, 2011). Some of the factors that contributed to the dominance of this approach were student unrest, the fear of litigation, and a 1961 court ruling on mandatory due process for students *Dixon v. Alabama State Board of Education* (as cited in Gallant, 2011). Punitive approaches are those that focus more on punishment than remediation. University administrators and faculty members pursuing a punitive orientation may reflect their views in the language

they adopt in their syllabi (Sutherland-Smith, 2010) and/or the sanctions they impose on students.

Sutherland-Smith (2010) researched the language used in university plagiarism policies at the top 20 colleges in Australia and revealed support for the rule compliance strategy. The findings concluded that the language used in the syllabi describing the process show evidence that many schools are adopting more legalistic language when addressing academic dishonesty similar to criminal law, more so than the process being one of remediation and learning. This is supported by the research of Gallant and Drinan (2006a) where the authors argued that universities focus more on policies and procedures (existence of policies, following of policies, and meeting spaces) as opposed to creating awareness and promoting academic integrity.

The movement in higher education is shifting from a punitive approach to plagiarism to an approach that promotes academic integrity via education and learning experiences (Gallant, 2008). Gallant (2008) encouraged administrators to adopt a teaching and learning model where students are not the only focus of the school's interventions and actions relating to academic integrity. As stated by Gallant (2008), the focus has shifted from faculty members and administrators asking themselves, "How do we stop students from cheating?" to, "How do we ensure students are learning?" (p. 6). The position of the education department staff on the continuum of punitive to educational responses to plagiarism was an important focus of this case study.

Approaches to plagiarism prevention, education, and response can be best understood by using micropolitics coupled with political organizational theory as a

framework to view interventions and evaluate their progress. Examining plagiarism using both perspectives enhanced the study's focus and the contributions to the field.

Theoretical Framework and Related Theories

Micropolitics was the focus of investigation of the case study, so the theoretical framework must also center on organizational politics. Organizational political theory as set forth by Gallant and Drinan (2006b) was the selected theoretical framework used to explore the micropolitical considerations within the education department at Esperanza University. A synopsis of related organizational theories and a presentation of the reasons why the organizational political theory of Gallant and Drinan (2006b) was best suited for this case study clearly illustrated the relationship between micropolitics and the selected theoretical framework for this study. While describing the organizational political theory of Gallant and Drinan (2006b), parallels were made connecting micropolitics and the selected framework.

Organizational/Political Theories

Organizational theories provide a framework to look at an entire organization as a system. Among the theories examined in this literature review are the student development approach (Kibler, 1993), the academic integrity institutionalization approach (Gallant & Drinan, 2006a), and the political theory approach to understanding academic integrity change movements and institutionalization (Gallant & Drinan, 2006b). The selected theory for this research was the political theory approach to understanding academic integrity change movements and institutionalization postulated by Gallant and Drinan (2006b). This approach uses political theory to address more complex

underlying factors that can potentially impact a college department's approach to academic integrity.

Student development approach. Kibler (1993) examined academic dishonesty from a student development approach. Development perspectives focus on the whole student and how he or she interacts with the college environment and how this impacts the development of young adults (Kibler, 1992). Kibler (1992) based his work on developmental theory and identified five categories under student development perspectives, "psychosocial theories, cognitive developmental theories, maturity models, typology models, and person-environment interaction models" (p. 31). The models that relate the most to academic integrity are psychosocial theories, cognitive developmental theories, and typology models (Kibler, 1992). Psychosocial theories relate to the life events that occur in a person's life and how they respond to these events and changes. Cognitive-structural theories address how people make meaning and reason their experiences, including how they respond to ethical and moral dilemmas. The application of typology models extend to a variety of areas because this model focuses on how different phenomena interact with development, such as learning style, personality type, and others (Kibler, 1992). Educational leaders can integrate these models to create an environment conducive to learning, development, and discovery (Kibler, 1992).

Kibler (1993) adopted a developmental perspective in his approach to academic integrity by assessing how and why schools can address academic dishonesty. This framework used three means of intervention: ethos, program, and policies as they relate to academic integrity (Kibler, 1993). These three means of intervention include seven components: "honor codes, communication, training, faculty assistance, disciplinary

policies, disciplinary process/programs, and promotion of academic integrity" (Kibler, 1993, p. 13). Kibler (1993) affirmed that schools needed to address academic dishonesty by promoting academic integrity and adopting preventative measures. Under this approach, academic dishonesty involves all stakeholders, including student affairs personnel, faculty members, and students.

The approach set forth by Kibler (1993) is helpful in understanding organizational considerations because Kibler (1993) looked at the entire university as a system and set a framework for understanding and studying ethos, programs, and policies and specific interventions based on this holistic approach. The limitation of this model is that Kibler (1993) continued to position the student as the person to blame for cheating and the individual serves as the unit of analysis instead of the organization (Gallant & Drinan, 2006b), although organizational components are addressed.

Academic institutionalization theory. Gallant and Drinan (2006a) explored institutionalizing academic integrity and the perceptions of administrators and institutional actions in their study. Gallant and Drinan (2006a) used a theoretical framework to understand three areas: different types of institutionalization strategies universities implement to address academic dishonesty; the factors supporting and opposing this process; and how these factors differed by the type of institution. Using a model based on academic institutionalization, Gallant and Drinan (2006a) investigated six areas: structures, procedures, symbols, obstacles, champions, and catalysts.

Structural indicators refer to the resource allocations (including space, budget, and staffing) related to the promotion of academic integrity, educational outreach on academic integrity, and the investigation and adjudication process (Gallant & Drinan,

2006a). Procedural indicators refer to school policies on academic integrity, honor codes, the compliance of the policies by faculty members and students, and the degree to which these policies are followed consistently by all stakeholders (Gallant & Drinan, 2006a). Cultural indicators may include the tradition of academic integrity at the school and how staff, faculty members, and students address academic integrity on campus, including what terminology is used and how faculty members, students, and administrators are involved in promoting academic integrity (Gallant & Drinan, 2006a). Gallant and Drinan (2006a) also examined the presence of specific obstacles to academic integrity institutionalization, the champions who purposefully advocate for academic integrity on campus, and catalysts—individuals who have the potential to notably contribute in promoting academic integrity.

Although the academic integrity institutionalization model is in line with the research questions designed for this study, the framework did not adequately represent the political considerations and social forces that are present in higher education. In addition to the micropolitical considerations previously outlined in this literature review, there are distinct macropolitical influences. According to Stanley (2010), schools face significant external pressures, including pressures related to accountability and funding. Publicly funded colleges and universities in the United States experienced 4 consecutive years of budget cuts (Kelderman, 2013). For the 2013/2014 fiscal year, modest increases in appropriations for many states are expected in exchange for university leaders freezing state tuition and/or tying money to increased student completion rates (Kelderman, 2013). In the study of the education department at Esperanza University, a large publicly funded research institution, these macropolitical pressures were no exception.

Applying political organizational theory to this study was also worthwhile because it allowed for a closer examination among the stakeholders within the university. Administrators and faculty members in higher education are often divided among themselves on the vision of the university and its core mission (Stanley, 2010). Shifts in power within the university and among stakeholders merit a closer look at how stakeholders interact at the university level and how individual values, assumptions, and perspectives (Stanley, 2010) shape these interactions. Applying a political theory to study academic integrity will permit such analysis. The application of political theory follows.

The political theory of Gallant and Drinan. Gallant and Drinan (2006b) examined academic integrity using political theory by positioning academic dishonesty as a problem of student corruption that threatens the integrity of the institution. To examine academic integrity from this perspective, Gallant and Drinan (2006b) combined four-frame change theory (Bolman & Deal, 1997) and theory of institutionalization (Huntington, 1968). The combination of these theories permits strategic analysis of the problem and possible solutions from different perspectives not common in the literature on academic integrity. Together the theories help frame organizational change and the institutionalization of changes within the fabric of a university. The application of political theories to higher education is rare (Gallant & Drinan, 2006b) and conducting a case study using this theoretical approach added to the body of knowledge and contributed a new perspective to understand academic dishonesty.

Bolman and Deal (1997) advocated for a four-frame approach to understanding organizations. The researchers' four-frames include the (a) structural frame, (b) human

resources frame, (c) political frame, and (d) symbolic frame (Gallant & Drinan, 2006b). Although only one frame is specifically political, all frames reinforce key concepts related to micropolitics. The structural frame refers to the structures in place within an organization that help drive increased quality and performance (Gallant & Drinan, 2006b). When applied to academic integrity issues, this involves the adoption of best practices by universities to promote academic integrity, such as committees, policies, and procedures (Gallant & Drinan, 2006b). The frame aligns with the topic as micropolitics taps into the process of policy adoption and implementation.

The human resources frame refers to personal relationships within the organization (Gallant & Drinan, 2006b). When applied to academic integrity, the human resources frame involves relationships, such as the relationship among faculty members and students in teaching and learning the course curriculum, and the dynamics between administrators and faculty members in developing and delivering training sessions pertaining to academic integrity (Gallant & Drinan, 2006b). Micropolitics complements the human resource frame because exploring the relationships among stakeholders, power influences, and decision-making can shed light on how training sessions and curriculum pertaining to academic integrity are adopted and implemented.

Using the political frame, the organization is positioned as a political unit, with differing interests and perspectives that can contribute to competition for power and resources (Gallant & Drinan, 2006b). Using the political frame to analyze academic dishonesty, the importance of forming coalitions among faculty members, administrators, and students to address academic integrity becomes apparent (Gallant & Drinan, 2006b). The political frame explicitly addresses many of the central tenants of micropolitics.

The symbolic frame focuses on the symbols that are a part of the fabric of an organization, including rituals, stories, and ceremonies. As applied to academic integrity, the symbolic frame supports the analysis of the way symbols are used to manage academic integrity on campus. A prime example of this frame is the adoption of the honor code that is prevalent in many schools today (Gallant & Drinan, 2006b). Understanding micropolitics compliments the symbolic frame because micropolitics examines the internal and external forces that influence decision-making and these forces can manifest themselves through rituals, symbols, and myths in diverse ways.

The political institutionalization theory set forth by Huntington (1965) provides a framework to examine how leaders internalize change within an organization. This is relevant to the topic of academic integrity because in order for new interventions in plagiarism prevention, education, and response to be meaningful, they must become socialized at the campus and integrated into policies, procedures, and teaching. Huntington (1965) provided insight to understanding the degree of institutionalization of changes on a college campus.

Huntington (1965) categorized institutionalization based on four criteria: adaptability, autonomy, complexity, and coherence. These four criteria align to the construct of micropolitics. Adaptability refers to an organization's ability to adjust to new changes. In theory, an organization that is more adaptable will have greater ability to institutionalize new changes (Huntington, 1965). Huntington (1965) asserted that the adaptability of an organization is often measured by the organization's age. Age can be measured by the age of the organization, or how old it is. An organization that has existed for 80 years is more likely to exist for 81 years than a brand new organization is

likely to exist one additional year (Huntington, 1965). Another way age is measured is by generational age, or the organization's historical number of leaders (Huntington, 1965). If an organization has survived several changes in leadership successfully, it is more adaptable by its nature than an organization that has yet to experience a change in leadership (Huntington, 1965). An organization's adaptability can also be measured by its functional adaptability, or its ability to change its primary functions to continue as a thriving organization (Huntington, 1965). An organization that is functionally adaptable is more institutionalized than organizations that are functionally dependent (Huntington, 1965). The use of the micropolitical lens supports the adaptability criteria with its concept of resources. An organization's level of resources may influence how adaptable an organization is to changes.

Adaptability is important when understanding the institutionalization of academic integrity movements in higher education because organizations need to be able to adapt their approach to academic dishonesty as students explore new reasons for and ways to engage in academic dishonesty. A major shift was evident with the advent of the Internet, when information became abundant and easily accessible, contributing to increased plagiarism using electronic resources (Belter & Pré, 2009; Park, Mardis, & Ury, 2011). Schools must be able to adapt to changes in how and why students plagiarize so that they can adapt their responses to prevention, educational efforts, and respond accordingly.

The second characteristic identified by Huntington (1968) is autonomy. Autonomy refers to the extent to which an organization implements policies that are independent of other social forces (Huntington, 1965). An organization that is easily

influenced by outside forces, such as a government with political leaders whom are easily bribed, lacks autonomy (Huntington, 1965). The impact of social forces is gradual in autonomous organizations because the processes and structures are in place to respond appropriately to external forces (Huntington, 1965). When applied to academic integrity, this can be examined from several perspectives. Faculty members and administrators need some level of autonomy so that they are not easily swayed by pressures not to report a student for plagiarism when blatant plagiarism has occurred. An administrator also needs autonomy to issue and enforce necessary sanctions and not succumb to any pressures to ignore the issue in order to help increase the institution's completion rates or to avoid upsetting the student or his/her family. Autonomy may then relate to the degree to which the university and its stakeholders are able to follow the established procedures to address academic dishonesty when it takes place. This characteristic clearly aligns with the construct of micropolitics, because it taps into the underlying internal and external forces that influence a stakeholder's level of autonomy in decision-making.

The third characteristic Huntington (1965) used to examine institutionalization was the notion of complexity. Huntington (1965) argued that organizations that are more complex are highly institutionalized and more stable. When applied to academic integrity, the more complex the institutional initiative is relative to academic integrity, the more likely the initiative will be successful since the movement is not dependent on one department or champion. A micropolitcal approach focuses on coalitions and conflicts that emerge within an organization, and this knowledge is helpful in understanding organization complexity. The more complex an organization, the more likely it will have both coalitions and conflicts.

The fourth characteristic is coherence. The more coherence that exists within an organization, the greater its level of institutionalization. Coherence relates to the extent to which some general consensus exists among active stakeholders on the functional boundaries of the group and procedures (Huntington, 1965). As applied to academic integrity, the greater the consensus among faculty members, students, and administrators that exists in terms of what academic dishonesty is and how to address it, the greater the level of coherence in the school. Coherence does not imply that different voices are not considered but more that overall there is a level of consensus among key groups. The micropolitical perspective focuses on competing interests among stakeholders and the degree of agreement among each stakeholder, similar to elements addressed through the coherence characteristic.

Gallant and Drinan (2006b) combined both theories and offered six strategies for schools of higher education to address school plagiarism and academic dishonesty as a system-wide problem based on student corruption. In their study, Gallant and Drinan (2006b) indicated specifically the need for empirical studies to assess their model. Although the purpose of this case study was not to empirically test the application of political theory to academic integrity, the theoretical framework was useful for aiding with the understanding of how micropolitical considerations influence the education department's approach to plagiarism prevention, education, and response.

Case Study Research

Plagiarism and the broader field of academic dishonesty have been studied using many different approaches. Qualitative case studies of this phenomenon have been limited, considering the significant research done in this area using other research

designs. A review of the literature found several major areas explored by case studies, including faculty members' and/or students' perspectives on plagiarism and academic dishonesty (Allemand, 2012; Kostka, 2012; Li & Casanave, 2012; Mahaffaey, 2010; Smith, 2012), case studies examining the prevention, detection and remediation of plagiarism and/or cheating, (Biggam & McCann, 2010; Jocoy & Diabiase, 2006; Kostka, 2012; Marshall et al., 2011; Wheeler & Anderson, 2010; Wilson, Krause, & Xiang, 2010), and the role values, assumptions, and culture assume in the promotion of academic integrity (Dufresne, 2004; Gallant, 2007). Missing from these case studies are studies specifically examining micropolitical considerations, such as power and resources, and their influence on the interaction among faculty members and administrators in addressing academic integrity, which was what was addressed in this study. Gallant (2007) advocated for more qualitative case studies among different institutional types to examine the complexities involved in socializing academic integrity. The findings from this study contributed to the literature in this area.

Conclusions

The foundation of this study built on the academic integrity institutionalization research conducted by Gallant and Drinan (2006b) by including the faculty members' perspective. Coupling interviews with the examination of artifacts, including course syllabi, training materials, newsletter articles, school and faculty policies, statistical data on the prevalence of plagiarism and academic dishonesty, and other related documents related to plagiarism added value to the study's findings. Gallant and Drinan (2006a) called specifically for case studies of schools addressing academic integrity to examine the different roles of key stakeholders, which was one aspect during the conduction of

this study. The role of micropolitical considerations, such as resources and power, in the development of system-wide approaches to academic integrity, were also studied.

Chapter Summary

The comprehensive review of the literature regarding plagiarism in Chapter 2 included: a historical perspective; consequences of plagiarism; motivations for plagiarism, prevalence of plagiarism in academia; micropolitics and its role in understanding approaches to plagiarism; approaches to plagiarism prevention, education, and response; related theories; and case study research. This review served as a foundation to explore plagiarism prevention, education, and response strategies among faculty members and administrators in the education department at Esperanza University. Chapter 3 includes a detailed overview of the research design and method selected for this qualitative case study and its justification. An overview of the research plan was provided, including information regarding the population and sample, plans for data collection, and data analysis. Chapter 3 includes an examination of all methodological considerations.

Chapter 3

Method

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore the micropolitical considerations that influence the development of a systemic approach to plagiarism education, prevention, and response within the education department at Esperanza University. The education department was considered the case in this single case study. Chapter 3 is organized into eight sections. These are: (a) research questions, (b) justification of research design and method, (c) site, (d) data collection, (e) data analysis, (f) trustworthiness, and (g) chapter summary.

Research Questions

The research questions guiding this study were helpful for revealing the information needed to assist educational leaders in gaining more insight into the micropolitical considerations that influence the development of a systemic approach to plagiarism education, prevention, and response within a university setting. The research questions aligned with political organizational theory and the construct of micropolitics. The research questions used in this study are:

RQ1) In what ways might elements of micropolitics influence college department administrators and faculty members in their approach to plagiarism prevention, education, and response?

RQ1a) What degree of formal and/or informal power and influence do college administrators, and faculty members have, and how does this influence the department's approach to plagiarism prevention, education, and response?

RQ1b) How do college administrators and faculty members interact to address plagiarism prevention, education, and response within the education department?

RQ1c) How is academic integrity socialized within the education department?

RQ1d) How are policies and procedures relating to plagiarism prevention, education, and response adopted and implemented within the education department?

RQ1e) What roles do rituals, myths, and symbols play in informing the department's approach to plagiarism prevention, education, and response?

Justification of Research Method and Design

The qualitative method was the most appropriate method to examine the micropolitical considerations that influence the development of a systemic approach to plagiarism education, prevention, and response in the education department. Qualitative research is "an umbrella term covering an array of interpretive techniques which seek to describe, decode, translate, and otherwise come to terms with the meaning, not the frequency, of certain more or less naturally occurring phenomena in the social world" (Van Maanen, 1979, p. 520). The qualitative researcher sought to understand the participants' perspectives on how they make sense of their experiences within a particular context and their interactions within this context through an inductive process (Merriam, 2009). As explained by Neuman (2003), qualitative researchers "emphasize conducting detailed examinations of cases that arise in the natural flow of social life" (p. 139). The product of the qualitative method is a rich description of a phenomenon within a particular context (Merriam, 2009; Neuman, 2003).

Researchers using the quantitative method focus on measuring variables and testing hypothesis through deductive reasoning (Neuman, 2003). While the use of the quantitative method may help determine quantitative measures relating to plagiarism, such as its prevalence, the characteristics of students who plagiarize, among others, this design was limiting because this data alone did not help gain a deep understanding of the micropolitical considerations that influence plagiarism education, prevention, and response within the education department at Esperanza University. Due to the exploratory nature of this contemporary research, a qualitative method was best suited to approach the study's research questions.

The qualitative case study design was the selected and appropriate design for this study. The case study is well suited to examine the *how* and *why* of social phenomenon (Yin, 2009), which are in line with the research questions used for this study. The underlying goals of the other designs are different. Phenomenological studies are appropriate when studying individuals' lived experiences (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010). The intent of this study was to explore the complex interaction between faculty members, administrators, and students in approaching plagiarism using organizational theory, rather than focusing on the lived experiences of the stakeholders. Ethnographic studies are well suited when the focus is on the way culture affects the way a group behaves and its interaction (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010; Merriam, 2009). Although this study was designed to discover how faculty members and administrators interacted in approaching student plagiarism, the intention was to understand their relationship as part of a larger system, more so than exploring the culture in depth. Grounded theory is focused on creating a theory from the data collected (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010) which was outside the scope of

this study. The review of the varying qualitative approaches supported the decision to select the case study method to explore the micropolitical considerations that influence the development of a systemic approach to plagiarism education, prevention, and response within the education department at Esperanza University. The case study design helped "uncover the interaction of significant factors characteristic of the phenomenon" (Merriam, 2009, pp. 42-43), which was the goal of conducting this study.

The case study is recommended when the focus of the research is to understand the *why* and *how* of social phenomenon, when the subject is contemporary, and the researcher has minimal to no impact on the social phenomenon (Yin, 2009). Given these three main conditions of case study research, this approach was appropriate to explore the micropolitical considerations that influence the development of a systemic approach to plagiarism education, prevention, and response in the education department at Esperanza University.

The case study provided an in-depth analysis of a bounded system, or case (Merriam, 2009). The research process in case studies involved exploring complex social phenomena (Yin, 2009) and the interaction of the elements and individuals associated with the phenomena (Merriam, 2009). By using multiple sources of evidence, the case study provided a rich and holistic description of the phenomenon that can lead to the construction of new hypotheses to inform future research (Merriam, 2009). Through the use of multiple sources of information while conducting this study, such as faculty and administrator interviews, syllabi, plagiarism training materials, policies and procedures, and statistical data on plagiarism and academic dishonesty, a deeper understanding of the micropolitical considerations that influence the development of system-wide approaches

to plagiarism prevention, education, and response was gained. The findings of the case study of the education department at Esperanza University can inform and improve future practices at the school as it relates to academic integrity institutionalization.

The case study is divided into different typologies (Stake, 2005). Among the methods of categorizing case studies is Stake's typology that divides case studies into three categories: intrinsic, instrumental, and collective (Stake, 2005). Intrinsic case studies are those where a researcher has an intrinsic interest in the case itself for a particular reason (Stake, 2005). Instrumental case studies are those, where a researcher is interested more in the phenomena, studied and the generalizations that may come from analyzing this phenomenon, rather than the particular case selected (Stake, 2005). The case selected is instrumental to understanding a particular phenomenon, as opposed to the focus of studying a particular case to learn more about its unique circumstances (Stake, 1995). Collective case studies focus on studying several instrumental cases as part of a multi-site visit (Stake, 2005). In instrumental cases, the purpose of the study and its guiding theories are often known in advance, whereas the intrinsic case is more about understanding the case at the onset and the case study findings shaping the purpose and theory selection (Grandy, 2010). Given the focus of the study, this case study was an instrumental case study because understanding micropolitical considerations that influence how a college department approaches plagiarism prevention, education, and response were the primary focus of study, rather than the education department at Esperanza University.

Despite its strengths in providing rich descriptions of a phenomenon, the case study method has its limitations. Given the case study's focus of a single unit, the

findings from the case study are not generalizable to a larger population (Merriam, 2009; Yin, 2009). Merriam (2009) countered this argument by asserting that there is much that people can learn from a single case and the reader determines if and how the study can apply to his or her context.

Site

The case study is the study of a bounded system (Merriam, 2009; Yin, 2009). For this case study, the education department at Esperanza University served as the case. Existing ties with a professional colleague from Esperanza University facilitated the selection of the case for this study. The professional colleague contacted several department chairs via email regarding the researcher's request and the chair of the education department expressed interest in supporting the study. Upon receiving Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval, the department chair at Esperanza University who expressed initial support for the study was contacted. Permission was given to use Esperanza University as the case, interview its employees, and work on its premises.

Population and Sample

Esperanza University is a public not-for-profit research institution in the Southeast United States with approximately 29,000 students. The university is located in an urban setting, with a diverse population of students. Forty-six percent of the student body is classified as minority or international students, representing the diversity of the school (Esperanza University Website, n.d.). Esperanza University has 170 undergraduate, master, and doctoral degree programs. The population selected for this study were faculty members and administrators, and included documents and other pertinent artifacts. The total population included 12 faculty members and 1 full-time

chairperson, who also served as a faculty member of the department, one Dean for the College and three Associate Deans in the College. The department offers seven academic programs, from undergraduate programs to doctoral programs. There were an unknown number of documents and artifacts available at the onset of the study. From this population, a purposive sample of seven education faculty members, one department chair, and two university administrators who worked with the department were consulted, along with the review of all applicable documents and artifacts pertinent to academic integrity.

There are different types of non-probability sampling, including haphazard, quota, purposive, snowball, deviant case, sequential, and theoretical (Neuman, 2003). For this study, purposive sampling and snowball sampling were used. Purposive sampling refers to selecting participants with a particular purpose in mind (Neuman, 2003). Snowball sampling refers to the technique of identifying future participants for the study by requesting referrals from existing participants (Neuman, 2003). These two sampling approaches are appropriate when the goals are to gain in-depth information about a particular phenomenon and to interview well informed individuals familiar with the academic integrity initiatives in the education department at Esperanza University.

Criteria were used to help ensure that the participants for interviews were knowledgeable on the topic of plagiarism at Esperanza University. The criteria set to determine eligible faculty members and administrators was their length of employment within the education department at Esperanza University. Faculty members and administrators participating in the study had to be employed by the education department for at least six months. This helped ensure that the participants had the opportunity to be

aware of department initiatives, training sessions, and the department's general approach to plagiarism. The goal of this study was to include a minimum of seven education faculty members and one administrator who worked with the department and who met this criterion.

Sampling criteria for the documents and artifacts were established. In order to ensure the documents and artifacts reviewed were a reflection of the department's current or most recent approach to plagiarism, the documents and artifacts reviewed were no more than 5 years old, with the exception of university policies. Policies older than 5 years were included if they were still university guiding doctrine.

Data Collection

The data collection procedure involved face-to-face interviews with faculty members and administrators, and a review of documentation relating to academic integrity. The documentation reviewed included faculty members' syllabi, training materials, policies and procedures, newsletter articles, statistical data on the prevalence of plagiarism and academic dishonesty, and other related documents addressing plagiarism. Data collection did not include individual level data relating to a student's grades or disciplinary history.

Informed Consent

Once approval from Esperanza University was granted, the researcher met with the education department chair to further discuss the study and request an email be sent to all faculty members and administrators in the education department as a means of formal introduction and to announce the study. The faculty members received an email

informing them of the study, inviting them to participate, and requesting their reply confirming their interest.

Interviews were scheduled on the Esperanza University campus at a time and location mutually convenient for the participant and researcher. At the end of the interview, snowball sampling was followed, a process of soliciting the participants' assistance in identifying additional participants who may be eligible and interested in participating in the study (Morgan, 2008). At the end of the interview, the interviewees were asked for future participant referrals, specifically someone who had similar views to him or her and someone who had different views. This helped increase variation in the responses. If the desired seven education faculty members and one administrator were not secured using both the initial email inquiry and snowball sampling, the plan was to request to speak to the faculty members and administrators at a department meeting to elicit their support; fortunately, the minimum sample was secured.

Faculty members and administrators who expressed initial interest in participating in the study were provided an electronic copy of the Informed Consent form (see Appendix A) that re-introduced the study, outlined the study's purpose, and solicited the faculty member's and administrator's voluntary participation in the study. The consent form informed the participants that there were no foreseeable risks regarding their participation in the study. Although there was no direct benefit of their participation in the study, their participation added to the body of knowledge in the area of plagiarism prevention, education, and response. The interview included a brief demographic questionnaire (see Appendix B), followed by a semi-structured interview. The interviews lasted approximately 1 hour and were digitally recorded. The Informed Consent form

also assured the individuals of their confidentiality if they choose to participate and informed them that they were free to withdraw from the study at any time without any repercussion by notifying the researcher via email, phone, or in person. If a participant withdrew from the study, all data would be destroyed by deleting any electronic records and shredding any documents collected.

Faculty members and administrators signed the consent form in ink prior to participating in the study. The participants were asked to scan and email or fax the signed consent form in advance to return prior to the interview. If the form was not received electronically, the consent form was given to the researcher in person prior to the interview. The interviewer did not proceed with the interview unless the signed consent form was on file.

Interviews

The interview process helped facilitate a deeper understanding of the individuals' lived experiences as it relates to plagiarism. Merriam (2009) argued that interviews are the best technique in case studies. The format of the interview relied on a brief demographic survey, followed by a semi-structured interview. The semi-structured interview questions and guide are in Appendix C. A matrix was also created to show the alignment between the research questions and interview questions, found in Appendix D.

The semi-structured interview allowed flexibility to include a mix of both structured and unstructured questions (Merriam, 2009). The structured questions ensured that all participants responded to certain questions, while also allowing the flexibility to ask participants about a list of guided topics as they relate to the dissertation study. The strength of the interview as a source of data collection is that this approach lent itself to

capture rich data from the participants (Yin, 2009). The main drawback of this data collection approach was that it could lead to response bias as some participants might have altered their answers to provide a response that may be considered more socially desirable (Yin, 2009). As recommended by Neuman (2003), social desirability bias was reduced by wording the interview questions in a non-threatening way and by presenting a wide range of acceptable behaviors through the line of questioning. Precautions were taken to ensure that the wordings of the questions did not assume that faculty members or administrators were actively addressing plagiarism. Proper wording should reduce any pressure on the participant to respond in a particular way.

Eight professional colleagues served as participants in the pilot study to validate the interview questions. This pilot allowed the refinement of the questions and procedures used for the research study (Yin, 2009). Merriam (2009) asserted that a pilot study is an important way to test questions with others to ensure the appropriate wording of questions, the alignment of the participant responses to the study's purpose, and the inclusion of the necessary questions. Upon the completion of the pilot study, the interview questions were refined, and formal interviewing began.

Interviews were digitally recorded and brief notes were taken during the interview. The audio files were sent for transcription by a professional transcribing service. (The non-disclosure agreement can be found in Appendix E). Annotated observations related to the interview were kept in field notes. The transcribed data and observation field notes were uploaded in QSR International's NVivo™ 10 software to analyze the participants' responses as they pertained to the research questions.

Documents and Artifacts

Documentation on university and faculty policies, course syllabi, training materials, newsletter articles on academic integrity, statistical data on the prevalence of plagiarism and academic dishonesty, and any other documents related to plagiarism were collected. Some of the advantages of using documents in qualitative research were that often the documents are easy to access, at no cost, and good sources of information that can save significant time (Merriam, 2009). Another strength of this type of data is its stability, because documents can be reviewed many times (Yin, 2009), and there is no risk of biasing the data in any way (Merriam, 2009). Documents are considered non-reactive, or unobtrusive, which means that the research process does not bias documents in any way (Merriam, 2009; Yin, 2009). A limitation of this type of data is that documents are not created with research in mind (Merriam, 2009; Yin, 2009). The data may be incomplete for research purposes because the format may not lend itself for analysis or the content may differ with findings from the interviews or they may conflict with the theoretical framework (Merriam, 2009). An additional limitation of using documents in research is determining the authenticity and accuracy of the documents reviewed (Merriam, 2009; Yin, 2009). Despite their limitations, documents were a valuable source of information that, when coupled with interviews, helped provide a rich understanding of the micropolitical considerations influencing the development of a systemic approach to plagiarism education, prevention, and response within the education department at Esperanza University.

Documents and artifacts were accessed using a variety of methods. The first method was via personal requests to the participants being interviewed and to other key

stakeholders in the education department and other departments at Esperanza University that had access to pertinent documents on academic integrity and plagiarism. The second method was by accessing documents and artifacts via the websites of Esperanza University and the education department. These websites were a good source for general policy documents that apply to the entire university, such as the student code of conduct and general department initiatives. The third method was to review student and university publications, such as newsletters, magazines, and pamphlets to gain a deeper understanding of the school and the department's approaches to plagiarism prevention, education, and response. These documents were available through student clubs within the other departments or within the education department itself.

Confidentiality

The names of the participants nor the university were used in the discussion of data collection or data analysis to ensure confidentiality of the individuals in the study. Prior to sending the audio transcripts to the transcriber, each individual in the study was coded according to classification (faculty member [f] or administrator [a]). Each faculty member was then assigned a number 1-12, with each transcribed interview labeled f1-f12 as appropriate. Similar protocol was followed for administrators (a1 to a3, as needed).

The list containing the participants' names and codes along with the interview transcript records, syllabi, training materials, and all other artifacts consulted were kept in the researcher's home, in Weston, Florida, during active research. All of the electronic records related to the research were in a password-protected computer both during and after the study's completion. After 3 years, the material will be deleted from the computer. Upon the completion of the data collection and analysis, all of the non-

electronic supporting documents and artifacts were kept in the safe deposit box of the researcher in Weston, Florida for 3 years. After the 3 years, the documents will be shredded.

Data Analysis

The data from this study were analyzed simultaneously with data collection. Field notes were added as they were compiled and reviewed as part of the data collection and analysis process as recommended by Merriam (2009). Simultaneous data analysis is critical in qualitative studies because it permitted new discoveries in the data collection process (Merriam, 2009). The simultaneous analysis process helped guide future interviews and data source reviews.

Initial Data Analysis and Coding

The initial data analysis involved systematically reviewing the interview transcripts, documents collected, and other field notes following each interview and making early reflections on the data collected as it occurred. The data were organized and sorted using QSR International's NVivo™ 10 software. During the data collection process, a simultaneous preliminary analysis of how the data addressed the research questions was conducted. Through this process, the larger themes were reflected on to help form initial categories (Creswell, 2013). Creswell (2013) advocated for reading the initial transcript and all additional data several times and then annotating preliminary observations and insights. This process also informed future data collection and analysis decisions (Merriam, 2009; Simons, 2009). Data analyzed during the collection process was less overwhelming and led to a more focused and insightful inquiry (Merriam, 2009).

The data analysis process for qualitative data was "primarily *inductive* and *comparative*" (Merriam, 2009, p. 175). After the initial preliminary analysis of the data was conducted following each interview, the next step was coding the data. Coding involved analyzing segments, or small pieces of meaning found in the data (Creswell, 2013). For this study, a determination was made on how the data would be analyzed, as a single word, phrase, sentence, or paragraph, based on the contents of the data collected and the organizational scheme that appeared to be most aligned with the contents of the data. A list of initial codes based on the coding of these small units of meaning was developed. Creswell (2013) advocated for creating a short list of codes and then expanding this list further if necessary during subsequent reviews of the data.

The initial codes that emerged from the analysis were further refined and consolidated as additional data were collected and analyzed (Merriam, 2009). As the data collection process ensued, the inductive process eventually became deductive; however, toward the end of the data collection process, the initial coding scheme became less tentative and the data gathered was categorized according to the consolidated categories established through the data collection and analysis process (Merriam, 2009). The consolidated categories were reviewed and analyzed to determine the themes present in the data that answered the research questions.

The procedure of analyzing the university documents and artifacts was very similar to the above-mentioned process, with some minor variations. To conduct a qualitative analysis of documents involved a combination of content analysis and thematic analysis (Bowen, 2009). The first step was reading the document and identifying the pertinent text that addressed the research questions (Bowen, 2009). The

second step involved re-reading the text and assigning codes to the text segments. The third step was a careful review of the text and an examination of the emerging themes in the document. The final step was interpretation, where the categories were identified and collapsed to identify larger themes (Bowen, 2009; Creswell, 2013). This initial coding was done simultaneously with data collection.

Analyzing the Synthesis of all Sources of Data

Once all the data were collected and simultaneously analyzed, a more intensive analysis phase began (Merriam, 2009). To begin the phase of cross-case analysis, the themes across all data sets were reviewed to determine the meanings found in the entire case. This cross-case analysis was conducted using Glaser and Strauss' (1967) constant comparative method to move beyond the thick description of the case study and analyze the data throughout the case for themes. Glaser and Strauss advocated for a four-stage process. For the purposes of this study, Glaser and Strauss' first three stages of the comparative method were used.

The first stage involved comparing the themes within the case and identifying their different aspects (Burns, 2010). This process involved categorizing the data into clusters based on commonalities and patterns observed in the data (Dye, Schatz, Rosenberg, & Coleman, 2000). This stage was inductive, where the patterns emerged from the data, rather than the imposition of pre-established categories to arrange the data. The second stage was to connect the themes, relationships, and variations within the case (Burns, 2010). This involved comparing the data in each of the categories generated in stage one and further regrouping the data and refining the categories as needed (Dye, Schatz, Rosenberg, & Coleman, 2000). This stage involved constant comparison of the

data and a continuous refinement of the categories. As the category refinement continued, eventually the parameters to include or exclude data into each of the categories became more precise (Dye, Schatz, Rosenberg, & Coleman, 2000). The third stage was to "delimit the theory" (Burns, 2010, para. 6), which involved making the connections found and reducing the findings to broader generalizations. This stage involved examining the refined categories and uncovering the larger overarching themes that emerged from comparing these categories (Dye, Schatz, Rosenberg, & Coleman, 2000). The fourth step, the generation of theory (Burns, 2010), was not conducted in this case study but is integral to grounded theory research. The themes uncovered in this analysis applied to this case only and are not generalizable to other cases. These findings deepened the overall understanding of plagiarism approaches in the education department at Esperanza University.

Trustworthiness

Lincoln and Guba (1985) proposed four criteria of trustworthiness to examine the trustworthiness of a study's findings. The four criteria are truth value, applicability, consistency, and neutrality (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The truth criteria, also called credibility, refers to how confident the researcher felt that the study's findings were truthful and credible (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; McGloin, 2008). To assess the truth value of the findings of a study, the study's findings were shared with the participants and their validation during the data analysis process was requested (McGloin, 2008; Merriam, 2009; Rothbauer, 2008). This process is also known as member checks or respondent validation (Merriam, 2009). For this study, the participants received a summary of the main themes of the interview via an email communication. Participants were informed in

this email communication that if they did not respond within 7 days of having received the paragraph summaries, the assumption would be made that the participant felt the summary was an accurate portrayal of the primary themes of the interview. The goal of this member check was to ensure the truthfulness of the data and initial interpretations by requesting validation from the participants.

The use of data triangulation was another way to assess the truth value of a study. By using multiple sources, the trustworthiness of the study can be enhanced (McGloin, 2008; Merriam, 2009). For this study, interviews of faculty members and administrators, and documents and other artifacts, such as syllabi, policies, minutes, articles, and statistical data on the prevalence of plagiarism and academic dishonesty were included to triangulate the study's findings and increase its trustworthiness.

An additional strategy used to assess the truth value of the study was peer checks (McGloin, 2008; Merriam, 2009). The peer review of the research involved engaging in conversations with colleagues regarding the research process, data collected, and proposed interpretations (Merriam, 2009). A professional colleague, an advanced doctoral student researching academic integrity and a current university administrator, served as a peer auditor and reviewed the data, audit trail, codes, and themes to ensure the work was free of any significant bias. The peer reviewer signed a Non-Disclosure Agreement prior to reviewing the data (see Appendix F). The peer reviewer wrote a one-page summary of his final impressions of the work (see Appendix G).

The second criterion for trustworthiness in case studies is applicability. Applicability, also known as transferability, refers to the degree to which the findings from the study can be applied to other contexts (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Lincoln and

Guba (1985) asserted that offering a thick description of the research findings is one way to help the study's readers to assess the degree of transferability of the findings to other settings. There is some disagreement on this measure for case studies because the purpose of the case study is not to generalize to other settings (McGloin, 2008). Since case studies inform the generation of theories, the findings can be applicable to the larger research field (McGloin, 2008).

The third criterion for trustworthiness is consistency. Consistency, also known as dependability, refers to the extent to which a replication of a study would result in the same findings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Merriam (2009) asserted that the concept of replication for qualitative studies is problematic and impossible, because the social world is highly contextual and dynamic. However, if similar findings are found after subsequent studies, the findings can be seen as more dependable (Merriam, 2009). Some of the strategies to address consistency are triangulation, peer examination, researcher reflexivity, and an audit trail (Merriam, 2009).

Of these four strategies, researcher reflexivity and the audit trail are yet to be explained. Reflexivity involves the researcher reflecting critically on his or her own individual biases (Merriam, 2009). The acknowledgement of biases and assumptions related to the research was important because it allowed the data to be examined with these considerations in mind. Chapter 1 and the research journal include the documentation of the researcher's assumptions and biases. The research journal is further explained in the following paragraph.

The research journal contained both the audit trail and reflexive journaling. The audit trail provides the reader a clear log of all the steps taken in the research, including

detailed description of all decisions made as part of the data collection and data analysis phases (Merriam, 2009). The audit trail is a clear account of how all findings were obtained and that the research findings are the best account of the data collected (Merriam, 2009). The reflexive journal included notes on assumptions, biases, and reflections as related to data collection and analysis, reflexivity, reflections, and challenges as it pertained to the research process, data collection, and analysis.

The fourth criterion is neutrality. Neutrality, also known as confirmability in qualitative research, refers to the extent the findings of the study are a reflection of the participants' views, not the result of any external influence on the participants or the data (McGloin, 2008). Neutrality is established using triangulation, peer auditing, and researcher reflexivity (McGloin, 2008) that were previously described.

Chapter Summary

Chapter 3 includes an overview of the research method and design appropriateness of this qualitative instrumental case study. Given the focus on the *how* and *why* of this contemporary phenomenon, the qualitative case study was selected to explore how micropolitical considerations influence the development of a system-wide approach to plagiarism education, prevention, and response. The study's research questions, the selected site, and an overview of the study's population and sample were also identified. Last, the data collection and data analysis approaches in this study outlined important considerations in relation to the trustworthiness of the study.

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore the micropolitical considerations that influence the development of a systemic approach to plagiarism prevention, education, and response within the education department at Esperanza

University. The multiple data sources that were consulted for this study, including the participants' interviews, archival documents such as course syllabi, training materials on academic dishonesty, school and instructor policies and procedures on academic integrity, newsletter articles on academic integrity, and statistical data on the prevalence of plagiarism and other forms of academic dishonesty, provided a rich description of the phenomenon of academic dishonesty in the education department at Esperanza University. Chapter 4 will include a presentation of the findings from the data collection.

Chapter 4

Findings

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore the micropolitical considerations that influence the development of a systemic approach to plagiarism prevention, education, and response within the education department at Esperanza University. A qualitative case study was used to explore these considerations in the context of a primary research question, supported by five sub research questions. The primary research question was: *In what ways might elements of micropolitics influence college department administrators and faculty members in their approach to plagiarism prevention, education, and response?* The supporting five sub research questions were:

RQ1a) What degree of formal and/or informal power and influence do college administrators and faculty members have and how does this influence the department's approach to plagiarism prevention, education, and response?

RQ1b) How do college administrators and faculty members interact to address plagiarism prevention, education, and response to the education department?

RQ1c) How is academic integrity socialized within the education department?

RQ1d) How are policies and procedures relating to plagiarism prevention, education, and response adopted and implemented within the education department?

RQ1e) What roles do rituals, myths, and symbols play in informing the department's approach to plagiarism prevention, education, and response?

Specific themes related to these research questions were identified by conducting face-to-face interviews with a total of ten participants, participant observation, and an

analysis of case artifacts. A pilot study was conducted to validate the interview protocol with eight professional colleagues serving in faculty and administrator roles within the researcher's geographical location. This chapter will provide a summary of the pilot study conducted, an overview of the demographics of the participants interviewed, a description of the artifacts consulted, an overview of the data collection and analysis process, and an overall summary of the research findings.

Pilot Study

Eight professional colleagues serving in faculty and administrator roles within the researcher's geographical location served as the pilot study participants. The participants did not have any affiliations to Esperanza University. After each interview was completed, the reflections of the interview experience were documented in the research journal. The interview protocol was refined after each interview to ensure the questions in the semi-structured interview protocol were appropriately worded and structured to address the research questions. After the completion of each interview, the participants were asked his/her thoughts on the interview questions and order. To ensure the appropriateness of the final protocol, several adjustments to the wording and order of the questions were made throughout the pilot study. The research journal includes the notes from the pilot study. Once the researcher felt comfortable with the wording and order of the questions based on the participants' responses, the coordination of the interviews with the Education department chair and faculty members at Esperanza University began.

Participant Demographics

The education department at Esperanza University consists of thirteen full-time faculty member and one full-time department chair. There is also one Dean for the

College and three Associate Deans in the College. Two of the thirteen full-time faculty members joined the department in August 2014, the month data collection began. To be eligible to participate in the study, faculty members and administrators had to be with the department for at least six months. Therefore, only eleven faculty members were eligible to participate in the study. Of these eleven, seven faculty members and the department chair participated in this study. In addition, two university administrators were interviewed, and several university staff across departments was consulted to help gain an understanding of the different resources available to faculty members on plagiarism and academic integrity at Esperanza University.

Data Collection

The data collection process began with a solicitation to the Education department chair for an initial meeting and subsequent interview. Previous communications with the department chair established the chair's eligibility to participate in the study based on the chair's length of employment with the department. As part of the interview process, the department chair and all other participants completed an Informed Consent. The department chair suggested the researcher email all department faculty members using the department directory available on the department's website to request their participation in the study.

All 12 faculty members listed in the directory received an email invitation to participate in the study. Of the 12 faculty members, two declined to participate in the study, two did not respond to the initial and follow-up email solicitations, and one faculty member listed on the directory was no longer with the department. At the time of the initial solicitation, the website directory did not reflect the two new faculty members for

Fall 2014. Appointment times with the seven faculty members who agreed to participate in the study were arranged for the month of August 2014 at Esperanza University. All of the department faculty members and the department administrator were asked for their explicit permission for the interview to be recorded. Of the seven faculty members and the one administrator interviewed, one faculty member expressed initial hesitation of being recorded, but agreed when she was informed she would be sent the interview transcript and a summary of the main points for the faculty member's subsequent review and approval.

As part of the research process, one of the faculty members interviewed connected the researcher with the department overseeing professional development training for faculty members teaching online courses. The faculty member made this recommendation given her personal knowledge that part of the training module specifically addressed plagiarism. This initial introduction resulted in the interviewing of two of the administrators who oversee the training of faculty members who teach online courses at Esperanza University. These individuals were interviewed together in one of their offices. The interview was not recorded. Documentation of the interview took place using field notes, followed by a summary overview later sent to the administrators for approval.

Consultation with an administrator overseeing the new student orientation for college freshman resulted in an invitation to observe the university's two-day freshman orientation. The researcher attended day one of the orientation, where plagiarism awareness and prevention were covered. In addition, discussions with University staff in the Writing Center, the Center for Learning and Student Success (CLASS), and the

Graduate College provided additional background on the university resources available to students on plagiarism prevention and education. Given the information gleaned from the sources consulted and the scope of the study, the College Deans were not solicited to participate in the study.

Data collection also included the review of select artifacts relating to plagiarism prevention, education, and response. The artifacts were varied and included faculty syllabi; the code of academic integrity; the flow chart for the process of the code of academic integrity at Esperanza University; writing guides and American Psychological Association (APA) formating resources available from the education department's website and the Writing Center's website; the 2014-2015 University Catalog; the 2014-2015 Student Handbook; the descriptions of the workshops available from the Writing Center, Graduate College, and the Center for Learning and Student Success; overview pamphlets from the Writing Center and the Center for Learning and Student Success; the freshman orientation brochure; and the graduate student orientation brochure. The syllabi were gathered directly from the Education department faculty members. University staff provided the freshman orientation brochure on the day of the session. The university staff in the Writing Center and the Center for Learning and Student Success shared their department's pamphlets. The remaining documents were all accessible from Esperanza University's website.

During the interview, each participant was asked a series of open-ended questions relating to the study's research questions. The interview protocol served as the guide for the interview. Throughout the interview, participants were asked clarifying questions as needed. The interviews lasted an average of 1 hour per participant, with some variations.

Once completed, digital files of the department-level interviews were sent to a professional transcription service. Following the receipt of the interview transcript, the transcript was reviewed and a summary of the main points was compiled to share with the participants for their review and approval. The department faculty members and department administrator were also informed that the original transcript was available for their review as well if desired. Only one faculty member was sent the full transcript upon her request. Six of the seven faculty members and the department chair approved the summaries. Three faculty members requested some minor changes to the summary, and they provided clarifying comments in some areas. One of the faculty members did not respond, although the faculty member was sent a reminder to review the summary and confirm its accuracy. The participant who did not provide explicit approval of the summary was informed in a follow up email that if no response was received within 10 additional days, an assumption would be made that the summary sent was an accurate representation of the participant's views.

Although the initial intent was to code the study's participants according to type of role carried (F for faculty member and A for administrator), given the size of the population, the department level staff and administrators were all coded as Participant F1-Participant F8 to protect the anonymity of all participants. Since the administrator serves as department chair and faculty member, he will be referred to as faculty member to protect his anonymity unless the data shared merits this distinction. Furthermore, the research findings indicated little differences in the responses among faculty members and the administrator. Also in an effort to protect the participants, certain information

reported in the findings was not specifically attributed to one faculty member, as the statement alone could potentially identify the participant.

A field journal was kept throughout the data collection process. Reflections were compiled after completing each interview and consulting informally with staff members in the different student support programs available to students. The data collection and analysis process occurred simultaneously, as the reflections informed the approach with the next participant.

Data Analysis

The data analysis was a multi-step process. The first step included conducting the interview and then purposefully reflecting after each interview in the field journal, annotating lessons learned, emerging themes, areas to follow up with future participants, and other related insights. The second step involved the review of the interview transcript and the compiling of a summary of the main themes of the interview. This summary was sent to each participant for his or her review and approval to help enhance the credibility of the findings.

The third step involved analyzing and coding text segments from the interview transcript according to main themes using QSR International's NVivo™ 10 software. During the interview transcript coding process, the coding categories in QSR International's NVivo™ 10 software were refined, adding or collapsing nodes as needed to reflect the main themes emerging from the data.

The fourth step was re-reading the interview transcript and reviewing the coding scheme employed in QSR International's NVivo™ 10 software to ensure all data were accurately captured and categorized. The fifth step involved the review of the transcript,

the interview summary, and the field notes to create a memo entry for each participant in QSR International's NVivo™ 10 software. The purpose of the memo entry was to document reflections after completing the interview summaries and transcript coding. The memo helped inform the approach for future interviews, identify emerging themes, and gain insight on how the data collected was contributing to the understanding of the study's research questions.

Emergent Themes

The primary research question for this qualitative case study was: *In what ways might elements of micropolitics influence college department administrators and faculty members in their approach to plagiarism prevention, education, and response?* To support this question, there were five sub research questions pertaining to formal/informal power; stakeholder collaboration; the socialization of academic integrity; policies and procedures; and the roles of rituals, myths, and symbols. Five themes pertinent to micropolitics emerged from the data:

1. Shared mission is balanced with individual approach.
2. Formal policies accompanied by informal approaches.
3. Faculty serves as gatekeepers to the teaching profession.
4. Unused potential for maximizing resources.
5. Faculty feel only limited direct and indirect pressures.

Theme 1: Shared mission is balanced with individual approach. The theme of *shared mission is balanced with individual approach*, refers to a group of individuals sharing common goals, but working toward these goals in distinct ways. This concept naturally emerged from the data and is further described in this section. As a team of

individuals, the faculty members in the education department at Esperanza University act independently and they enjoy the academic freedom characteristic of most post-secondary institutions, yet they also co-exist in an environment of collegiality with a shared goal of enhancing academic quality.

The faculty members in the education department share four common goals related directly or indirectly to plagiarism. These four goals are high-quality curriculum and assessment design to improve student learning; enhancing students' writing skills through a former writing grant; setting proper expectations for students using the course syllabi; and collaborating with the administrator on the formal plagiarism process; however, each faculty member pursues these goals in distinct ways. As the data will show, although faculty members share a common goal in all of these areas, their individualism as faculty members still prevails.

High-quality curriculum and assessment design. The education faculty members work closely together to develop high-quality curriculum and assessments to help improve student learning. When prompted to reflect specifically on departmental level approaches to plagiarism prevention, education, and response, several faculty members commented that their focus was not on plagiarism per se, plagiarism prevention was more of an undertone of other curricular and assessment discussions, as evidenced in Participant F5's statement,

> Those conversations [assessment design, curriculum, and course delivery] happen regularly, and I think plagiarism is an undertone. You wanted to develop assessments where there's not as much room for that. We talk more on that level of it.

Six of the eight faculty members interviewed addressed curriculum and assessment design as an approach to plagiarism prevention in some way during their interview. The two individuals who did not make this mention are in roles where administrative work is a major part of their responsibilities, and their teaching load is limited.

The faculty members' focus on curriculum and assessment relates to the faculty members' purposeful design of assessments to encourage students to think critically and relate personally to the topic, thus minimizing the opportunities students have to plagiarize assignments. Participant F5 explained the importance of assessment design as part of Participant F5's strategy to prevent plagiarism, "[I] try to design assignments where they are critical thinking assignments or build off of a student's feelings or opinion so that the incidents of plagiarism are less." This focus on curriculum and assessment also relates to how some faculty members approach the writing process. Participant F2 commented that Participant F2 purposefully breaks up large assignments into smaller deliverables, such as outlines and drafts, thus making it harder to plagiarize assignments, as evidenced in Participant F2's statement,

> It is my opinion that at some level the assignment also has something to do with that, if plagiarism occurs or not, and so in my undergraduate classes when I was teaching, I was able to A, create an assignment such that it was almost impossible to plagiarize it. But second in those instances, we have certain things [that] might have been taken off the websites and so on and so forth. You call for outlines. You call for topics. You call for drafts earlier on, so you're able to detect it and

even begin to tell students more explicitly, this is what it means and this is what you should be doing, and here's how to correct it, and so on and so forth.

The focus on curriculum and assessment design plays an important role in how the department faculty members help prevent plagiarism. As faculty members in the College of Education, these individuals teach their undergraduate and graduate students pedagogical principles and strategies on how to design appropriate curriculum and assessments for their pre-kindergarten- grade 12 students. As Participant F5 indicated, "We are the curriculum department so I would feel that everybody can sit down and agree that a good assessment will produce quality work." Although this general consensus exists among faculty members, faculty members continue to have the autonomy to design and select the assessments they use in their classrooms.

Writing grant. Through the interviews, faculty members emphasized that the instructional focus and its direct connections with plagiarism prevention, education, and response were heavily emphasized approximately 2 or 3 years ago under the guidance of a former department chair. During the chair's administration, the department received a writing grant where the group focused their efforts as a collective to examine students' writing and instructional strategies to provide students feedback. Participant F6 commented, "We basically wanted to improve the quality of student writing both at the graduate and undergraduate level." There was a team of individuals working together on this effort for one year, including the director of the Writing Center, select department faculty members, and the former department chair. The faculty members came together to examine students' writing and discuss how to grade student work, the type of feedback

to give, the difference between plagiarism and sloppy writing, the use of rubrics and more. Participant F7 described and questioned how to assess student's work,

> Let's talk about it. How do we grade this? How do we look at this? How do we create students whose writing is improving? How do you give them feedback to improve their writing? When is it plagiarism versus bad writing that we can get the writing center to help, versus rubrics that we have in our own classrooms that are the same no matter whose class you're in?

One of the recommendations from the Director of the Writing Center to the education faculty members was the introduction of a writing log for faculty members to use when grading student papers. Participant F6 explained that the recommendation for faculty members was that they mark students' writing errors in the log, without correcting them. The student then was responsible for determining the nature of the error, show the correction and the appropriate grammar rule or source they found to help them identify and correct the error. The student had to handwrite these corrections for each error marked. The objective of this intervention was to institute a consistent approach to assessing student writing among all faculty members (Participant F6). Participant F6 commented on this approach, "This is part of what we learned in the grant. If they [students] are being sloppy they just need to clean up their act, and we need to hold them to a higher standard to get rid of the slop."

Participant F6 commented on the degree to which this particular intervention related to plagiarism, "Are they [the writing logs] addressing plagiarism per se? Not so much, as the right way to cite things." Participant F6 is unsure whether the faculty members are currently using the writing logs. Five of the eight faculty members

interviewed referenced the work the department did with the writing grant in their interviews, but Participant F6 was the only one to make a specific mention of the writing logs.

As it relates to plagiarism, as part of the writing grant, the group discussed ways to approach plagiarism and some of the challenges in interpreting the results of the reports generated by the plagiarism detection software. The software generates a report that provides a similarity percentage for a student's paper, by calculating the percentage of text in the paper that resembles another outside source. Participant F7 described some of these conversations among faculty members relative to their interpretation of the similarity reports, "What is the percentage that we're looking for plagiarism before we really say it's plagiarism? Is there a set percentage?" Participant F7 commented on the benefits of these collegial discussions,

> It was nice having those dialogues because then that's kind of the conversations we had to say, Okay. So, then what do we do? What's going to be our procedure when this happens? So, it was things that people were kind of wrestling with, in silos almost, that it forced us to have those conversations. I mean, we'd kind of talk around the water cooler a little bit about them, but it became real faculty issues.

Although a threshold percentage of similarity reports was not set, the workshops provided the faculty members the opportunity to discuss how they would approach particular situations related to student writing in general and plagiarized assignments. Participant F2 commented on the benefits of participating in the writing grant, "I think in

many senses we all became much more aware and alert, and began to do things upfront [to prevent plagiarism]."

Five of the eight faculty members discussed the writing grant in their interviews. Of the two faculty members who did not mention this grant, one has served as a full-time faculty member for only one year and the other faculty member is working primarily with doctoral student advisement and teaches on a limited basis. Based on the feedback received from the five faculty members, the grant was well received and beneficial to the team. Participant F7 commented on the effectiveness of the grant, "Thanks to that writing grant, we were able to spend time really trying to develop continuity, with the faculty, on how we address writing issues."

The faculty members' current approach to enhancing students' writing is not as structured and collaborative as it was before. As stated by Participant F2, "I honestly at this point of time don't know as much as I used to about who's talking about what, who's detecting what across of the department." Several of the faculty members indicated that their current conversations regarding plagiarism are more informal, as evidenced by Participant F8's statement, "We've had informal discussions, not at department meetings or those sorts of things, but just hallway discussions." Three of the eight faculty participants stressed the need for the department to revisit the topic formally every so often. Participant F1commented, "We consider ourselves a reasonably close-knit department, we do and we're small enough that we could be, but we don't share practices in that way like maybe we could, on this topic particularly." Participant F1 went on to say, "I pretty well know how I handle it [plagiarism] but I couldn't tell you how Dr. Kline [pseudonym] handles it on the West campus [pseudonym]. I have no idea." Participant

F2 commented on the shift in focus of the department since the writing grant, "I think the thing is, the question I have is, are we not as good as we used to be or is the problem better?"

Course syllabi. Around the same time as the writing grant for the department, Esperanza University required that all faculty members across the university include a statement on their syllabi linking students to the university's code of academic integrity. All of the individuals interviewed referred in some way to this standard. A review of the faculty syllabi confirmed the faculty members in the education department were following this practice.

The review of the faculty members' syllabi showed that although the faculty members referred to the university's academic integrity policy in their syllabi, there were variations on how they approached the policy. Some faculty members included statements relative to the possible penalties for plagiarism, words of caution to students when copying and pasting work, and others included more concise statements with the actual link for students to access the formal policies. Participant F2 commented on some of these variations,

> I didn't go with that longer statement mostly because I don't want my syllabus to come off to students in the beginning of the semester as a holistic thou shall not. I want a certain tone, but I have to say then [during the time of the writing grant] as a department we did address this explicitly.

The commonality of faculty members inclusion of the academic integrity link on the syllabus, coupled with the subsequent variations in how faculty members address

academic integrity later in the document, supports the theme of *shared mission is balanced with individual approach*.

Formal process. Another way faculty members share the same mission, but approach things individually, is relative to the formal process for reporting academic integrity violations. All seven faculty members and the department chair referenced the Academic Integrity Policy in some way during the interview. As per the stipulation of university guidelines, the first step is an informal resolution. This requires a meeting between the faculty member, student, and department chair. Participant F3 commented on Participant F3's experience working with the department chair on a plagiarism incident,

> [The chair] was very supportive. We talked about how we could help the student. We had a meeting with the student. She [the student] came in, [the chair] was really very supportive, and I just wanted him to be there and I think he was very helpful and supporting.

Within this collaborative environment pertaining to the formal plagiarism process, the faculty members continue to retain their autonomy on how to sanction issues relating to plagiarism as evidenced by Participant F1's statement, "It's totally up to us. If we use that [a specific percentage similarity] and the kind of penalties we apply, and I know that's not the case with other universities." Participant F6 echoed this sentiment by describing the level of support Participant F6 has received by the department chair as it relates to formal plagiarism cases, "In any of the incidences, I've made a recommendation, what I thought was an appropriate response and I was supported at that."

The theme of *shared mission is balanced with individual approach* that emerged from the data reflects an environment where faculty members and the administrator work together to address plagiarism prevention, education, and response through their work with curriculum and assessment; a former writing grant; course syllabi; and the formal process of addressing incidents of plagiarism. Within each of these approaches, the data reflected differences in how faculty members approached the issue. Faculty members shared the same overall goals relating to student outcomes, but they pursued the same goal in different ways.

Theme 2: Formal policies accompanied by informal approaches. The theme of the role of formal and informal policies relative to plagiarism emerged from the data, reflecting policies and procedures that provide a solid framework for university personnel to follow, yet with room for some level of instructor autonomy at the departmental level. The formal policies relative to academic dishonesty cases are outlined, followed by some of the informal policies/approaches followed by the faculty members within the department. The data reflected variations in how faculty members pursue plagiarism cases within the department.

Formal policies relative to plagiarism. As evident on Esperanza University's web page and the website of the State University's System of Board of Governors, the disciplinary process and code of conduct is uniform and applies to all of the university's students, regardless of their major. The current code was last amended in 2010. The university's disciplinary process and code were presented by the Board of Trustees at Esperanza University and approved by the State University System's Board of Governors. The State University System's Board of Governors is responsible for

overseeing the management of the twelve public universities in the state. Esperanza University's board of trustees consists of thirteen members, six of whom are appointed by the state governor, five by the Board of Governors. The remaining members are the student body president and the president of the University Faculty Senate. The faculty members serving on the Faculty Senate are appointed for 2-year terms. The education department has a faculty member serving in the Senate as a presiding member.

The University Student Affairs department's website includes an outline of Esperanza University's formal policy relative to incidents of academic dishonesty. The process described on the website is as follows: The first step involves the faculty member meeting with the student to discuss the particular concern. If a faculty member finds that academic dishonesty took place, then a formal charge letter and a sanction is given to the student. Part of the standard sanctions for incidents of academic dishonesty includes an annotation on the students' transcript outlining the violation of the academic integrity policy. Additional sanctions were described by Participant F7,

> It could be failing the course. If it's something major, it could be being kicked out of school. It could be repeating that assignment. So, it just depends on, I don't know, the extent of it, the pattern, if there's a pattern. But, it could be as small as repeating the assignment and as big as being kicked out of school or repeating the course.

Upon the student receiving the letter, the student can request a meeting with the department chair and the faculty member within 5 days of receiving his or her written notice to discuss the matter further. If the student is not satisfied with the outcome of the meeting, he/she has the right to up to two formal appeals, one with the Dean of the

College, and the final to the University Provost. If the student does not wish to appeal the charge, in addition to the classroom sanction received, he/she may elect to complete peer counseling through a third party vendor associated with the Dean of Students Office. After successful completion of the peer-counseling program, the annotation of the academic integrity violation is removed from the student's transcript. For all second offenses, the student is expelled from the institution.

All of the faculty members interviewed discussed the formal policy to some degree. This finding was not surprising because all of the participants were directly asked about their understanding of the university and department policies on plagiarism. The data reflected varying levels of awareness of the policy among the faculty members. All of the eight faculty participants expressed a general understanding of the policy, and seven of the eight indicated that the first formal step was to work with the department chair. The data however did not reflect as much awareness of the actual steps involved in the formal process. One of the faculty members with administrative experience noted,

> Actually I was pretty confident enough...that nobody had even read the academic integrity policy of the University, so they were making references to it on the syllabi, but they didn't have a clue about how that process was supposedly, or how it evolved. There was a policy out there, but I don't think there was much attention paid to what it actually said.

This faculty member with administrative experience elaborated on the faculty members' responsibilities relative to the formal policy,

> One of their [faculty members'] responsibilities is to follow the policy in terms of how it's spelled out in the various steps. The first step, fortunately, is the informal

resolution stage. If that doesn't work out, then it gets increasingly more formal, and it is important for people to understand what subsequent steps would entail.

Participant F5 commented on Participant F5's own understanding of the policy, "Outside of, don't do it, I'm not really sure what the exact policies are, I'm sure it is in the student handbook." In contrast, Participant F2 commented,

> You encounter it [plagiarism] every so often when you grade students' work and then in many senses, you follow the protocols. We have a very clear set of guidelines as to what we need to be doing, and usually that involves involving your chair, and we take it from there.

Interestingly, Participant F2 was the only faculty member who discussed the peer counseling program and the fact that students' transcripts are annotated with a violation of the policy with their first offense during the interview, supporting the notion of different levels of awareness of the policy among the department members.

Informal policies relative to plagiarism. A common theme in the discussion of the university-level policies and the department approaches was that of informal policies. As the chair noted, the first step of the formal process, is an informal resolution, but within this context, variations in faculty member's approaches were noted. Participant F2 commented on their own approach,

> I think with the new rules that we have, it has caused me a little bit to step back. Maybe it's because now with the very first offense, students, something goes on their transcript. You try to see whether there are benefits of doubt that you can give students and so on and so forth. Now, so I could say the last year or so I

have not reported anybody for plagiarism, it doesn't mean I haven't had a conversation with students.

Some level of resistance to go through the formal process was noted in the faculty members' responses, as evidenced by Participant F7's statement,

> That's why I'm often like, Okay. Let's look at this. Let's really think about this. I know we all have families. We all have, [and are] trying to balance. Maybe just this one thing kind of got out of hand. Or, maybe they were in the middle of the night nursing a baby or a sick kid. So, I'm thinking about the whole student and each situation, which is why I had a little bit of problems with just automatically going to the chair.

Participant F4 commented on Participant F4's approach to the formal process, "I think administrators are more called upon when there is an intentional utilization of somebody else's work." Similarly, Participant F8 commented,

> I think most academic administrators have been faculty members at one time, and they understand the nuances of the stuff, right? I think it's more with them [administrators] in terms that they'd rather it be worked out at the lower levels as well. There's no real explicit discussion to that effect, but it seems to me that that's probably sort of a tacit assumption about the way these things work.

Informal policies relative to plagiarism: Varying approaches. A common theme in the data was that within the realm of informal approaches, faculty members respond differently to instances of plagiarism in their courses. As stated by Participant F8, "I think you would find that some faculty would be incredibly hard-lined on it. Some faculty might even turn a blind eye to it. That would depend on the faculty member."

There was an underlying awareness among faculty members that their responses to plagiarism varied. The differences in approach can be seen in their varying comments. As Participant F1 commented, "I can say that the faculty who work with graduate students in our department bend over backwards not to kick somebody out, not to, in fact, they want to give them more leeway than maybe they should." The comments provided by Participant F1 were further supported by Participant F7's observations,

> I take my students as my own, really. I really kind of internalize their issues, which probably is not necessarily great, but it's just who I am. So, I have a little bit of more empathy, maybe, for students than others. I guess, by nature, I'm kind of a nurturer, so I'm always kind of the mother hen of the department.

The variance appears to be more prevalent in the instances where the severity of the incident was unclear because faculty member's interpretations of plagiarism vary. One of the faculty members reported about the experience from an administrative perspective,

> Sometimes I think that their [other faculty members'] interpretation of plagiarism might be a little bit more severe than what mine would be, so dropped quotation marks on a sort of brief phrase or something like that is not from my perspective, it's not a terribly serious offense as opposed to a complete paragraph being pulled out, right?

Although the faculty members do respond to plagiarism incidents differently, many of them indicated that the first offense and/or for moderate cases, their first response is educational. As commented by Participant F8, "If it's a moderate case, then it

seems to me we're all pretty much on the same page, that the way to address is to do it from an educational standpoint."

An important factor influencing faculty members' response to plagiarism is the concept of student intent. Faculty members looked not just at the extent of plagiarism and its context, but the perceived intent of the action. As Participant F2 commented, "And for me it's that intentional effort to deceive, and so I tried to figure out to what extent is it that intentional effort to steal somebody's ideas as opposed to ignorance, as opposed to other kinds of things?" Similarly, Participant F1 commented, "When the evidence is clear, then I want to get to the bottom of why the student did what he or she did, and then decide what the next step should be." The concept of student intentionality was mentioned either directly or indirectly in five of the eight faculty/administrator interviews, reflecting a commonality in the culture within the department. Based on the data, it appears that the degree of plagiarism, coupled with the perceived intent, shapes the way the education department's faculty members and administrator respond to plagiarism.

Theme 3: Faculty serves as gatekeeper to the teaching profession. The theme of *faculty serves as gatekeeper to the teaching profession* emerged naturally from the data. As the education department, many of the faculty members interviewed were former pre-kindergarten- grade 12 teachers. The data revealed a common culture among the faculty members as gatekeepers to the teaching profession, characterized by their own sense of obligation to their field. Variations existed in how individual faculty members interpreted this obligation; from doing all they could to support the development of

teachers, to instilling the highest ethical standards to ensure that only quality graduates enter the field.

As gatekeepers to the teaching profession, faculty members expressed a duty to their profession. There appeared to be faculty members who approached this sense of duty differently, with varying degrees of support and tolerance to student transgressions relative to academic dishonesty. Participant F6's comment reflected the varying approaches within the department,

> I've had colleagues in the past who were much more judgmental and their philosophy has been – It's better to weed out weak candidates now than to have them get jobs as teachers and not be able to do that well.

In contrast, Participant F6's indicated Participant F6's position was, "My job is not to throw out the bad ones, whereas my job is to help the potentially bad ones become better."

The faculty members who provided more leeway to students on plagiarism issues appeared to do so because they saw the moment as a teaching opportunity. Participant F3 commented, "I see my job as helping students to be successful. I do not see my job as flunking students out. I don't see myself as an evaluator. I'm an educator. I don't do this to flunk kids out." Similarly, Participant F6 commented,

> I don't try to get rid of people, I try to help people become better at what they are doing and if they are doing something not right, I want them to know it and I want them to fix it but I don't want them to leave.

Participant F7 expressed similar sentiments,

> I just feel like because we are working with people who will be working with little people, the rules don't apply. You know? I really think it's important that we really help them get it and at whatever costs, I guess, is what I think we should be doing.

The education faculty members work on balancing their educational and punitive approaches to plagiarism. Participant F2 commented,

> I think most faculty members if there's hesitation [addressing plagiarism] is [that] they are trying to do the right thing by the students. We feel very strongly, and certainly I do, but I think my colleagues do too that if we see something that's cheating, we ought to act on that on a moral obligation so to speak. At the same time, I think part of it is trying to sort out at what point is it legitimately punitive and at what point is it reasonably a pedagogical teaching experience?

Five of the eight faculty members interviewed described examples of how their own commitment to training well-prepared and ethical pre-kindergarten- grade 12 educators influenced their response to plagiarism with students. Participant F1 commented,

> I had a student, one student a couple of years ago said that to me: 'Dr. Jones [pseudonym], who's going to know? Nobody's going to know that; nobody's going to know that I didn't write that.' Well, that's really interesting. That means it's okay. Because if nobody knows, you know, why should we care? You will know!

The faculty members' effort to train ethical practitioners is also part of the college's requirements for accreditation as explained by Participant F1, "Part of our accreditation, we have to have a vision or a mission for accreditation and ethical is one of the characteristics that we put forward for our graduates." Participant F1 went on to explain,

> You want to build that [ethical] disposition over time in a program; you want people to care about their own internal monitoring, not just the external, and I think that oftentimes we rely on the external and forget all about building [internal monitoring]. So I talk a lot with doctoral students about, what do you want to be known for? What is the meaning of this dissertation in your life as well as in your profession? You want to say, I did this, and I'm really proud of it. Well, what does that mean? Part of it is this [originality of work], it's not the only part. So you want to get them to the point where they're owning it. It's also a notion of ownership. If it's everybody else's stuff, then it's not your stuff.

Participant F6 explained Participant F6's focus of promoting ethical values in students,

> Just my general philosophy, I tell the student from the beginning, if you do your best and you don't try to put one over on me I'll work with you. When you start trying to take shortcuts that are unethical and a violation of the university code, you don't want to see me in- I'm not pretty when I'm angry. Don't mess with me, I give you a lot of flexibility, I give you a lot of support, I give you a lot of help, don't abuse that.

The theme of the faculty member as gatekeeper to the teaching profession reflects an important facet of faculty culture within the education department. The data reflected

a strong sense of obligation the faculty members had to support their students in their development as current or future educators. Faculty members varied in their approach to this obligation, with some faculty members approaching plagiarism from more of an educational standpoint, and others assuming this approach but with the expectation that it is necessary to weed out the students who are not fit for the profession.

Theme 4: Unused potential for maximizing resources. In the context of this study, the theme *unused potential for maximizing resources* involved an examination of the resources available for faculty members in the areas of plagiarism prevention, education, and response, and the specific university and department resources that help students, either directly or indirectly, understand what plagiarism is and how to avoid it. Faculty resources include software to help detect plagiarism, professional development opportunities for faculty members, and faculty members' time. Student resources include peer counseling, one-on-one and workshop assistance through the Writing Center, new student orientations, tutoring through the Center for Learning and Student Success, and department sponsored workshops for doctoral students. A common theme in the discussion of resources was the need to enhance and maximize the utility of resources currently available to faculty members and students.

Faculty resources: Plagiarism detection software. Esperanza University initially used Turn-it-In™ as the school's detection software and then switched over to Safe Assign™, a free detection software. One of the faculty members was an open critic of Safe Assign™ and argued that the detection software did a poor job of detecting copied outside sources, as evidenced by the statement,

> The university at one point had Turn-it-In™, [then] moved to SafeAssign™, I didn't find it very reliable and Dr. Kline [pseudonym] and I grumbled about this quite a bit. I lobbied at the senate level to see whether we could bring Turn-it-In™ back instead of SafeAssign™ because I didn't feel that it was strong enough and was doing as good a job.

Although the faculty member is unsure if the lobbying efforts contributed to the change, the return to the old system was a welcomed one. The faculty member commented,

> Certainly the resources like Turn-it-In™ having that it's helpful so I'm glad they paid the extra money to Blackboard to get that done, so in that that was good. Before we were told SafeAssign™ was free, and that's why they switched to SafeAssign™, so in that sense at least there is a reallocation of resources.

Turn-it-In™ returned in the fall of 2014 and the faculty members of the education department expressed satisfaction about this change. As commented by Participant F6, "Turn-it-In™ was a huge reversal that was greatly needed. I had no love for Safe Assign™." Similar sentiments were expressed by Participant F7, "They went back and bought Turn-it-In™, so everybody's a little bit happier about that."

The department administrator and all but one of the faculty members mentioned Turn-it-In™ as a tool faculty members can use to assist them in detecting plagiarism. Faculty members who use the software as a tool share best practices among each other, including tips on how to maneuver the system and how to exclude cited sources in the similarity report, as evidenced by Participant F5's statement,

> She [Dr. Monte – pseudonym] was talking to Dr. Kline [pseudonym] about the different functionality that she uses within Turn-it-In™ so that it's not catching

every 2%. There was a little peer collaboration going on with Dr. Monte educating Dr. Kline, about how you could, then, Dr. Monte sent something out to the whole department on how you can adjust the functionality [on Turn-it-In™].

Although there was an awareness that the tool existed among almost all of the individuals in the department, the faculty members' individual comfort level with the tool and experience using the tool varied across the department as evidenced by a faculty member's statement,

> I got an email about something called Turn-it-In™ and I don't use that, something about that being on Blackboard or something, I don't know what. But I don't, usually I would know, I have a good memory for when I read things.

Similarly, Participant F6 indicated the need for additional faculty training with this plagiarism detection software as evidenced by Participant F6's comment, "I don't think that we're well trained in how to use it [Turn-it-In™] as a group collectively." Although Participant F6 did indicate throughout the interview several examples of when Participant F6 had used the software and required students to do the same, Participant F6 recognized that this is still a general area in need of further development for faculty members.

Participant F3's and Participant F6's comments are in contrast to Participant F2's description of how Participant F2 uses the software in her classroom, "I also have shown students what a document looks like in Turn-it-In™, what lies and all the colors and the this and the that and the whatnot so that they are aware." Similarly, Participant F7 commented, "I actually have them run their lesson plan, major lesson plan project through Turn-it-In™." Participant F5 explained some of the variances that exists within

the department as it relates to the plagiarism detection software, "I think just the use of things like Turn-it-In™ for our assignments, is really a department, it's used at your own discretion." In sum, although the plagiarism detection software is available to faculty members as a resource, faculty members' own comfort level with the tool and the degree to which this tool is used to help address plagiarism varies within the department, thus pointing to an opportunity to maximize the potential of this resource among faculty members.

Faculty resource: Professional development. Esperanza University's specific professional development resources for faculty members in the area of plagiarism prevention, education, and response were limited. According to Participant F1, the formal development opportunity that addresses plagiarism prevention for faculty members is through the university's e-learning department that provides professional development opportunities for faculty members teaching online classes. Participant F5 and Participant F8 stated that the informal development opportunity for the education department's faculty members is through informal ad-hoc trainings on the style guidelines and updates set forth in the publication manual of the American Psychological Association facilitated by one of the group's members.

Two administrators working in the e-learning department provided their feedback on the department's formal efforts with faculty professional development in an interview. The e-learning department's approach to plagiarism and cheating, in particular, focuses on teaching faculty how to design their courses in a purposive way that promotes and almost ensures the production of original student work. Faculty development in this area focuses on helping faculty members understand the role of authentic assessments to

uphold the integrity of the courses and make the learning experience more personalized for students. Not all of the faculty members of the department teach online courses, but at least one faculty member who teaches online took this training and commented on its value and applicability.

One of the education faculty members facilitates another more informal and department based professional development opportunity. According to Participant F7, the department has an "in-house editor" that helps keep the group up to date on changes with APA style changes. Participant F7 commented on the assistance this faculty member has provided the group relative to APA citations and updates. Participant F7 indicated,

> Dr. Fram [pseudonym] does a lot of editing as well, so she's very up on the APA. She's the one that when we do little workshops, she usually pulls that together. So, we have a kind of in-house editor, which is nice because when there's a lot of, some changes in the handbook, she's all over it. So, we usually have a faculty meeting where she [the faculty member who servers as in-house editor] goes, 'These, this page, and this page, and this page are changed.' So, that is helpful to us too. So, she often helps with the editing and things like that.

Participant F3 also commented on some of the challenges both faculty members and students have learning proper APA style as evidenced in Participant F3's comment, "Just learning APA style is, it's mind-boggling for me, so it must be mind-boggling for them [students]."

The need for more professional development opportunities for the education faculty beyond what is currently offered emerged as an important theme under the theme *unused potential for maximizing resources*. Participant F1 indicated,

> To tell you the truth, I don't know of any resources that are devoted to that [plagiarism], other than the E-learning attention in their workshops and training. If our university puts money behind that in terms of student development, I'm sure they do, I just don't know what they do. We in the college, I mean, I have my ear to the ground pretty well in this college, and I would say we've never put any money or time behind it.

Five of the eight department participants indicated the need to include more development opportunities for faculty members and/or students. As Participant F1 commented, "I think they [policies and procedures] could be much more effective if there were a better understanding and more professional development for all faculty so that we had some clear guidelines. I think we're a little loose about it." Similarly, Participant F6 stated, "I would have somebody identify a time-limited but effective opportunity. It could be a webinar, it could be a 2-hour session." Participant F1 discussed some of the benefits of additional learning opportunities for faculty members, "I think we just don't quite know what it [plagiarism] is. That's why I think things like Turn-it-In™ levels might be useful, so we don't have to take it upon ourselves to make that decision."

Faculty resource: Time. The concept of faculty member's time as a resource also emerged as an important theme. Five of the eight faculty members interviewed referenced their workload and/or lack of time as a barrier to addressing plagiarism among their students. Participant F5 commented,

> I think right now workload is a barrier. I think, and we learned this I guess if we're virtual school it's a full-time job [to] define plagiarism and to track it down and to try. In order, you're doing, you're teaching your courses if you were creating these assignments that are usually written. We want to give good quality feedback, and you got your research and you got your community service and all of that and you may read something, I feel like that's familiar, I feel like I've seen that, it will take you another 2 hours to really follow up on that. Some of it is just workload. If you're not using a software system even with the software system, there's follow up really.

Similarly, Participant F7 commented, "I guess it depends on the individual's time, your own time you have to put into looking at all of them and going to find out what it was, I mean, which is very time consuming." Participant F5 further explained that motivation to allocate the necessary time to research potential plagiarism cases,

> I mean to try to figure out if it is, if it isn't, you don't want to accuse someone because that may ruin, that is going to put a mark on your relationship with your student. It's a big job to try to follow it up and really find incidents of plagiarism. You don't want to be wrong. I think just the workload of it all, if we had a plagiarism sheriff and we could say, could you investigate this? I feel like I'm in a gray area, but we don't have that person on staff, so you take it upon yourself.

As the faculty participants shared their understanding of time as a resource, an additional layer of complexity arose relative to the teaching load of faculty members and the time involved in working with undergraduate students. Participant F7 shed light on this phenomenon,

> Also, I think people who have more undergraduate courses, it's very time-consuming when you have 230 plus students in your classes, and they usually are the ones who are more prone to plagiarize. Versus, having 2 graduate courses with 10 kids, 10 students in it and who are doing wonderful writing, generally. So, I think, I don't know if people really look at that in that term, in terms of the inequity there.

Participant F5 commented on some of the drawbacks relative to addressing plagiarism under the current practices the department follows to assign teaching obligations, "Our most educated, our most well-read faculty are actually teaching the least amount of students. Do you see?" Participant F5 continued, "It's hard because we need our most well-read faculty to really focus on our doc students, and they have the smallest incidents in plagiarism because all their work is original. We're reversed."

Although this potential tension surfaced, efforts do appear to be in place to make the distribution of undergraduate courses more equitable among the department. Participant F7 commented on the department chair's position on teaching assignments since the chair's appointment in the role,

> There were only like 2 full-timers who still taught undergrad, but [The chair was] very emphatic that everybody should be, that the undergrads should have the best of the most tenured faculty too, not just adjuncts and instructors. So, typically, the tenured faculty will teach the doctoral and masters courses. But, also...teach undergrad.

The concept of time as a faculty resource shed light on faculty members' views of their time and the different factors that may influence time maximization. The main

factor outlined was relative to faculty teaching loads and some of the potentially perceived inequities that may emerge, as a result. As Participant F7 commented,

> There are some of our faculty members who are not teaching undergraduate, and I can see that, I mean, it takes a lot of time, with those critical assignments, to go through them all when you have 2 undergraduate courses. So, I guess there's some inequity there.

As commented by Participant F1, "You know this [addressing plagiarism] takes a lot of effort."

Student resources: Broader academic success resources. In the context of this study, the unused potential for maximizing resources relative to students pertains to specific university and department resources that help students, either directly or indirectly, understand what plagiarism is and how to avoid it. These resources include peer-counseling, one-on-one and workshop assistance through the Writing Center, new student orientations, tutoring through the Center for Learning and Student Success, and department sponsored workshops for doctoral students. With the exception of the peer-counseling program and the undergraduate new student orientation, the other department and university resources do not cover plagiarism specifically, but rather approach academic success more broadly, by providing students with assistance in academic writing, APA formatting, and academic support for select courses.

Peer counseling. As illustrated on the Flowchart for the Process of the Code of Academic Integrity at Esperanza University accessed on the school's website, the university provides students who are formally charged with plagiarism with a written notice of the charge and the pertinent sanction. If the charge is substantiated, there will

be a formal annotation on the students' transcript indicating their violation of the school's code of academic integrity. For first offenses, students are afforded the opportunity to go through a peer-counseling program, coordinated through the Dean of Students Office. Upon completion of the peer-counseling program, the annotation on the student's transcript will be removed, though internal records are maintained to document this first transgression in the event of future incidents. A visit to the Dean of Student's website showed that the peer-counseling program is outsourced to a third party offering academic integrity seminars that are instructor-led and personalized. According to the website of this third party vendor, "the seminar is used for ethical development programming, honor council and hearing board training, and as remediation for violations of university honor codes and codes of conduct." Participant F2 was the only faculty member who mentioned this program during the interview,

> They [students] have to go through some peer counseling and things like that, and if they complete that peer counseling, then they can apply to have that [violation annotation on transcript] taken off their transcript. But the second offense is then the dismissal from the university.

Although Participant F2 did mention this program, Participant F2's knowledge on what the program entailed was minimal, "I don't know, for instance how many students are being caught for it and what this peer mediation is doing." Although the faculty members interviewed did not mention the peer-counseling program specifically, the university's formal academic integrity policy that all faculty members must reference in their course syllabi does address the program.

The writing center. Esperanza University also prides itself in a renowned Writing Center. According to one of the staff members at the Writing Center, although the Writing Center has only been at Esperanza for 3 years, it has already received national recognition. At the Writing Center, writing consultants meet with students and writing style guidelines and tips are available as handouts for students. Students can make appointments on their website for this one-on-one support or walk into the center to make their appointment. The center provides students with a voucher verifying their attendance and in some cases; faculty members reward students for using this resource.

The Writing Center also offers writing workshops for students. A review of the Writing Center's workshop calendar reflected five different topic offerings geared toward helping students with academic writing. One of these five workshops was: *Incorporating in-text citations, quotes, and support*. Although the Writing Center provides a wide range of resources for students, according to Participant F5, the College of Education students were among the students with the lowest usage rates of the Writing Center, as compared to the other colleges at Esperanza, according to the usage analysis of the Writing Center for the 2013-2014 school year. This statistic also supports the notion that students in the department are currently not maximizing the existing resources relative to plagiarism prevention.

New student orientation. Another resource available to students that helps educate them on plagiarism is the new student orientation. Part of data collection included the attendance of day one of the 2-day orientation for undergraduate students. Plagiarism was addressed twice during the sessions observed. In the first session, one of the segments covered with students was *Steps for Success*. The new student orientation

presenter explained the Code of Academic Integrity as part of *Step Two: Success is Understanding the Rules*. In this section, the Code of Academic Integrity and other university policies were outlined. The reference to the policy was brief, and the message to students was that they should read the policy and become familiar with it to avoid potential ramifications. The second mention of plagiarism during the new student orientation was in a segment entitled, *It's All Academic with CLASS*. As part of this section, the resources of the Center for Learning and Student Success (CLASS) were covered. As part of this overview, the administrator who presented discussed academic integrity broadly, including the difference between unintentional and intentional plagiarism and the importance of originality and students doing their own work. The researcher was unable to attend day two of the orientation, but according to the pamphlet guide, there was a 15-minute segment on Responsible Freedom covered by the Dean of Student's office. The pamphlet outlined talking points that were related to the violation of the code for behavioral transgressions, rather than academic dishonesty.

The Graduate College also hosts new student orientations. The researcher was unable to attend the orientation, but did access the Graduate Student Orientation Manual online. In this manual, integrity was listed under Graduate Student Requirements. Academic dishonesty is introduced as a violation of ethical standards that conflicts with the university's mission of providing students with a high quality education and is destructive to the university community that is built on trust, integrity, and responsibility. The link to the university's code of academic integrity was also referenced in the manual and available for the students to access.

Center for learning and student success (CLASS). The purpose of CLASS is to provide personal and academic support to undergraduate students to help increase students' academic success, instill a sense of community, and assist in student retention. The resources available for students through CLASS include academically based tutoring (one on one and group tutoring) and different types of support, including student-learning communities. Student learning communities are a way the university tries to make the undergraduate experience more personal to students by grouping incoming freshman with similar academic goals with the same course schedule. The objective is to provide students with more opportunities to connect with their fellow students and help students have their own study and support network with their learning community. CLASS does not provide specific education to students about plagiarism, but its efforts to build community and promote academic success are certainly aspects that help promote a culture of learning among students and indirectly helps prevent plagiarism.

*Departmental doctoral workshops***.** All of the resources outlined, with the exception of the education department's workshops for doctoral students, are university initiatives and therefore not unique to the department. The department level resource involves workshops focused on helping doctoral students with their dissertation. The workshops cover a variety of topics, depending on where students are in their dissertation research. One to two workshops are offered each semester. In addition to these workshops, writing and APA are addressed specifically in the course seminar where students are writing their literature review. The literature review, in particular, is an area that is more subject to plagiarism because assignments of this type require students to analyze and synthesize a plethora of outside resources. As Participant F1 explained, "It's

pretty easy to plagiarize when you're writing a literature review." The education department provides training to students on how to avoid plagiarism but this training is done in the context of promoting the proper use of outside sources in the dissertation, rather than on focusing exclusively on plagiarism prevention and education.

The theme *unused potential for maximizing resources* reflects an opportunity to maximize the different resources at Esperanza University relative to plagiarism prevention, education, and response. For faculty members, the main areas in which to maximize resources are in the areas of faculty training on Turn-It-In™ and overall professional development opportunities for faculty members relative to plagiarism. In addition, the concept of faculty members' time as a resource reflected differences in teaching loads which unevenly impacted the time faculty members have available to address plagiarism issues with students. The student resources available to address plagiarism are largely geared toward broader academic success initiatives, although the peer counseling sponsored by the Dean of Students and the new student orientations address plagiarism directly. Interestingly, the student resources that specifically addressed plagiarism, the peer counseling, and new student orientations, were not well known by the faculty members. Only one faculty member mentioned the peer counseling resource and her knowledge of the program was limited. Of the two faculty members who mentioned the new student orientation in their interviews, neither of them were aware of what the orientation entailed, but assumed that plagiarism/academic integrity was part of the content.

Theme 5: Faculty feel only limited direct and indirect pressures. As a means to tap into any power influences within the department, participants were asked if they

felt any direct or indirect pressures to approach plagiarism in a certain way and if there were any tensions within the department on the topic. The data showed that there were limited direct pressures identified by the faculty members, with the main direct pressure being due more to faculty members' own self-imposed pressure to promote academic quality among students. Indirect pressures relative to university retention goals were also identified, but this did not appear to be a shared pressure among faculty members at the departmental level.

Direct pressures. Only one of the faculty members interviewed described some level of direct pressure from colleagues to address issues relating to academic quality and integrity in a certain way. One of the faculty members described a situation where the faculty member disagreed with her colleague on whether or not to give a student who was found plagiarizing the benefit of the doubt and address the situation informally with the student, versus going to the chair. The faculty member commented, "But, when we all agreed that we go to the chair, it was a compromise for me because I really like to get to know my students and try to figure out what's going on with that student." The faculty member continued, "I mean, not to where there was conflict. But, when she [faculty colleague] asked me what I thought, my thoughts were a little bit different from hers."

More common in the responses was a mention of direct self-imposed internal pressures among faculty members. Four of the eight participants indicated there was more of a self-imposed pressure than an external one. As articulated by Participant F3, "For the most part, I don't feel any pressure except my own academic integrity to make decisions that are in the best interest of the student." Similarly, the concept of self-pressure was further described by Participant F4, "I'm a person who tends to really be

sure that the sources are documented and that they're documented correctly, especially if it's a dissertation. That matters to me, but I don't feel pressured to do that. That's internal." Participant F5 sums up why some faculty members may feel this pressure, "There's a lot of pressure to make sure that, especially your graduate students are not plagiarizing because that's everybody's worst fear is that you have a program that students are getting through, and they are not really learning."

When describing internal pressures, Participant F1 described an unspoken fear that some faculty members may have when addressing plagiarism, "I think sometimes, and this is a sad commentary, but I'll say it anyway, I think sometimes people confuse academic integrity concerns with discrimination, and that's a fear in our university, as it is in many, many universities." Participant F1 continued to discuss how the possible fear of students' allegations of discrimination may present themselves with graduate students,

> In the case of these issues we've been talking about with dissertation, the pressure is almost comes from within faculty members who are afraid to go forward with any kind of accusation because they fear they'll be accused of discrimination. So it's more an internal self-check, which is why I go to, if I feel like we were more savvy, if we had more understanding of where these lines were, we'd be a little more sure of ourselves.

Indirect pressures: Indirect pressures refer to pressures that may influence faculty members' approach to plagiarism indirectly. Two of the eight faculty members interviewed mentioned an indirect pressure that was part of the contextual backdrop facing university faculty members and administrators. Participant F8 commented,

> There's so much pressure on people for completion and retention rates, and it can get messy, not only administratively but legally if formal charges are brought. Then you're into things like disclosures and how much information was the student given about what is wrong and what is the penalty. It's just a bit of, because, it's a bit of an administrative and potential legal minefield.

According to a faculty member, the State Board of Governors has implemented a metric to assess universities' performance, and retention and completion rates are an important part of the metrics. This faculty member indicated, "We're currently being penalized 7 million dollars of what was previously allocated money because we haven't performed adequately in those areas." The faculty member indicated that given this context, it makes more sense for faculty members to resolve plagiarism issues informally with the student than enter the formal realm of policy. As Participant F6 mentioned, "I think if we did what it says in the regulations, we'd not be contributing to the [university's] retention and graduation goals."

The theme of *faculty feel only limited direct, and indirect pressures* reflected limited direct external pressures on faculty members relative to their handling of plagiarism cases. Instead, the data reflected more of an internal self-imposed pressure to uphold academic quality and support students. The indirect pressure identified in the faculty interviews was relative to university retention and graduation rates; however, this pressure appears to be more directly felt at higher levels of the organization.

Chapter Summary

Chapter 4 provided a narrative description of the process of conducting a qualitative single-case study of the education department at Esperanza University and the

methods of collecting data from seven faculty members, one department chair, two administrators overseeing faculty development; participant observation of a freshman new student orientation; and pertinent artifacts relating to plagiarism prevention, education, and response. The initial phase was a pilot study conducted with professional colleagues. After the validation of the questions, the interviews at Esperanza University began. This qualitative case study used a purposeful snowball sampling approach; however, given the size of the population, all but four faculty members from the department were interviewed. Two faculty members declined to participate in the study, and two did not respond to the two email requests.

To explore the micropolitical considerations relating to plagiarism prevention, education, and response within the Education department, the case study included an examination of: (a) formal/informal power influences among stakeholders; (b) stakeholder collaboration; (c) the socialization of academic integrity; (d) policies and procedures; and (e) roles of rituals, myths, and symbols. The main findings of the micropolitical considerations relative to faculty members' approach to plagiarism prevention, education, and response that emerged are addressed in five themes summarized below.

Shared Mission is Balanced with Individual Approach

The faculty members in the education department share a common mission of helping prepare quality educators. Part of these efforts includes maintaining academic quality and preventing plagiarism from occurring. Although the faculty members share the common goal, they go about addressing plagiarism differently. The main areas where this shared mission and individual approach were observed were in the areas of

curriculum and assessment design; the department's work with a writing grant; the course syllabi; and the formal plagiarism process. In all four of these areas, it was evident that the faculty members were guided by a clear objective, but varied in how they approached the objective. This reflects on the faculty culture within the department. Chapter 5 addressed these implications.

Formal Policies Accompanied by Informal Approaches

Faculty members possess different levels of awareness of the formal steps for addressing plagiarism, although all faculty members had a general understanding of the policy. Although the education department faculty members do not have a direct say on what policies are adopted by Esperanza University relative to plagiarism, they are able to voice their concerns through the department level representative on the university faculty senate. The data also reflected a tendency for faculty members within the department to resolve plagiarism cases informally with the student, especially when the cases are reflective of relatively minor infractions. This informal approach sheds light on the faculty culture within the department.

Faculty Serves as Gatekeeper to the Teaching Profession

The theme of *faculty serves as gatekeeper to the teaching profession* addressed the unique position that the education faculty members were in as trained educators in education as a discipline. The data reflected that many faculty members often approach plagiarism from a pedagogical view and faculty members viewed themselves more as educators than graders. Within this approach, variations existed in how faculty members approached students, with some faculty members being more lenient with student

transgressions and others wanting to weed out any of the students whom they consider are not cut out for the teaching profession.

Unused Potential for Maximizing Resources

The theme of *unused potential for maximizing resources* refers to the allocation of faculty and student resources related to plagiarism across the university and the notion that these resources can be maximized. The faculty resources were the use of plagiarism detection software; faculty professional development on plagiarism; and faculty members' time. Potential inequities were raised among faculty members on how their teaching loads were distributed and the impact of these on their time and their ability to address plagiarism in their classes. The resources available to students in the areas of plagiarism and writing include: peer counseling through a third-party vendor, the Writing Center, new student orientation, the Center for Learning and Student Success, and doctoral workshops. Plagiarism as a topic was covered directly in the new student orientation and in the peer counseling with the third-party vendor. All of the remaining resources address plagiarism as an undertone to general efforts to increase students' academic success. Faculty members had minimal knowledge of the resources that directly addressed plagiarism. A common theme among faculty members was that more could be done to maximize both faculty and student resources.

Faculty Feel Only Limited Direct and Indirect Pressures

The department faculty and administrator appeared to be more influenced by direct pressures relative to their own self-imposed pressures, rather than any pressures from colleagues or the administrator to respond to plagiarism cases in a specific way. The indirect pressures identified relate to the retention and graduation goals universities

have; however, the interviews reflected that only two faculty members acknowledged this contextual backdrop.

Chapter 5 includes the conclusions of the study and recommendations for future research on the role of micropolitical considerations on plagiarism prevention, education, and response. Chapter 5 also presents the implications of this study for higher education leaders and faculty members.

Chapter 5

Conclusions and Recommendations

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore the micropolitical considerations that influence the development of a systemic approach to plagiarism prevention, education, and response within the education department at Esperanza University. Seven faculty members, one department chair, and two administrators in faculty training were interviewed for this research study. In addition, artifacts were collected and examined, including faculty syllabi; pamphlets from the undergraduate and graduate student orientations; APA and citing resources from the Writing Center and the education department's website; pamphlets from the Writing Center and the Center for Learning and Student Success; the code of academic integrity; the flow chart for processing cases of academic dishonesty; the 2014-2015 University Catalog; the 2014-2015 Student Handbook; and the descriptions of the workshops available from the Writing Center and the Graduate College. The data collection process also included participant observation of the freshman new student orientation at Esperanza University. The study found that micropolitical considerations related to plagiarism prevention, education, and response are important to consider, but may not play such a large role at the departmental level on issues that on their own are not divisive. Nonetheless, important findings relative to five major themes emerged from the data:

1. Shared mission is balanced with individual approach.
2. Formal policies accompanied by informal approaches.
3. Faculty serves as gatekeeper to the teaching profession.
4. Unused potential for maximizing resources.

5. Faculty feel only limited direct and indirect pressures.

Chapter 5 includes the research findings and their interpretations relative to the main research question: RQ1) In what ways might elements of micropolitics influence college department administrators and faculty members in their approach to plagiarism prevention, education, and response? The limitations of the study are identified, along with recommendations to higher education leaders wanting to enhance their approach to plagiarism prevention, education, and response. Finally, recommendations for areas of future research and a chapter summary are presented.

Review of the Findings

Shared Mission is Balanced with Individual Approach

The theme *shared mission is balanced with individual approach* reflects the group members' common goals, coupled with the academic freedom enjoyed by most academics at traditional research institutions. In this environment, the group resembles a loosely coupled system, where there are marked unifying features among the groups' members, but their individualism as members is also a key characteristic of the unit (Orton, 2008). The notion that an institution of higher education resembles a loosely coupled system is supported in the literature (Pajak & Green, 2003; Root-Robbins, 2005). This organizational structure plays an important role in shaping faculty culture and the dynamics of the education department at Esperanza University.

The micropolitical perspective sheds light on the theme *shared mission is balanced with individual approach* since this lens helps examine the interrelationships among stakeholders, including positive relationships that help drive collaboration among individuals, and negative relationships that can be polarizing and lead to conflict (Björk

& Blase, 2009; Chen, 2009; Eilersten et al., 2008; Marshall & Scribner, 1991). As highlighted by Blase (1991), "[Micropolitics] is about conflict and how people compete with each other to get what they want. It is about cooperation and how people build support among themselves to achieve their ends" (p. 2). From the interviews, it was evident that the faculty culture relative to the addressing of plagiarism issues was relatively conflict free. The micropolitcal lens, therefore, helped explore how faculty members cooperated on issues relative to academic quality, more so than exploring the inherent conflicts among its members.

The faculty members collaborated in four main areas directly or indirectly related to plagiarism: developing high quality curriculum and assessment design; improving student writing through a former writing grant; using course syllabi; and engaging in the university's formal process when reporting academic integrity violations. Within these four areas, faculty members were guided by a common goal, but faculty members adopted unique approaches at the time of implementation. This cooperation was evidenced by Participant F7's comment, "So, we had conversations about that [plagiarism] as a department of, what are we going to do as a department so that we're all on the same page?" Despite this unifying goal, variations in how to approach the goal varied among faculty members in all four fronts.

High-quality curriculum and assessment design. The education faculty members worked closely on enhancing curriculum and assessment in their department meetings. As mentioned by Participant F5, "From an assessment perspective it's our job as educators to design quality assessments." The importance of creating meaningful assessments as way to help prevent plagiarism is supported by the literature (Davis, 2011;

den Ouden & van Wijk, 2011; Heckler, Forde, & Bryan, 2013; Hrasky & Kronenberg, 2011; Macdonald & Carroll, 2006). As College of Education faculty members trained in curriculum and assessment as a discipline, the faculty members may have a deeper understanding of the importance of designing assignments that require students to think critically and engage personally with the topic, compared to faculty members in other disciplines who may lack this formal training. Many of the assignments the education faculty members assign to students, especially undergraduate students, have a field experience component where the university student has to do field work in a pre-kindergarten- grade 12 classroom. Participant F5 explained, "The assignments that they are doing are based on their field experience. Their assignments are personal assignments, so my incident [of plagiarism] is not higher there [with undergraduate students] because of the design of the assessments." This sheds lights on possible factors that influence the extent of plagiarism that arises within the department that may be unique to disciplines where as an integral part of the coursework includes fieldwork. Although the faculty members collaborated in department meetings on ways to enhance the curriculum and assessment, the faculty members continued to have the autonomy to design and/or select the curriculum and assessments of their choice, thus supporting the general theme of *shared mission is balanced with individual approach*.

Writing grant. The faculty members in the Education department discussed their collaboration relative to a writing grant they received a few years ago. This grant provided an important avenue for the faculty members to discuss students' writing and also ways to address plagiarism. The data reflected that this grant helped the faculty members come together for a common goal and share ideas on how to address

plagiarism. As Participant F2 indicated, “It was down toward an issue of writing, right, and that is what our department address[ed] because we also as a department [had] been very concerned about our students' writing standards.”

Interestingly, there appears to be some level of ambiguity as to the effectiveness of the grant as mentioned by one of the faculty members,

> We were encouraged to do that [use writing logs] as a college across the board and that if we had a consistent standards, students would learn to write and take care of their writing. I don’t think that’s happened, and I’m impressed that you even heard of the program from anybody else.

While the undertone of these comments may not necessarily be indicative of any conflicts within the department relative to the writing grant, there does appear to be some level of disconnect between the group’s initial objective and their final outcomes.

Essential to the micropolitical perspective is the understanding that conflict influences stakeholder interactions. As mentioned, there was little evidence of conflict among the faculty members in the education department. Achinstein (2002) commented on collaboration and conflict among educators,

> Fostering a culture of collaboration within a teacher professional community may spark conflict. Communities are often born in conflict because they demand substantial change in school norms and practices, challenging existing norms of privacy, independence, and professional autonomy, and may question existing boundaries between cultures and power groups at school sites. (p. 425)

Given Achinstein’s perspective, it is possible to argue that the micropolitical factors relative to the writing grant were not as salient; therefore, the faculty members’

collaboration during the grant appeared to be collegial and conflict free. Instead, at question was the long-term impact of the grant. In relation to the theme *shared mission is balanced with individual approach*, the faculty members were united with the shared mission of improving students' writing as part of the writing grant, but how and to what extent they then implemented the strategies that resulted from the grant varied.

Course syllabi. The theme *shared mission is balanced with individual approach* was further evidenced in the way the faculty members approached the development of their course syllabi. Per the university guidelines, all faculty members across departments must reference the code of academic integrity in their course syllabi. Faculty members in the Education department varied in how they approached this mandate. As elaborated by Participant F2, "I have a much more truncated version. Some people may have something much longer. I don't want plagiarism and academic dishonesty and whatnot big issues on the first day of class." This method of employing the syllabus as a way to help prevent plagiarism is also a common theme in the literature (Bruwelheide, 2010; Davis, 2011). As related to micropolitics, the course syllabi can be seen as a contract between the faculty member and the student (Parkes & Harris, 2002; Zucker, Baker-Schena, & Pak, 2010). Parkes and Harris (2002) stated, "Regardless of how it is created, the syllabus ultimately becomes an agreement on roles and responsibilities" (pp. 55-56). Since micropolitics involves the realm of policies and procedures and the direct and indirect use of power, the syllabus can be seen as a way to communicate and enforce said policies.

Formal process. The last finding under the theme *shared mission is balanced with individual approach* relates to the formal process faculty members follow when

reporting plagiarism cases. Similar to the other collaborative efforts of the faculty members, this process was relatively conflict free. The first step in the formal plagiarism process at Esperanza University involves an informal resolution through the chair. All of the faculty members were aware of the university's academic integrity policy and felt supported by the department chair as evidenced by Participant F3's comment on Participant F3's experience handling a plagiarism case, "[The department chair] was really very supportive." Participant F3's comments were supported by other faculty members as well. When asked if there had been any conflicts relative to the process the department followed to address plagiarism concerns, one faculty member with administrative experience noted,

> I guess sometimes I've worked to try to suggest that it may not be as serious a case as what they [faculty members] had initially thought, which can help in trying to work out some sort of mutually agreeable solution in the cases of plagiarism.

Despite this response, none of the faculty members expressed any pressures to approach plagiarism matters in any particular way, from their colleagues or the department chair. This response suggests a collegial collaboration of faculty members relative to the plagiarism process.

Micropolitics and shared mission/individual approach. An examination of the theme *shared mission is balanced with individual approach,* relative to the research question suggests that the micropolitical lens was only somewhat helpful in understanding the faculty members' approach to plagiarism because inherent in political approaches is an examination of the influence of power dynamics within a group and this

was largely absent within the department relative to how the group addressed plagiarism. As Webb (2008) noted, "Micropolitical researchers [...] reveal how power operates to inculcate desires, indeed, produce desires, for political gain" (p. 138). Nonetheless, the micropolitical perspective helped identify some important characteristics of the faculty culture in the education department at Esperanza University, including the main areas in which the group members collaborate on relative to plagiarism, mainly curriculum and assessment; a former writing grant; course syllabi; and the formal plagiarism process. The data reflected variations on how faculty members approached each of these four areas.

Formal Policies Accompanied by Informal Approaches

The theme *formal policies accompanied by informal approaches* refers to the formal academic integrity policy that exists at Esperanza University and the informal approaches many of the education faculty members acknowledged they pursued in their own classrooms. The data indicated that faculty members had a general awareness of the institutional policy, but lacked the in-depth knowledge of what the procedural component of the policy entailed. Within this realm of general understanding, the data also reflected that individual faculty members varied in how soon they resorted to formal policies, with some faculty members opting instead to address plagiarism from an educational standpoint with students in their classroom without involving the department chair.

Participant F2 explained that in 2010, Esperanza University revised its academic integrity policy. Participant F2 commented on the focus of the previous policy,

> The previous one was still two strikes and you're out but it was after the second [offense], the first complaint, something went into your personal file. It wasn't

solidly on your transcript, and then if there were no other offense, that was expunged, but now they're putting it on the transcript.

The new policy requires an annotation on the student's transcript of the students' violation of the code of academic integrity after the first offense. Participant F2 also indicated that for first offenses, students have the option of completing a peer-counseling program through a third party vendor. After successfully completing the program, students can petition to have the annotation on the transcript removed. If a student violates the academic integrity code a second time, they are expelled from the university. Other than Participant F2, no other faculty member mentioned the peer-counseling component of the academic integrity policy. Participant F2 also admitted Participant F2's limited awareness of the content and effectiveness of the peer-counseling program. This knowledge gap among the faculty members is noteworthy, suggesting that the faculty members may interpret the actual university policy as being more stringent for first offenses then it is.

Despite the strict policy, there were faculty members who commented that they had followed formal procedures. However, on average, there appears to be a general hesitation among faculty members to go through the formal university process, especially if the student appears to be remorseful and/or the transgression appeared to be unintentional. The data reflected that many of the faculty members addressed plagiarism on their own with students without going through the formal process. Participant F8 commented, "If I'm convinced that they've [students] learned a lesson, I'd rather work it out in this fashion as opposed to having them kicked out of the university through a senate decree or something like that." Participant F3 expressed compassion for students

who engage in unintentional plagiarism. After addressing a plagiarism case with a student, Participant F3 opted in approaching the matter informally as evidenced by Participant F3's comment to the student, "I don't want to bring a plagiarism charge against you, because it's punishing you for something that you didn't, you didn't really understand." Nonetheless, Participant F3 indicated that Participant F3 found outright deceit troublesome. Participant F3 commented, "If I felt that somebody was just outright lying and was really being deceitful and all that, I would act on that." These findings are in line with the literature that indicates that the degree of plagiarism and faculty members' perceptions of students' intent to plagiarize influence faculty members subsequent approach with students (Blum, 2009; East, 2010; Flint, Clegg, & Macdonald, 2006; Paterson et al., 2003).

From a procedural standpoint the department faculty members' process may be acceptable; however, given the limited sharing that takes place among education faculty members relative to particular student cases, the potential exists that several faculty members address plagiarism concerns with the same student on multiple occurrences until a faculty member decides to go through the formal process, if at all. Witherspoon, Maldonado, and Lacey (2012) conducted a study of 186 undergraduates across eleven disciplines at a large urban college. In their study, they found that 79.7% of students admitted to having cheated at least once in college, but there was only a small number of students who admitted to cheating five or more times. Similarly Eret and Ok (2014) conducted a study of 386 teacher candidates in Turkey and found that 15.5% of students usually or frequently intentionally copied Internet materials for assignments and 11.9% usually or frequently paraphrased the work of others on the Internet in a way that may be

considered academically dishonest. This suggests that the percentage of students who engage in repeated plagiarism may be relatively low, but the potential exists that a minority of students may be taking advantage of repeated informal resolutions, if they are addressed at all.

Micropolitics and policies. An examination of the theme *formal policies accompanied by informal approaches,* relative to the research question suggests a gap between formal policy on plagiarism and faculty members' follow-through on using the formalized process. The observed gap aligns with the micropolitical lens, as stated by Björk and Blase (2009), "[the] study of micropolitics in schools and districts is a way to understand the differences between policy rhetoric and the reality of implementation, i.e., 'the implementation gap' of educational reform" (p. 198).

Willner (2011) asserted that contradictions between formal policy and current practice may be helpful to organizations to readjust their procedures, as evidenced by the statement, "From the micropolitical perspective the combination of formal and informal rules stabilizes contradictory intentions and actions within an organization" (p. 166). This suggests that the current gap that exists between formal policy and practice may be due to conflicting goals or expectations among stakeholders. Furthermore, the gap may be helpful to stabilize any potential misalignments between practice and policy.

Faculty Serves as Gatekeeper to the Teaching Profession

The theme *faculty serves as gatekeeper to the teaching profession* refers to the notion that as former pre-kindergarten- grade 12 teachers, the faculty members in the education department share a common culture as educators and a sense of duty to the profession. Part of this duty involves the faculty members serving as gatekeepers to the

teaching profession. Faculty members varied on how wide they allowed the entry gates to be open, with some faculty members expressing more tolerance to students' transgressions than others do. From the onset of the discussion of this theme, it is important to note that the peer reviewer of the coding scheme used in this study did not identify this theme in his independent review of the data. Instead, he attributed the variations among faculty members' approaches to plagiarism as differences relative to their own personal and professional standards, not due to a sense of duty they had to the teaching profession. The peer reviewer's academic and professional background in business, which varies from the researcher's educational and professional background in the pre-kindergarten- grade 12 and post-secondary educational sectors, may account for this difference. A possible limitation of the study relative to the credibility of the findings on this theme may also possibly explain this difference.

Using micropolitics as a lens, this theme reflects the power faculty members exert over students in their role as gatekeepers to the profession and the potential conflicts that can emerge from the faculty members with differing approaches to plagiarism. As stated by Participant F1,"I can say that the faculty who work with graduate students in our department bend over backwards not to kick somebody out, not to, in fact, they want to give them more leeway than maybe they should." Although there was no explicit mention of any type of conflict among the faculty members relative to plagiarism, the different stakeholder perceptions on how best to address plagiarism with students may one day become a source of conflict within the group. As articulated by Eilertsen et al. (2008),

> The micropolitical perspective of schools as organisations...rests upon the assumption that schools are characterised by a diversity of interests and goals resulting in uncertainty or disunity when considering the choices of what ought to be achieved and how things ought to be done. (p. 235)

Although conflict was not evident within the department relative to plagiarism, the varying perspectives among faculty members on how to approach plagiarism may be a future source of contention among faculty members. This reinforces the assertion that schools are "*arenas of struggle*; to be riven with actual or potential conflict between members; to be poorly coordinated; to be ideologically diverse" (Ball, 1987, p. 19).

The concept of *gatekeepers to the teaching profession* is important because it suggests that a faculty member's previous experience as a pre-kindergarten- grade 12 classroom teacher may influence their approach to plagiarism. In their research of teacher trainees in Israel, Reingold and Baratz (2011) argued the importance of faculty members upholding academic integrity with their Education students, especially given the students' chosen profession. The findings of this study build on this premise by supporting the notion that faculty members teaching in teacher preparation programs may feel a sense of duty to their profession and subsequently, may either be more lenient with students to allow students the opportunity to develop as teachers or they may impose strict expectations to ensure that only the best candidates are graduating.

To the researcher's knowledge, no other study has examined how College of Education faculty members' sense of duty to the teaching profession, can influence their response to plagiarism. Scholars in other disciplines have explored the connection

between plagiarism and professionalism. Kenny (2007) examined the field of nurse education and the role of the nurse educator. Kenny stated,

> Plagiarism is clearly a serious issue for students who are undertaking training to enter a profession where integrity, honesty, and trustworthiness are paramount to the nurse-patient relationship. It is thus essential that nurse educators contribute to building a culture of integrity and professionalism demonstrable throughout the academic community from the commencement of training. (p. 18)

Nurse and teacher educators share the important responsibility of training future community workers (nurses/teachers) with the skills, knowledge, and affective dispositions needed to be effective in their respective fields. As applied to a faculty member's response to plagiarism, this sense of duty to his or her profession may manifest itself in the faculty member approaching plagiarism more from an educational standpoint, rather than a punitive approach because the faculty member may feel his/her role is one of a teacher, not a grader, as articulated by Participant F3 in Participant F3's statement relative to plagiarism, "We're here to be teachers. We're not here to be the police." This sense of duty can also manifest itself in a faculty member having less tolerance of student transgressions due to the high standards they hold of their education students as evidenced in Participant F1's statement, "We try to make it [the academic program] as rigorous as we can."

Micropolitics and faculty as gatekeeper. An examination of the theme *faculty serves as gatekeeper to the teaching profession,* relative to the research question suggests that the micropolitical lens sheds light on the power faculty members can directly or indirectly exert over students, not necessarily over their fellow colleagues or faculty

subordinates, as in the case of the department chair. As gatekeepers to the profession, faculty members are indirectly exerting power over their students as they determine who is ready and prepared to serve as an effective educator. This is central to micropolitics because micropolitics involves, "the patterns of formal power and informal influence" (Eilersten et al., 2008, p. 295).

What emerged from the data collected in this study was a unique shared culture among faculty members and a deep-rooted duty to the teaching profession that influenced the faculty members' response to students who plagiarize. The concept of a shared culture among faculty members relative to their approach to academic integrity has been studied in the literature, mainly through an examination of a university's commitment to socialize academic integrity through a campus honor code (Christensen, Hughes, & McCabe, 2006; McCabe & Trevino, 2002) and faculty members' commitment to embracing academic integrity by pursuing "five fundamental values: honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility" (International Center for Academic Integrity, 2013, p. 2). To the researcher's knowledge, none of these studies have explored the socialization of a culture of academic integrity specifically within College of Education faculty members nor if and how faculty members' sense of duty to their profession is connected to their approach to plagiarism.

Within the education department at Esperanza University, the faculty members operated with minimal overt conflicts relative to plagiarism and in a collaborative spirit, though differences in faculty members' perspectives on how to approach plagiarism may possibly lend themselves to future conflict. The literature on academic integrity reflects significant variations in how faculty members define plagiarism and how they respond to

it when it occurs (Bouman, 2009; Power, 2009; Wilkinson, 2009) though to the researcher's knowledge, none of these studies have explored perceived or real conflicts among faculty members relative to their handling of plagiarism issues in the classroom. These findings are in line with micropolitics because "micropolitics deals with the realm of co-operative (i.e. collaborative, collegial, consensual, democratic) as well as conflictive forms of interaction in organizational settings" (Blase & Blase, 1997, p. 138). The findings in this theme also share some commonalities with the previously discussed theme, *formal policies accompanied by informal approaches*, because the majority of the faculty members saw themselves as educators first and thus felt obliged to address plagiarism with students more from an educational standpoint, rather than a punitive one.

Unused Potential for Maximizing Resources

The theme *unused potential for maximizing resources* refers to the notion that the existing resources available for faculty members and students in the areas of plagiarism prevention, education, and response can be better utilized. The identified faculty resources include plagiarism detection software, professional development, and faculty members' time. The student's resources include peer counseling; the Writing Center; new student orientation; the Center for Learning and Student Success; and department sponsored workshops for doctoral students. Of these student resources, plagiarism was directly covered only in the peer-counseling program through the third party vendor and during the new student orientation. Faculty members had limited knowledge of these particular resources.

Faculty resources. The primary resource faculty members have to address plagiarism was detection software through Turn-it-In™. Although the data reflected

some level of collaboration among select faculty members relative to the use of the tool, there was also evidence that their level of comfort with Turn-it-In™ and detection software in general, varied among the department members. One on end there was a faculty member who lobbied against the previous software (SafeAssign™) the school had adopted , and on the opposing end, there was a faculty member who acknowledged minimal understanding of how to use Turn-it-In™ as a tool. Although both faculty members may be outliers in the study, with such a small department, this perspective is important to properly situate the findings. Within the small department, there is perhaps a combination of generational differences and differences in technological savviness that influence the efficacy of Turn-it-In™ as a resource for faculty members. These differences are best understood by a comment made by one of the faculty members, "Our department specifically has [a] majority of older faculty." This faculty member went on to say,

> There is a generation gap about, how could you [plagiarize]? Whereas I think I mean granted I am certainly not as young as our students but I understand how easy it is. It's two clicks. That's it, between right and wrong.

Similarly, there are differences in the savviness faculty members have in using plagiarism detection software such as Turn-it-In™, as reflected in one of the faculty members own recognition of her minimal knowledge of the software and several of the faculty members' reccomendation for more professional development in this area. Participant F6 commented, "I don't think that we're well trained in how to use it [Turn-it-In™] as a group collectively." These findings indicate the need for more faculty training

in this area and supports the general premise that there is room for maximizing the existing resources for faculty members related to student plagiarism.

The current professional development resources for faculty members on plagiarism revolve primarily around virtual training for faculty members teaching online classes through the university's e-learning department and ad-hoc workshops for faculty members by a fellow colleague addressing APA. Based on the data, it is evident that more is needed to support the faculty members on the use of Turn-it-In™ and in providing spaces for faculty members to share best practices among each other relative to academic integrity. Several of the education faculty members recommended the department revisit plagiarism a little more formally and on a routine basis to ensure all faculty members had a good understanding of the policies and are able to share best practices. Participant F2 commented, "I think maybe just we may have gone away from some of our casual conversations about what we are seeing [regarding student plagiarism]."

The last faculty resource identified in this study is faculty members' time. A faculty member's heavy workload and limited availability may leave him or her little time to detect and respond to plagiarism. The notion that plagiarism takes time to detect is also supported by the research (Thompson, 2006; Whitley & Keith-Spiegel, 2001). As stated by Larkham and Manns (2002), "The resource implications of pursuing plagiarism can be significant...this can be particularly significant during the peak weeks of end-of-semester and year assessment, when many instances of possible plagiarism are detected" (pp. 343-344).

Related to faculty members' time, the concept of teaching load emerged from the data. Several faculty members commented on some of the inequities related to the process used to distribute undergraduate and graduate teaching assignments among the faculty members. Participant F5 commented that tenured faculty members typically teach graduate students. In graduate courses, the classes are smaller, and students' writing skills are generally better than that of undergraduate students, thus presumably teaching graduate courses may be less burdensome on faculty members' time. Gallant (2008) acknowledged that one of the constraints faculty members face in complying with university's academic integrity policies is the teaching of large classes as the sheer number of students makes it harder for faculty members to monitor academic dishonesty. Although Participant F7 noted that the department chair works hard to ensure faculty members' teaching loads are balanced, the topic still came up, and some of the faculty participants mentioned some tensions in this area.

The use of the micropolitcal lens helps facilitate the examination of apparent inequities. Flessa (2009) commented, "attending to micropolitics means that important concerns about school unfairness or inequity, ignored in the standard operating procedures from day to day, might come to light" (p. 346). In this context, micropolitics is addressed by exploring a possible source of tension identified by some of the participants in the interviews. Although faculty members were not specifically asked about their teaching loads, the topic arose naturally when the discussion relative to faculty members' time and resource allocation arose. Given the frequency in which faculty members mentioned concerns with course load assignments when discussing resources for addressing plagiarism, it is possible that the education department is not

closely attending to some of the micropolitical considerations they are currently facing the group. Thompson (2006) highlighted some of the challenges higher education leaders face with allocating resources to plagiarism,

> Faculty must simply have access to both time and the tools to catch plagiarism, which will almost certainly decline if it is taken seriously. It is these resources, unfortunately, that probably will continue to be in short supply in the view of the current crisis in higher education funding and the increase number of students. (p. 2447)

Student resources. Although many student resources are available to support students' academic success at Esperanza University, few resources specifically address plagiarism. The broader academic resources include the Writing Center, the Center for Learning and Student Success, and department level doctoral workshops. The resources that address plagiarism specifically include the peer-counseling program through the third-party vendor and the new student orientation. Only one faculty member identified the peer counseling program as a student resource and two faculty members mentioned the new student orientation, though the faculty members did acknowledge they were unaware of the content of either of the resources.

Micropolitics and resources. Blase and Blase (2002) explained that the understanding of resources under the lens of micropolitics refers largely to how individuals exercise power to keep or obtain resources, or obtain a preferred outcome. An examination of the theme *unused potential for maximizing resources,* relative to the research question suggests that the main way in which micropolitics influences faculty members' approaches to plagiarism revolves around the allocation of time as a resource

and the different tensions that can emerge relative to any real or perceived imbalance of faculty members' workloads. As argued by Thompson (2006), faculty members' workload may reduce the time faculty members have available to attend to plagiarism. The micropolitics lens was not as useful in understanding the other resources identified by the faculty members, mainly faculty resources, including plagiarism detection software and professional development, and student resources including peer counseling, the Writing Center, new student orientation, the Center for Learning and Student Success, and department sponsored workshops for doctoral students, because these resources cannot be obtained or kept through power influences from the department. Nonetheless, the use of the micropolitical lens helped gain greater insight of the education faculty members' views on the concept of resources. The data suggests faculty members may interpret resources as educational resources, more so than resources relative to money, power, and influence.

Faculty Feel Only Limited Direct and Indirect Pressures

By examining plagiarism prevention, education, and response through the lens of micropolitics, it is possible to explore the role power influences, and pressures play in everyday interactions among people. As stated by Blase (1991) in his germinal text on micropolitics, "Micropolitics is about power and how people use it to influence others and protect themselves" (p. 1). Within the department, the power influences and pressures faculty members experienced from colleagues or administrators were minimal as it related to plagiarism. Only one of the seven department faculty members interviewed admitted to having felt a bit pressured by a colleague to approach the department chair with a plagiarism concern and her desire to resolve the issue with the

student directly. This hesitation is in line with the literature that describes some of the hesitation faculty members may feel in formally addressing plagiarism with students out of fear of negatively impacting the student's record and/or a preference to address the issue in their classrooms (Auer & Krupar, 2001; Liebler, 2009).

From the data, it was evident that the pressures relative to student plagiarism were limited, but rather, the prevailing influence was a self-imposed pressure faculty members felt to support students and academic quality. The findings in this theme align with the theme, *faculty serves as gatekeepers to the teaching profession.* For some faculty members this self-imposed pressure can be interpreted as doing all they can to support the student, as evidenced by Participant F6's statement,

> I come from a philosophy of trying to help our diverse students succeed in a challenging environment. I have special soft spots for our international students, our black students, our students who have come through our [public] schools who just, somebody needs to tell them what's right, what's good, what's not quality.

This viewpoint supports the notion that as an educator by discipline, the faculty member may feel an internal pressure to make up for any deficiencies in the pre-kindergarten- grade 12 system and then do his/her part to ensure the teachers in the future teaching pool are culturally diverse. This philosophy was most evident in Participant F6's comment,

> I especially feel that we need teachers who are male, teachers who are Black, teachers who are multicultural, multilingual. They may not be the strongest academics, but we need them in our classrooms, we need them in our schools, we need our students to have role models they can identify with and they can say, 'I

too can go to college, I too can get a good job.' The candidates that are really trying, the candidates that have that potential to be that role model for others who identify with their identity, I'll do everything to try to hold on to.

In contrast, for Participant F2, this self-pressure impelled Participant F2 to be less tolerant of student transgressions, as evidenced in the statement,

> If you can't get your act together and if you are academically dishonest, you don't belong in the classroom, so we have an obligation if we see this to address it. And, students, I tell them, I'm flexible in all sorts of things but when it comes to this I turn rock solid.

What emerged from the data was an important finding relative to the influence of faculty members' self-imposed pressures to support teachers or teacher leader candidates, either by making a concerted effort to support teacher development by perhaps being more lenient on transgressions with the aim of helping the student correct his/her wrongs, or in the same spirit of support, supporting teachers and teacher leaders by setting high expectations and not being as lenient on plagiarism cases. While the research was not a specific examination of the way faculty members' sense of duty to their profession has shaped their own self-imposed pressures in how they approach plagiarism, the findings aligned with the research conducted by Auer and Krupar (2001) and Liebler (2009) that found that some faculty members feel self-imposed pressures to do all they can to support students and consequently, they may refrain from addressing plagiarism formally with students to avoid negatively impacting students' academic record.

The State Board of Governors method of ranking universities, which includes retention and graduation rates, may represent a source of indirect pressure on faculty

members and administrators. Only two faculty members mentioned retention and graduation rates in their interview and from those two, one faculty member discussed the recent seven million dollar fine Esperanza University incurred for not meeting the required goals. This indirect pressure is important to mention given the substantial fiscal impact on the university; however, the findings suggest this pressure did not influence faculty members' approach to plagiarism cases in their classroom. The academic literature has not specifically examined how retention and graduation rates may influence faculty members' responses to plagiarism. However, Gallant (2008) did suggest that faculty members are subject to some external pressures when addressing plagiarism cases resulting from the lack of support from school administrators for addressing plagiarism incidents and/or fear of student retaliation. The mainstream media has covered alleged cases where faculty members have resigned or sued universities for administrators pressuring faculty members to be lenient on student cheating and plagiarism (Field, 2011; Maffly, 2012).

Micropolitics and pressures. An examination of the theme *faculty feel only limited direct and indirect pressures,* relative to the research question suggests that the main pressure that emerged for faculty members relative to plagiarism was a self-pressure to support students and instill academic quality. Since the micropolitical lens can best be used to examine pressures related to direct and indirect influences and power, this finding suggests that the micropolitical lens may not be the best suited to exam the direct pressures the faculty members in the education department faced since the pressures identified emerged primarily from an internal self-pressure, rather than an external influence. Caruso (2011) researched the micropolitics of change among middle school

principals and defined four pressures within an organization: delegation of resources; issues of control; daily tasks; and middle school needs. Although this interpretation is only one approach to micropolitical pressures, the types of pressures identified in the study clearly reflect the influence of an external pressure on decision makers (Caruso, 2011). This external pressure was largely absent within the College of Education department faculty members at Esperanza University relative to addressing student plagiarism.

Similarly, the indirect pressures on faculty members' approach to plagiarism, mainly goals related to Esperanza University's retention and graduation rates, were not observed within the department. Given the hefty penalties the university faces if the goals are not met, it is possible to assume that the pressures stemming from monetary sanctions are likely felt at higher levels of the organization and not necessarily isolated to handlings of student plagiarism cases. Consequently, the micropolitics lens was only marginally useful in helping understand the departmental dynamics relative to plagiarism and the direct pressures and indirect pressures were limited and did not appear to have an influence on the handling of plagiarism incidents at the departmental level.

Implications

This case study was an exploration of the micropolitical considerations relative to an education department's approach to plagiarism prevention, education, and response. Based on the review of the academic integrity literature, no other study has examined the influence of micropolitics on faculty members' handling of plagiarism cases. To address the implications of the study, the usefulness of the micropolitical lens in examining

faculty members' approaches to plagiarism was first evaluated, followed by the examination of the implications relative to each of the research findings.

Usefulness of the Micropolitical Lens

The micropolitical lens helped the understanding of the five themes that emerged from the data:

1. Shared mission is balanced with individual approach.
2. Formal policies accompanied by informal approaches.
3. Faculty serves as gatekeeper to the teaching profession.
4. Unused potential for maximizing resources.
5. Faculty feel only limited direct and indirect pressures.

The usefulness of the micropolitical lens for each of these themes varied. The first theme, *shared mission is balanced with individual approach* emphasized the level of collaboration among faculty members relative to their approaches to plagiarism in four main areas: curriculum design, a former writing grant, course syllabi, and formal policies. The micropolitical lens was helpful because it helped explore stakeholder collaboration (Björk & Blase, 2009). However, given the limited power influences among the education department faculty members relative to their approaches to plagiarism, the lens is only partially aligned to the theme because the concept of power and influence is central to the micropolitical perspective.

The micropolitical lens also helped uncover an important gap between the university's formal and informal policies relative to the handling of plagiarism concerns. Specifically, the lack of consensus among the faculty members as to when they should bring plagiarism concerns formally to the chair for review and mediation, versus handling

the concern informally in the classroom. The gap between policy and practice was an important part of the micropolitical realm (Björk & Blase, 2009) and was explored in the theme, *formal policies accompanied by informal approaches*. The micropolitical lens appeared to be best aligned with this theme.

The micropolitical lens was also useful in identifying self-pressures faculty members experienced relative to how they handle student plagiarism issues and their sense of duty to the teaching profession. The theme, *faculty serves as gatekeeper to the teaching profession*, includes the exploration of this sense of duty. Because the main power influences identified in this theme were among faculty members exerting power over their students, not among each other, the micropolitical lens was only partially helpful in examining faculty level interactions within the department.

Relative to the theme, *unused potential for maximizing resources*, the main contribution of the micropolitical lens was the understanding of time as a faculty resource, especially relative to how faculty members' teaching loads impact faculty members' workload. Central to the exploration of resources and the micropolitical perspective is the concept of power and how stakeholders use power to preserve or secure new resources or attain a desired outcome (Blase & Blase, 2002). The main limitation of this lens was its inability to explain the majority of resources faculty members identified during their interviews, which were primarily student resources that cannot be kept or obtained through power influences within the department.

The micropolitical lens was the least useful in exploring the theme, *faculty feel only limited direct and indirect pressures,* since there were limited pressures relative to plagiarism approaches that emerged from the data. The direct pressure identified, faculty

members' self-pressures, is not well aligned because self-pressures are apolitical, and thus not pertinent to micropolitics. The indirect pressures identified, state-imposed goals for retention and graduation rates, were only mentioned by two of the individuals interviewed, and therefore likely not to be a major influence among faculty members in their approach to plagiarism.

Despite the insight provided by the micropolitical lens in understanding some of the aspects of the emerging themes, the micropolitical lens was only marginally useful in examining Esperanza University's education faculty members' approach to student plagiarism. The level of collegiality among faculty members within the department, or the notion that on its own, plagiarism as a topic was not a particularly divisive topic for the faculty members, or a combination of both influences may account for this finding.

Implications of Research Findings

Although the findings of this study found that the micropolitical lens was only partially useful in understanding the departmental level dynamics, there were important contributions of this study to the field relative to the five identified themes. The first theme, *shared mission is balanced with individual approach*, outlined the unique characteristics of the department's shared goals in the areas of quality curriculum and assessment design; a writing grant; course syllabi; and the formal process. What were noteworthy in this collaboration were faculty members' varied approaches to these goals.

Studies have shown that students perceive faculty members to be inconsistent in their approach to plagiarism (Bouman, 2009; Power, 2009; Roig, 2001; Wilkinson, 2009). Faculty members' varied approaches to plagiarism, especially as it pertains to their coverage of plagiarism on the course syllabi, may potentially contribute to mixed

messages to students on what academic dishonesty is and the extent and seriousness of the violation. This distinction is important for university leaders to consider when designing their plans to promote academic integrity among key stakeholders within an educational setting.

Similarly, an important finding stemmed from the examination of the theme, *formal policies accompanied by informal approaches*. This theme helped uncover a gap that exists among university policy and faculty practice. Robinson-Zañarthu et al. (2005) argued that unclear definitions of plagiarism largely explain the inconsistencies in faculty members' approaches to plagiarism. Although the faculty members at Esperanza University were relying on the same code of academic integrity that outlined the definition of plagiarism as part of the code, there were still inconsistencies in how faculty members addressed plagiarism. The gap between policy and practice may also be explained by faculty members' willingness to devote their time and energy to the administrative process (Auer & Kruper, 2001; Brown & Choong, 2005; Gallant, 2008). These findings suggest that university leaders should consider how they define plagiarism and also reexamine their internal processes for reporting academic dishonesty to ensure they are not unduly burdensome or time-consuming for faculty members.

The theme, *faculty serves as gatekeeper to the teaching profession*, reflects a unique contribution to the literature because to the researcher's knowledge, no other study has examined how faculty members' sense of duty to the teaching profession influences their approach to addressing student plagiarism. While the relationship between faculty members' duty to the profession and their approach to plagiarism has been explored in the nursing field (Kenny, 2007), this is still a fairly new perspective that

merits additional study. This outlook helps identify a new way of examining faculty members' roles as professionals and the degree to which these can be leveraged to socialize academic integrity among the student body.

The theme, *unused potential for maximizing resources*, reflects the various faculty and student resources relative to addressing plagiarism at Esperanza University. One of the key findings were that very few resources were devoted specifically to addressing plagiarism, with the exception of the peer counseling program through a third party vendor and the new student orientation. Interestingly, the faculty members within the department knew the least about these two resources. This finding suggests that faculty members may not be as well equipped to approach plagiarism with students because they are unaware of the trainings and university resources students have been exposed to, such as new student orientation. Furthermore, if faculty members are not aware of the university's educational resources utilized to respond to plagiarism, such as Esperanza University's peer counseling program, then they may not be as willing to follow the formal process.

Relative to faculty resources on plagiarism, the main resource available to faculty members was electronic software to detect similarity percentages in students' work. Another finding related to resource allocation relates to faculty members' teaching loads and how increased teaching responsibilities can negatively impact the time faculty members have to address plagiarism issues. The main implication of this finding is that when faculty members face more tasks than time available, student plagiarism may not get the sufficient attention or response.

Lastly, the theme, *faculty feel only limited direct and indirect pressures*, reflects the limited pressures the faculty members felt relative to their approach to plagiarism in the classroom. Instead, what emerged was a self-imposed self-pressure to uphold academic quality and support the development of future and current teachers and educational leaders. This finding is important because it reinforces the role faculty members have as gatekeepers to the teaching profession and how this sense of duty to the profession can manifest itself in self-imposed pressures to instill academic rigor in the classroom.

Limitations of the Study

Participants in the study included seven full-time faculty members in the education department at Esperanza University, the Department Chair, and two administrators who oversee professional development for faculty members teaching online courses at the university. The results of qualitative case study research are limited to the single case and cannot be generalizable to the larger population (Merriam, 2009; Yin, 2009). The many differences that exist within departments, such as cultural, geographic, internal department dynamics, and more, all limit the generalizability of the findings to other college departments. This sample population limited the study because the findings are only generalizable to the education department at Esperanza University.

A central goal of this study was to obtain honest and truthful responses to the interview questions. There was not any reason to believe that the responses provided by the participants were not an accurate representation of their beliefs. However, given the sensitivity of the topic, there may be some minor differences between the participants' answers and their true perceptions.

Despite the precautions taken to avoid introducing any bias to the study, including a pilot study to validate the interview protocol, participants' responses may have been influenced by the order in which questions were posed, the question wording, and/or the way the researcher interacted with the participants and asked follow-up questions. In addition, the peer review of the coding scheme reflected a difference in the reviewer's interpretation of the theme, *faculty serves as gatekeeper to the teaching profession.* This difference may be explained by the different academic disciplines of the researcher and the peer reviewer; however, it may also reflect a potential limitation to the credibility of the findings relative to this theme. Inherent in qualitative research the data collected is subject to the researcher's interpretations (Salkind, 2003). Although a concerted effort was made to avoid bias in the data analysis, the risk of some degree of bias is inevitable and a limitation of the study.

Recommendations for University Leaders

Although the findings from this study cannot be generalized, they can be transferable if leaders determine that the research and findings closely match those at their own organization (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The findings from this qualitative case study offer university administrators and faculty members with different strategies to help bolster their approach to plagiarism prevention, education, and response. The main implications for professional practice are related to faculty-level collaboration and university policy.

The first recommendation is to enhance the opportunities for faculty-level collaboration relative to academic integrity issues. A recurring topic that emerged from the data was the importance of having faculty members periodically revisit plagiarism in

a purposeful way. University leaders would benefit from creating spaces to allow for this intentional and planned collaboration among faculty members. The need to offer spaces for faculty members to discuss academic integrity issues and brainstorm on strategies on prevention and how to respond to incidents is supported by the research (Caldwell, 2010; Gallant, 2011). As noted by Walsh, Lewis, and Rakestraw (2013), "Unlike the scholarly community faculty can turn to when struggling with a research question, many faculty do not feel they have a comparable community of support for addressing teaching challenges" (p. 21). Providing faculty members with the time and space to collaborate on ways to socialize academic integrity among students can help contribute to the development of an ethical culture within the department and university. This socialization requires more than one initial communication and, therefore, periodic discussions on the topic among faculty members are recommended based on the findings of this study and in line with the literature recommendations.

In the context of a teacher education program for training future teachers, teacher leaders, and administrators, this recommendation should be situated within a larger contextual backdrop where the students' profession is at its center. Therefore, faculty level collaboration should involve purposeful and meaningful attempts to help students understand the connections between intentional academic dishonesty in college to intentional unethical behavior of educators in the field, and the implications of both.

The second recommendation relates to university policy and the gap between formal policy and faculty practice in addressing plagiarism. Higher education leaders should recognize that many plagiarism cases might be informally addressed by faculty members in their classrooms (Auer & Krupar, 2001; Liebler, 2009). Without providing

any type of minimal guidelines or general parameters to address these cases, there is likely to be great variation among faculty members on how they pursue plagiarism cases. In line with the recommendations per Gallant (2011), it is recommended that university leaders adopt a wider interpretation of plagiarism and provide guidelines for faculty members to navigate the many nuances that come with students understanding how to incorporate outside sources in their written work.

The findings from Turn-it-In™ (2012) research study with 900 high school and college instructors around the world, supports this recommendation. In this study, Turn-it-In™ researchers conceptualized plagiarism as a plagiarism spectrum, where ten different types of plagiarism exist, with varying levels of severity and frequency. Turn-it-In™ (2012) recommends that educators keep in mind the different types of plagiarism and respond to students' transgressions accordingly. The concept of plagiarism as a spectrum supports the development of incremental guidelines for faculty members to address student plagiarism, especially when addressing matters informally. The incremental guidelines may potentially help faculty members be more consistent in how they approach student plagiarism and possibly reduce the number of incidents that faculty members address informally because the formal process would be extended to address varying levels and types of plagiarism.

Recommendations for Future Research

There are two recommendations for future research. The first is to examine the micropolitical perspective as it relates to plagiarism from the vantage point of a university or a university system, rather than a college department, as was the approach of this study. This perspective may offer greater clarity on the role micropolitical

considerations such as power, resources, conflict, and collaboration have on larger institutional decisions relating to plagiarism and student retention. As explored in the theme, *faculty feel only limited direct and indirect pressures,* Esperanza University incurred a seven million dollar fine for not meeting graduation and retention rates. Given the extent of the fine, it is possible to deduce that there are pressures to meet retention and graduation rates at some level of the organization. Since this fine was only mentioned by one faculty member, it appears that discussions with individuals higher in the organization may shed light on how direct or indirect pressures impact practice relative to the faculty and institution's response. Although case studies of universities examining plagiarism have been conducted, the examination of micropolitics and the way it impacts university-based decisions on student code of conduct issues, including plagiarism, has largely been ignored and merits a closer examination.

The last recommendation for future research is to reexamine how faculty members approach plagiarism and the role that their profession and their sense of duty to their profession play in their response to incidents in the classroom. On one end of the spectrum, the professional educator serves as educator first and works above and beyond to ensure all students succeed as reflected in Participant F7's comment, "I really think it's important that we really help them [students] get it [academic content/skills] and at whatever costs, I guess, is what I think we should be doing." This may result in the faculty member working through all informal channels first and providing significant amounts of coaching to students before ever raising the issue of plagiarism up to an administrator. On the other end, some faculty members' sense of duty to the teaching profession may result in them approaching the issue of plagiarism more punitively to

ensure that only the strongest and best teacher candidates, teacher leaders, or administrators, are the ones who graduate from the programs. Participant F8 also expressed these sentiments as seen in Participant F8's statement, "I think you would find that some faculty would be incredibly hard-lined on it. Some faculty might even turn a blind eye to it. That would depend on the faculty member." Researching how faculty members in other departments internalize their sense of duty to their profession and how this influences their approach to plagiarism, prevention, education, and response is an important perspective that deserves formal attention in future studies.

Chapter Summary

Chapter 5 provided an overview of the conclusions and recommendations of the study relative to the research questions. The significance of the five emergent themes was explored and situated within the larger context of the literature on academic integrity and micropolitics. The applicability of the micropolitics lens for each of the identified themes was highlighted and then holistically examined to identify the usefulness of the micropolitical lens in understanding the education department's approach to plagiarism prevention, education, and response. The micropolitical lens was only partially useful in understanding the departmental level dynamics and the faculty members' approach to plagiarism incidents.

Chapter 5 includes the acknowledged limitations of the study and recommendations for university leaders relative to faculty collaboration on plagiarism prevention and strategies to help address the gaps between academic integrity policy and faculty practice. Lastly, recommendations for future research are presented, including the need to re-examine the usefulness of the micropolitical lens in understanding approaches

to plagiarism from a university level or university system level, rather than a departmental level and the importance of exploring how faculty members' sense of duty to their profession influences their approaches to plagiarism.

References

Allemand, K. R. (2012). *Student and faculty perceptions of academic dishonesty: A qualitative single-case study.* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (UMI No. 3529662).

American Psychological Association (2010). *The publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Anderson, K. E., & Cvetkovic, V. B. (2010). Teaching intellectual honesty in a parodied world. In K. E. Anderson, & V. B. Cvetkovic (Eds.). *Stop plagiarism: A guide to understanding and prevention,* 3-14. New York, NY: Neal-Schuman Publishers.

Anitsal, I., Anitsal, M., & Elmore, R. (2009). Academic dishonesty and intention to cheat: A model on active versus passive academic dishonesty as perceived by business students. *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal*, *15*(2), 17-26. Retrieved from http://www.alliedacademies.org/public/journals/JournalDetails.aspx?jid=6.

Auer, N. J., & Krupar, E. M. (2001). Mouse click plagiarism: The role of technology in plagiarism and the librarian's role in combating it. *Library Trends, 49*(3), 415-435. Retrieved from https://www.ideals.illinois.edu/bitstream/handle/2142/8353/librarytrendsv49i3d_opt.pdf?sequence=1.

Babalola, Y. T. (2012). Awareness and incidence of plagiarism among undergraduates in a Nigerian private university. *African Journal of Library, Archives & Information Science, 22*(1), 53-60. Retrieved from http://www.ajol.info/index.php/index/search/search.

Badke, W. (2007). Training plagiarism detectives: The law and order approach. *Online, 31*(6), 50-52.

Baetz, M., Zivcakova, L., Wood, E., Nosko, A., De Pasquale, D., & Archer, K. (2011). Encouraging active classroom discussion of academic integrity and misconduct in higher education business contexts. *Journal of Academic Ethics, 9*(3), 217-234. doi:10.1007/s10805-011-9141-4.

Bailes, M. (2009). The evolution of the plagiarist: Natural history in Anna Seward's order of poetics. *Eighteenth-Century Life, 33*(3), 105-126. doi:10.1215/00982601-2009-005.

Ball, S.J. (1987). *The Micropolitics of the School: Towards a Theory of School Organization*. Methuen: London.

Batane, T. (2010). Turning to Turn-it-In™ to fight plagiarism among university students. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society, 13*(2), 1. Retrieved from http://www.ifets.info/.

Behrendt, L. S., Bennett, K. K., & Boothby, J. L. (2010). Encouraging faculty reporting of plagiarism: Implications for administrators. *The Journal of Faculty Development, 24*(3), 15-20. Retrieved from http://newforums.metapress.com/content/l0k734268267588h/?p=b98b9208e35347b5aabb42778df91581&pi=1.

Belter, R. W., & Pré, A. D. (2009). A strategy to reduce plagiarism in an undergraduate course. *Teaching of Psychology, 36*(4), 257-261. doi:10.1080/00986280903173165.

Biggam, J., & McCann, M. (2010). A study of Turn-it-In™ as an educational tool in student dissertations. *Interactive Technology and Smart Education, 7*(1), 44-54. doi:10.1108/17415651011031644.

Bing, M. N., Davison, H., Vitell, S. J., Ammeter, A. P., Garner, B. L., & Novicevic, M. M. (2012). An experimental investigation of an interactive model of academic cheating among business school students. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 11*(1), 28-48. doi:10.5465/amle.2010.0057.

Björk, L. G. & Blase, J. (2009). The micropolitics of school district decentralization. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, *21*(3), 195-208. doi:10.1007/s11092-009-9078-y.

Blase, J. (Ed.). (1991). *The politics of life in schools: Power, conflict, and cooperation.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Blase, J., & Blase, J. (1997). The micropolitical orientation of facilitative school principals and its effects on teachers' sense of empowerment. *Journal of Educational Administration, 35*(2), 138-164. doi:10.1108/09578239710161777.

Blase J., & Blase, J. (2002). The micropolitics of instructional supervision: A call for research. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 38*(1), 6-44. doi:10.1177/0013161X02381002.

Blum, S. D. (2009). *My word!: Plagiarism and college culture*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Boehm, P., Justice, M., & Weeks, S. (2009). Promoting academic integrity in higher education. *The Community College Enterprise, 15*(1), 45-61. Retrieved from http://schoolcraft.edu/pdfs/cce/15.1.45-61.pdf.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1997). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bouman, K. W. (2009). *A phenomenological investigation of college students' construction and representation of plagiarism.* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (UMI No. 3387432).

Bowers, W. J. (1966). *Student dishonesty and its control in college.* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (UMI No. 679326).

Brosky, D. (2011). Micropolitics in the school: Teacher leaders' use of political skills and influence tactics. *The International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation, 6*(1), 1-11. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ972880.pdf.

Brown, B. S., & Choong, P. (2005). An investigation of academic dishonesty among business students at public and private United States' universities. *International Journal of Management*, *22*(2), 201-214. Retrieved from http://www.internationaljournalofmanagement.co.uk/2005/2005-2.html.

Bruwelheide, J. H. (2010). Plagiarism: Trends, thoughts, suggestions. *TechTrends, 54*(5), 22-24 doi 10.1007/s11528-010-0433-0.

Burns, J. (2010). Cross-case synthesis and analysis. In A. Mills, G. Durepos, & E. Wiebe (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Case Study Research*, 265-268. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi: http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.apollolibrary.com/10.4135/9781412957397.

Bush, T. (2011). The micropolitics of educational change. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *39*(6), 642-645. doi:10.1177/1741143211424559.

Caldwell, C. (2010). A ten-step model for academic integrity: A positive approach for business schools. *Journal of Business Ethics, 92*(1), 1-13. doi:10.1007/s10551-009-0144-7.

Caruso, L. F. (2011). *The micropolitics of educational change experienced by novice public middle school principals.* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database (UMI No. 3239316). Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.7282/T3CF9PGZ.

Carroll, J. (2009). Should we use Turn-it-In™ at this university? *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education (Oxford Brookes University), 8*(2), 160-162. Retrieved from http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/assets/hlst/documents/johlste/vol8no2/82ResourceReview157to166.pdf.

Chao, C. A., Wilhelm, W. J., & Neureuther, B. D. (2009). A study of electronic detection and pedagogical approaches for reducing plagiarism. *Delta Pi Epsilon Journal, 51*(1), 31-42. Retrieved from http://www.dpe.org.

Chen, H. J. (2009). Micropolitics of the staff meeting in a Taiwanese primary school. *Engitim Arastirmalari-Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 35*, 21-38. Retrieved from http://www.ejer.com.tr/0DOWNLOAD/pdfler/eng/1677072813.pdf.

Christensen Hughes, J. M., & McCabe, D. L. (2006). Understanding academic misconduct. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 36*(1), 49-63. Retrieved from http://wiki.mcmaster.ca/TAN/_media/julia_understanding_academic_misconduct_cjhe_2006.pdf.

Cole, S., & Kiss, E. (2000). What can we do about student cheating? *About Campus, 5*(2), 5. Retrieved from https://saa.lsu.edu/sites/saa.lsu.edu/files/attachments/About%20Campus%20May_June2000.pdf.

Comas-Forgas, R., & Sureda-Negre, J. (2010). Academic plagiarism: Explanatory factors from students' perspective. *Journal of Academic Ethics, 8*(3), 217-232. doi:10.1007/s10805-010-9121-0.

Crisp, GT (2004, July). Plagiarism and the reputation of the university: How to distribute effort between educating students on attribution and rigorous detection of cheating? Paper presented at the Proceedings of the Australian Universities Quality Forum 2004: Quality in a Time of Change, 52-56. Adelaide, Australia. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/2440/28615

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry & research design* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cvetkovic, V. B., & Rodriguez, L. F. (2010). The academic versus plagiarism: Rearranging the deck chairs on the Titanic or the stand at Thermopylae. In K. E. Anderson & V. B. Cvetkovic, (Eds.), *Stop plagiarism: A guide to understanding and prevention,* 39-49. New York, NY: Neal-Schuman Publishers.

Davis, L. (2011). Arresting student plagiarism: Are we investigators or educators? *Business Communication Quarterly, 74*(2), 160-163. doi:10.1177/1080569911404053.

Davis, M., & Carroll, J. (2009). Formative feedback within plagiarism education: Is there a role for text-matching software? *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 5*(2), 58-70. Retrieved from http://www.ojs.unisa.edu.au/index.php/IJEI/article/view/614.

Davis, S. F., & Ludvigson, W. H. (1995). Additional data on academic dishonesty and a proposal for remediation. *Teaching of Psychology, 22*(2), 119. doi:10.1207/s15328023top2202_6.

den Ouden, H., & van Wijk, C. (2011). Plagiarism: Punish or prevent? Some experiences with academic copycatting in the Netherlands. *Business Communication Quarterly, 74*(2), 196-200. doi:10.1177/1080569911404405.

Dufresne, R. L. (2004). An action learning perspective on effective implementation of academic honor codes. *Group & Organization Management, 29*(2), 201-218. doi:10.1177/1059601103261472.

Dye, J. F., Schatz, I. M., Rosenberg, B. A., & Coleman, S. T. (2000, January). Constant comparison method: A kaleidoscope of data. *The Qualitative Report* [On-line serial], *4*(1/2). Retrieved from http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR3-4/dye.html

East, J. (2010). Judging plagiarism: A problem of morality and convention. *Higher Education, 59*(1), 69-83. doi:10.1007/s10734-009-9234-9.

Eilersten, T. V., Gustafson, N., & Salo, P. (2008). Action research and the micropolitics in schools. *Educational Action Research*, *16*(3), 295-308. doi:10.1080/09650790802260208.

Eret, E. & Ok. A. (2014). Internet plagiarism in higher education: tendencies, triggering factors and reasons among teacher candidates. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 39*(8), 1002-1006. doi: 10.1080/02602938.2014.880776.

Ferree, C. W., & Pfeifer, H. L. (2011). The 'write' stuff: Simple techniques designed to teach students how to avoid plagiarism. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 22*(2), 286-303. doi:10.1080/10511253.2010.517768.

Field, K. (2011). Faculty at for-profits allege constant pressure to keep students enrolled. (cover story). *Chronicle Of Higher Education, 57*(36), A1.

Flessa, J. (2009). Educational micropolitics and distributed leadership. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *84*, 331-349. doi:10.1080/01619560902973522.

Flint, A., Clegg, S., & Macdonald, R. (2006). Exploring staff perceptions of student plagiarism. *Journal of Further and Higher Education, 30*(2), 145-156. doi:10.1080/03098770600617562.

Gallant, T. B. (2006). *Reconsidering academic dishonesty: A critical examination of a complex organizational problem.* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (UMI No. 3239316).

Gallant, T. B. (2007). The complexity of integrity culture change: A case study of a liberal arts college. *Review of Higher Education, 30*(4), 391-411. doi:10.1353/rhe.2007.0024.

Gallant, T. B. (2008). Academic integrity in the twenty-first century. *ASHE Higher Education Report, 33*(5), 1-130. doi:10.1002/aehe.3305.

Gallant, T. B. (2011). *Building a culture of academic integrity.* [white paper]. Madison, WI: Magna Publications. Retrieved from http://www.depts.ttu.edu/centerforcampuslife/downloads/academicintegrity-magnawhitepaper.pdf.

Gallant, T. B., & Drinan, P. (2006a). Institutionalizing academic integrity: Administrator perceptions and institutional actions. *NASPA Journal (National Association of Student Personnel Administrators), 43*(4), 61-81. doi:10.2202/1949-6605.1723.

Gallant, T. B. & Drinan, P. (2006b). Organizational theory and student cheating: Explanation, responses, and strategies. *The Journal of Higher Education, 77*(5). 839-860. doi:10.1353/jhe.2006.0041.

Gilmore, J., Strickland, D., Timmerman, B., Maher, M., & Feldon, D. (2010). Weeds in the flower garden: An exploration of plagiarism in graduate students' research proposals and its connection to enculturation, ESL [English as a second language] and contextual factors. *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 6*(1), 13-28. Retrieved from

http://www.eacfaculty.org/pchidester/Eng%20102f/Plagiarism/Organizational%20theory%20and%20student%20cheating.pdf.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. New York: Aldine.

Grandy, G. (2010). *Instrumental case study*. In A. J. Mills, G. Durepos, and E. Wiebe (Eds). Encyclopedia of case study research (474-476). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. doi:10.4135/9781412957397.

Granitz, N., & Lowey, D. (2007). Applying ethical theories: Interpreting and responding to student plagiarism. *Journal of Business Ethics, 72*(3), 293-306. doi:10.1007/s10551-006-9171-9.

Gurung, R. R., Wilhelm, T. M., & Filz, T. (2012). Optimizing honor codes for online exam administration. *Ethics & Behavior, 22*(2), 158-162. doi:10.1080/10508422.2011.641836.

Haag, S., & Smith, M. L. (2002). The possibility of reform: Micropolitics in higher education. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *10*(21).

Hard, S. F., Conway, J. M., & Moran, A. C. (2006). Faculty and college student beliefs about the frequency of student academic misconduct. *Journal of Higher Education, 77*(6), 1058-1080. doi:10.1353/jhe.2006.0048.

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. Retrieved from http://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/bitstream/handle/2027.42/55268/2004?sequence=3.

Heckler, N. C., Forde, D. R., & Bryan, C. H. (2013). Using writing assignment designs to mitigate plagiarism. *Teaching Sociology, 41*(1), 94-105. doi:10.1177/0092055x12461471.

Howard, R. M., & Davies, L. J. (2009). Plagiarism in the internet age. *Educational Leadership, 66*(6), 64-67. Retrieved from http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/mar09/vol66/num06/Plagiarism-in-the-Internet-Age.aspx.

Hoyle, E. (1999). The two faces of micropolitics. *School Leadership & Management, 19*(2), 213-222. doi:10.1080/13632439969249.

Hrasky, S., & Kronenberg, D. (2011). Curriculum redesign as a faculty-centred approach to plagiarism reduction. *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 7*(2), 23-36. Retrieved from http://www.ojs.unisa.edu.au/index.php/IJEI/article/viewFile/761/576.

Huntington, S. P. (1965). Political development and political decay. *World Politics, 17*(3), 386-430. doi:10.2307/2009286.

Huntington, S. P. (1968). Political order in changing societies. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Hutton, P. A. (2006). Understanding student cheating and what educators can do about it. *College Teaching, 54*(1), 171-176. doi:10.3200/CTCH.54.1.171-176.

Iannaccone, L. (1991). Micropolitics of education: What and why. *Education and Urban Society*, *23*(4), 465-471. doi:10.1177/0013124591023004008.

Insley, R. (2011). Managing plagiarism: A preventative approach. *Business Communication Quarterly, 74*(2), 183-187. doi:10.1177/1080569911404058.

Jocoy, C., & DiBiase, D. (2006). Plagiarism by adult learners online: A case study in detection and remediation. *International Review of Research in Open & Distance Learning, 7*(1), 1-15. Retrieved from http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/242/466.

Kaufman, F., & Still, F. (2010). Professional organizations' recommendations regarding intellectual honesty. In K. E. Anderson, & V. B. Cvetkovic (Eds.), *Stop plagiarism: A guide to understanding and prevention* (pp. 58-61). New York, NY: Neal-Schuman Publishers.

Kelderman, E. (2013). States strike budget bargains with higher education. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/1400693384?accountid=458.

Kenny, D. (2007). Student plagiarism and professional practice. *Nurse Education Today, 27*(1), 14-18. doi:10.1016/j.nedt.2006.02.004.

Kibler, W. L. (1992). *A framework for addressing student academic dishonesty in higher education from a student development perspective.* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (UMI No. 304017157).

Kibler, W. L. (1993). A framework for addressing academic dishonesty from a student development perspective. *NASPA Journal, 31*(1), 8-18. Retrieved from http://www.naspa.org/login?return=/publications/journals.

Klein, D. (2011). Why learners choose plagiarism: A review of literature. *Interdisciplinary Journal of E-Learning & Learning Objects*, *7*, 797-110. Retrieved from http://www.ijello.org/Volume7/IJELLOv7p097-110Klein730.pdf .

Kolich, A. M. (1983). Plagiarism: The worm of reason. *College English, 45*(2), 141-148. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/377221?uid=3739600&uid=2134&uid=2&uid=70&uid=4&uid=3739256&sid=21103336693161.

Koshy, S. (2009). A case of miscommunication? Obstacles to effective implementation of a plagiarism detection system in a multicultural university. University of Wollongong in Dubai-Working Paper Series, 3. Retrieved from http://ro.uow.edu.au/.

Kostka, I. (2012). *A case study of l2 writers' evolving understandings of plagiarism.* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (UMI No. 3511428).

Kutz, E., Rhodes, W., Sutherland, S., & Zamel, V. (2011). Addressing plagiarism in a digital age. *Human Architecture: Journal of the Sociology of Self-Knowledge, 9*(3), 15-35. Retrieved from http://scholarworks.umb.edu/humanarchitecture/vol9/iss3/3.

Larkham, P. & Manns, S. (2002). Plagiarism and its treatment in higher education. *Journal of Further and Higher Education, 26*(4), 339-349. doi:10.1080/0309877022000021748.

Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J. E. (2010). *Practical research: Planning and design* (9th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Lehman, K. (2010, October). Stemming the tide of plagiarism: One educator's view. *Library Media Connection, 29,* 44-46. Retrieved from http://www.librarymediaconnection.com/pdf/lmc/reviews_and_articles/featured_articles/Lehman_October2010.pdf.

Levine, J. (2001). What we are learning about academic integrity. *About Campus, 6*(1), 9. Retrieved from http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/1536-0687(200103/04)6:1%3C1:AID-ABC61%3E3.0.CO;2-H/abstract.

Li, Y., & Casanave, C. P. (2012). Two first-year students' strategies for writing from sources: Patchwriting or plagiarism? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 21*(2), 165-180. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2012.03.002.

Liebler, R. (2009). Plagiarism and costs. *College Student Journal, 43*(3), 718-722. Retrieved from http://www.freepatentsonline.com/article/College-Student-Journal/206687064.html.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Macdonald, R., & Carroll, J. (2006). Plagiarism-A complex issue requiring a holistic institutional approach. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 31*(2), 233-245. doi:10.1080/02602930500262536.

Maffly, B. (2012, November 26). Is Southern Utah University tolerating plagiarism by ESL students? *The Salt Lake Tribune*. Retrieved from http://www.sltrib.com/sltrib/news/55287015-78/plagiarism-esl-frost-program.html.csp.

Mahaffey, P. A. (2010). *Academic integrity: The experience of learning through cheating.* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from Proquest Dissertation and Theses database. (UMI No. 3412345).

Marsh, B. (2007). *Plagiarism: Alchemy and remedy in higher education*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Marshall, C., & Scribner, J. D. (1991). It's all political: Inquiry into the micropolitics of education. *Education and Urban Society, 23*(4)*, 347-355.* doi:10.1177/0013124591023004001.

Marshall, T., Taylor, B., Hothersall, E., & Pérez-Martín, L. (2011). Plagiarism: A case study of quality improvement in a taught postgraduate programme. *Medical Teacher, 33*(7), e375-e381. doi:10.3109/0142159X.2011.579201.

Martin, B. (2008, March/April). Comment: Citation shortcomings; peccadilloes or plagiarism? *Interfaces, 38*(2), 136-137. Retrieved from http://www.bmartin.cc/pubs/08interfaces.html.

Martin, D. E., Rao, A., & Sloan, L. R. (2011). Ethnicity, acculturation, and plagiarism: A criterion study of unethical academic conduct. *Human Organization, 70*(1), 88-96. Retrieved from http://www.academia.edu/1120695/Ethnicity_Acculturation_and_Plagiarism_A_Criterion_Study_of_Unethical_Academic_Conduct.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) (2010). Academic integrity: What is plagiarism? Retrieved from http://web.mit.edu/academicintegrity/citing/whatisplagiarism.html.

Mazzeo, T. J. (2007). *Plagiarism and the literary property in the romantic period*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

McCabe, D. L. (2005). Cheating among college and university students: A North American perspective. *International Journal of Educational Integrity, 1*(1), 1-11. Retrieved from http://www.ojs.unisa.edu.au/index.php/IJEI/article/download/14/9.

McCabe, D. L. (2009). Academic dishonesty in nursing schools: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Nursing Education, 48*(11), 614-623. doi:10.3928/01484834-20090716-07.

McCabe, D.L; Butterfield, K.D., Treviño, L.K. (2003). Faculty and academic integrity. The influence of current honor codes and past honor code experiences. *Research in Higher Education, 44*(3), 367 – 385. doi.org/10.1023/a:1023033916853

McCabe, D. L., Butterfield, K. D., & Treviño, L. K. (2006). Academic dishonesty in graduate business programs: Prevalence, causes, and proposed action. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 5*(3), 294-305. doi:10.5465/AMLE.2006.22697018.

McCabe, D. L., & Pavela, G. (2004). Ten [updated] principles of academic integrity. *Change, 36,* 10-15. doi:10.1080/00091380409605574.

McCabe, D. L, & Trevino, L. (2002). Honesty and honor codes. *Academe, 88*(1), 37-41. doi:10.2307/40252118.

McCabe, D. L., Trevino, 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.

McGloin, S. (2008). The trustworthiness of case study methodology. *Nurse Researcher, 16*(1), 45-55. Retrieved from http://rcnpublishing.com/doi/abs/10.7748/nr2008.10.16.1.45.c6752.

McMahon, M. (2009). Academic dishonesty in colleges & universities. *Academic Dishonesty in Colleges & Universities - Research Starters Education*, 1-7.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Moeck, P. G. (2002). Academic dishonesty: Cheating among community college students. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 26*(6), 479-491. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02776770290041846.

Montuno, E., Davidson, A., Iwasaki, K., Jones, S., Martin, J., Brooks, D. et al. (2012). Academic dishonesty among physical therapy students: A descriptive study. *Physiotherapy Canada, 64*(3), 245-254. doi:10.3138/ptc.2011-13.

Morgan, D. (2008) Snowball sampling. In L. Given (Ed.), The Sage encyclopedia of qualitative reasearch methods, 816-817. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412963909.n425

Morris, E. (2009). A perspective from the Academy JISC Academic Integrity Service. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education (Oxford Brookes University), 8*(2), 162-164.

Neuman, W. L. (2003). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Nonis, S., & Swift, C. O. (2001). An examination of the relationship between academic dishonesty and workplace dishonesty: A multi-campus investigation. *Journal of Education for Business*, *77*(2), 69. doi:10.1080/08832320109599052.

QSR International Pty Ltd. (2012). NVivo qualitative data analysis software (Version 10). Retrieved from http://www.qsrinternational.com/default.aspx

O'Neill, H. M. & Pfeiffer, C. A., (2012). The impact of honour codes and perceptions of cheating on academic cheating behaviours, especially for MBA bound undergraduates. *Accounting Education, 21*(3). doi:10.1080/09639284.2011.590012.

Orton, J. (2008). Loose coupling. In S. Clegg, & J. Bailey (Eds.)*, International Encyclopedia of Organization Studies,* 834-837. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi: http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.apollolibrary.com/10.4135/9781412956246.n286.

Pajak, E. & Green, A. (2003). Loosely coupled organizations, misrecognition, and social reproduction. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 6*(4), 393-413. Retrieved from http://people.upei.ca/cdigiorgio/pajak%2Bgreen-organizations_misrecognition_socialreproduction.pdf.

Park, C. (2003). In other (people's) words: Plagiarism by university students – literature and lessons. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 28*(5), 471-488. Retrieved from

http://www.elearning.tcu.edu/resources/faculty/Turn-it-In™ /Why%20Students%20Plagiarize.pdf.

Park, S., Mardis, L. A., & Ury, C. J. (2011). I've lost my identity - oh, there it is ... In a style manual. *Reference Services Review, 39*(1), 42-57. doi: 10.1108/00907321111108105.

Parkes, J. & Harris, M. B. (2002). The purposes of a syllabus. *College Teaching, 50*(2), 55. doi: 10.1080/87567550209595875.

Passow, H. J., Mayhew, M. J., Finelli, C. J., Harding, T. S., & Carpenter, D. D. (2006). Factors influencing engineering students' decisions to cheat by type of assessment. *Research in Higher Education, 47*(6), 643-684. doi:10.1007/s11162-006-9010-y.

Paterson, B., Taylor, L., & Usick, B. (2003). The construction of plagiarism in a school of nursing. *Learning in Health & Social Care, 2*(3), 147-158. doi:10.1046/j.1473-6861.2003.00047.x.

Perry, B. (2010). Exploring academic misconduct: Some insights into student behaviour. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 11*(2), 97-108. doi:10.1177/1469787410365657.

Postle, K. (2009). Detecting and deterring plagiarism in social work students: Implications for learning for practice. *Social Work Education*, *28*(4), 351-362. doi:10.1080/02615470802245926.

Power, L. G. (2009). University students' perceptions of plagiarism. *Journal of Higher Education, 80*(6), 643-662. Retrieved from http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/jhe/summary/v080/80.6.power.html.

Pritchett, S. (2010). *Perceptions about plagiarism between faculty and undergraduate students.* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (UMI No. 3401777).

Qian, Y. K. (2009). The institutionalization of democratic civil society in Taiwan: A case study of NGOs working on the Hsi-Chih Trio case. *Asian Survey, 49*(4), 716-739. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/as.2009.49.4.716.

Reingold, R., & Baratz, L. (2011). An institutional code of ethics – A response to attitude of Israeli teachers' education college students toward academic plagiarism. *US-China Education Review*, *8*(5), 589-598. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED520682.pdf.

Rettinger, D. A., & Kramer, Y. (2009). Situational and personal causes of student cheating. *Research in Higher Education, 50*, 293-313. Retrieved from http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs11162-008-9116-5.

Rhoda, R. (1978). Political instability and institutionalization in developing countries: An empirical evaluation of the Huntington model. *Review of Public Data Use*, *6*(1), 38.

Roberts, T (2008). *Student plagiarism in an online world: Problems and solutions*. Hershey, PA: Information Science Reference. Retrieved from http://repository.binus.ac.id/2009-1/content/L0032/L003271821.pdf.

Robinson-Zañartu, C., Peña, E. D., Cook-Morales, V., Peña, A. M., Ashfani, R., & Ngyuen, L. (2005). Academic crime and punishment: Faculty members' perceptions of and responses to plagiarism. *School Psychology Quarterly, 20*(3), 318-337. Retrieved from http://psycnet.apa.org/?&fa=main.doiLanding&doi=10.1521/scpq.2005.20.3.318.

Roig, M. (2001). Plagiarism and paraphrasing criteria of college and university professors. *Ethics & Behavior, 11*(3), 307-323. doi:10.1207/S15327019EB1103_8.

Roig, M., & Caso, M. (2005). Lying and cheating: Fraudulent excuse making, cheating, and plagiarism. *Journal of Psychology, 139*(6), 485-494. doi:10.3200/JRLP.139.6.485-494.

Roig, M., & DeTommaso, L. (1995). Are college cheating and plagiarism related to academic procrastination? *Psychological Reports, 77*(2), 691-698. doi:10.2466/pr0.1995.77.2.691.

Root-Robbins, L. (2005). *Enabling change in loosely coupled systems: Principles and practices from an action research study*. (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (UMI No. 305348821).

Rothbauer, P. (2008). Triangulation. In Lisa M. Given (Ed.), The SAGE Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods. (pp. 893-895). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi: http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.apollolibrary.com/10.4135/9781412963909.n468.

Salkind, N. J. (2003). *Exploring Research,* (5th ed.). Prentice-Hall, Inc. A Pearson Education Company.

Simons, H. (2009). *Case study research in practice*. London, England: Sage. doi:10.4135/9781446268322.n7.

Singh, H. & Bennington, A. J. (2012). Faculty on the frontline: Predicting faculty intentions to address college student plagiarism. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal, 16*(4), 115-128. Retrieved from http://alliedacademies.org/public/Journals/JournalDetails.aspx?jid=5.

Smith, M. J. (2012). *Faculty integrity and its contribution to the culture of integrity in online nursing courses.* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (UMI No. 3533661).

Spencer, L. (2010). The onus of originality: Creativity and accomplishment in digital and competitive age. In K. E. Anderson & V. B. Cvetkovic (Eds.), *Stop plagiarism: A guide to understanding and prevention* (pp. 29-37). New York, NY: Neal-Schuman Publishers.

Staats, S., Hupp, J. M., Wallace, H., & Gresley, J. (2009). Heroes don't cheat: An examination of academic dishonesty and students' view on why professors don't report cheating. *Ethics & Behavior, 19*(3), 171-183. doi:10.1080/10508420802623716.

Stake, R. E. (2005). Qualitative case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.), pp. 443-466. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stanley, R. (2010). *Still divided academy: How competing visions of power, politics, and diversity complicate the mission of higher education*. Blue Ridge Summit, PA: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Sullivan, J. P. (2005). *Martial: The unexpected classic*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Sutherland-Smith, W. (2008). *Plagiarism, the internet and student learning: Improving academic integrity.* Maddison, NY: Taylor & Francis.

Sutherland-Smith, W. (2010). Retribution, deterrence and reform: The dilemmas of plagiarism management in universities. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 32*(1), 5-16. doi: http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/titles/1360080X.asp.

The International Center for Academic Integrity. (2013, June). The fundamental values of academic integrity [Draft]. Retrieved from http://www.academicintegrity.org/icai/assets/FVproject.pdf.

Thompson, C. (2006). Unintended lessons: Plagiarism and the university. *Teachers College Record, 108*(12), 2439-2449. Retrieved from http://www.tcrecord.org/content.asp?contentid=12848.

Turn-it-In™ (2012). The plagiarism spectrum: Instructor Insights into the 10 types of plagiarism. [white paper]. Retrieved from http://www.turnitin.com/assets/en_us/media/plagiarism_spectrum.php.

University of California San Diego (n. d.). Academic integrity: About us. Retrieved from https://students.ucsd.edu/academics/academic-integrity/about/index.html.

University of Southern California (2013). Organizing your social science research paper. Retrieved from http://libguides.usc.edu/content.php?pid=83009&sid=616083.

Vandehey, M. A., Diekhoff, G. M., & LaBeff, E. E. (2007). College cheating: A twenty-year follow-up and the addition of an honor code. *Journal of College Student Development, 48*(4), 468-480. Retrieved from http://muse.jhu.edu/login?auth=0&type=summary&url=/journals/journal_of_college_student_development/v048/48.4vandehey.html.

Van Maanen, J. (1979). Reclaiming qualitative methods for organizational research: A preface. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 24*(4), 520-526. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/2392358?uid=3739600&uid=2&uid=4&uid=3739256&sid=21103336908831.

Volkov, A., Volkov, M., & Tedford, P. (2011). Plagiarism: Proactive prevention instead of reactive punishment. *E-Journal of Business Education & Scholarship of Teaching, 5*(2), 22-35. Retrieved from http://www.ejbest.org/upload/eJBEST_Volkov_Volkov_Tedford_2011_2.pdf.

Waithaka, A. G., & Gitimu, P. (2012). Academic dishonesty - team effort against it; a review of literature. *Journal of Academic and Business Ethics, 6*, 1-7. Retrieved from http://www.aabri.com/manuscripts/121142.pdf.

Walker, A. L. (2008). Preventing unintentional plagiarism: A method for strengthening paraphrasing skills. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 35*(4), 387-395. doi:10.1207/S15328023TOP2902_06.

Walsh, M. L., Lewis, J. S., & Rakestraw, J. (2013). Faculty collaboration to effectively engage diversity: A collaborative course redesign model. *Peer Review, 15*(1), 21-24. Retrieved from http://www.aacu.org/publications-research/periodicals/faculty-collaboration-effectively-engage-diversity-collaborative.

Webb, P.T. (2008). Re-mapping power in educational micropolitics. *Critical Studies in Education, 49*(2), 127-142. doi:10.1080/17508480802040183.

Wheeler, D., & Anderson, D. (2010). Dealing with plagiarism in a complex information society. *Education, Business and Society: Contemporary Middle Eastern Issues, 3*(3), 166-177. doi:10.1108/17537981011070082.

Whitley, B. E., Jr., (1998). Factors associated with cheating among college students: A review. *Research in Higher Education, 39*(3), 235-274. doi:10.1023/A:1018724900565.

Whitley, B. E., Jr., & Keith-Spiegel, P. (2001). Academic integrity as an institutional issue. *Ethics & Behavior, 11*(3), 325-342. doi:10.1207/S15327019EB1103_9.

Whitley, B. E., Jr., & Keith-Spiegel, P. (2002). *Academic dishonesty: An educator's guide.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Wideman, M. (2011). Caring or collusion? Academic dishonesty in a school of nursing. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 41*(2), 28-43. Retrieved from http://ojs.library.ubc.ca/index.php/cjhe/article/view/2298/2216.

Wilkinson, J. (2009). Staff and student perceptions of plagiarism and cheating. *International Journal of Teaching & Learning in Higher Education, 20*(2), 98-105. Retrieved from http://library.oum.edu.my/oumlib/sites/default/files/file_attachments/odl-resources/4583/ijtlhe202.pdf.

Williams, B. T. (2007). Trust, betrayal, and authorship: Plagiarism and how we perceive students. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 51*(4), 350-354. doi:10.1598/JAAL.51.4.6.

Willner, R. (2011). Micro-politics: An underestimated field of qualitative research in political science. *German Policy Studies, 7*(3), 155-185. doi: 10.1080/14719030802263954.

Willower, D. J. (1991). Micropolitics and the sociology of school organizations. *Education and Urban Society, 23,* 442-454. doi:10.1177/0013124591023004006.

Wilson, M. S., Krause, M. J., & Xiang, T. (2010). A redemption strategy for students caught cheating, *2*, 80-85.

Witherspoon, M., Maldonado, N., & Lacey, C. H. (2012). Undergraduates and academic dishonesty. *International Journal of Business and Social Science, 3*(1), 76-86. Retrieved from http://www.ijbssnet.com/journals/Vol_3_No_1_January_2012/9.pdf.

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research designs and methods* (4th edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Zucker, K.D, Baker-Schena, L., & Pak, M. (2010). The course syllabus: Contract, culture, and compass. *The Teaching professor, 24*(1). Retrieved from http://www.magnapubs.com/newsletter/the-teaching-professor/59/the_course_syllabus_contract_culture_and_compass-7711-1.html.

Appendix A

Informed Consent: Participants 18 Years of Age and Older

Dear Faculty/Administrator,

My name is Alexandra Escobar and I am a student at the University of Phoenix working on a Doctorate in Educational Leadership. I am doing a research study entitled: A College Department's Approach to Plagiarism: A Case Study of Micropolitics. The purpose of the research study is to explore how micropolitical considerations influence the development of a systemic approach to plagiarism education, prevention, and response within a college department.

Your participation will involve completing a short demographic questionnaire, a face to face interview, and the sharing of any documents pertaining to academic integrity that are not confidential in nature, such as your course syllabi/instructor policies, PowerPoint presentations of training sessions you facilitated or attended, handouts on academic integrity, quantitative data on the prevalence of academic dishonesty, among others. The goal is for the researcher to gain a deep understanding of how plagiarism is approached by a college department and using multiple sources will enrich this study and analysis. After the data is collected and reviewed by the researcher, you will be asked to review a summary of the major points of the interview to confirm their accuracy.

You can decide to be a part of this study or not. Once you start, you can withdraw from the study at any time without any penalty or loss of benefits. The results of the research study may be published but your identity will remain confidential and your name will not be made known to any outside party. In this research, there are no foreseeable risks to you.

Although there may be no direct benefit to you, a possible benefit from you being part of this study is helping college administrators and faculty gain a deeper understanding of the complexities involved in developing a system-wide approach to plagiarism prevention, education, and response to help strengthen current approaches to further promote academic integrity among college students.

If you have any questions about the research study, please call me at 954-661-8391 or email me at alexandra.escobar@ymail.com. For questions about your rights as a study participant, or any concerns or complaints, please contact the University of Phoenix Institutional Review Board via email at IRB@phoenix.edu.
As a participant in this study, you should understand the following:

1. You may decide not to be part of this study or you may want to withdraw from the study at any time. If you want to withdraw, you can do so without any problems by informing the researcher via phone or email.

2. Your identity will be kept confidential.

3. Alexandra Escobar, the researcher, has fully explained the nature of the research study and has answered all of your questions and concerns.

4. You must give permission for the researcher, Alexandra Escobar, to record the interviews. You understand that the information from the recorded interviews may be transcribed. Data will be kept in a secure and locked area. The data will be kept for 3 years, and then destroyed.

5. The results of this study may be published.

"By signing this form, you agree that you understand the nature of the study, the possible risks to you as a participant, and how your identity will be kept confidential. When you sign this form, this means that you are 18 years old or older and that you give your permission to volunteer as a participant in the study that is described here."

(☐) I accept the above terms. (☐) I do not accept the above terms. (CHECK ONE)

Signature of the interviewee _____ Date _____
Signature of the researcher _____ Date _____

Appendix B

Participant Demographic Survey

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study. Prior to our interview, please complete this short questionnaire. As with our interview questions, this information will remain confidential and your identity will not be revealed in the study's results.

Please note: this study includes faculty who have taught in the department for at least one year and administrators who have worked in the department for at least six months. If you do not meet these criteria, please do not proceed in completing this survey and notify the researcher.

1) What is your current role? A faculty member or administrator in the education department at Esperanza University?

_____

2) How many years have you been teaching/working in the education department at Esperanza University?

_____

3) How many years of experience do you have in higher education?

_____

4) If applicable, do have tenure at your current institution?

_____

Thank you for taking the time to answer these questions.

If you have any questions regarding this study and/or your participation, you may contact the researcher at Alexandra.Escobar@ymail.com

Appendix C

Semi-Structured Interview Guide

The researcher will ask the questions below of all faculty and administrators. Follow-up questions will be interjected as needed by the researcher to ask for further clarification or to redirect the interview question to address the study's research questions.

1) What has been your experience at Esperanza University and the education department been relative to academic integrity?

2) How do you handle plagiarism in your classroom?

3) Could you describe any conversations you may have had with other colleagues about plagiarism?

4) Could you describe any ways that faculty and administrators collaborate on issues related to plagiarism?

5) How are the policies and procedures pertaining to the handling of plagiarism cases adopted and implemented?

6) What is your understanding about how resources are allocated to support the detection of plagiarism and promotion of academic integrity?

7) What role does the university's code of conduct and other university and department initiatives related to academic integrity play in how you choose to operate as a faculty or administrator?

8) What measures, if any, has the education department undertaken to promote academic integrity among students and faculty? What is your perspective of these efforts?

9) What recommendations would you offer to the education department to enhance its approach to plagiarism prevention, education, and response?

10) What else would you like to share about plagiarism that we haven't discussed?

Sub-Ideas for Interview Questions

The topics below will serve as sub-ideas to further develop during the semi-structured interview.

- The general approach to plagiarism – punitive, educational, a mix between punitive/educational, hands-off approach, or other.
- The concept of agency as it relates to plagiarism prevention, education, and response.
- Barriers faculty may face in addressing plagiarism in their classroom or any policies/processes that work exceptionally well.
- The relationship that exists among faculty/administrator as it relates to addressing plagiarism. Examine any tensions that may exist, such as competing interests.
- The concept of resources – such as personnel, system support, promotion efforts, training needed to address plagiarism.
- Assumptions faculty and administrators have as they pertain to plagiarism.

Appendix D

Research Question/Interview Question Matrix

The matrix below outlines the study's research questions and their alignment to the study's interview questions.

Interview Questions	RQ1	RQ1a	RQ1b	RQ1c	RQ1d	RQ1e
1) What has been your experience at Esperanza University and the education department relative to academic integrity?	X	X	X	X	X	X
2) How do you handle plagiarism in your classroom?	X		X			
3) Could you describe any conversations you may have had with other colleagues about plagiarism?	X		X	X		X
4) Could you describe any ways that faculty and administrators collaborate on issues related to plagiarism?	X	X	X		X	
5) How are the policies and procedures pertaining to the handling of plagiarism cases adopted and implemented?	X				X	
6) What is your understanding about how resources are allocated to support the detection of plagiarism and promotion of academic integrity?	X			X	X	
7) What role does the university's code of conduct and other university and department initiatives related to academic integrity play in how you choose to operate as a faculty or administrator?	X			X	X	
8) What measures, if any, has the education department undertaken to promote academic integrity among students and faculty? What is your perspective of these efforts?	X			X		X

9) What recommendations would you offer to the education department to enhance its approach to plagiarism prevention, education, and response?	X		X	X
10) What else would you like to share about plagiarism that we haven't discussed?	X			

Appendix E

Non-Disclosure Form: Transcription

Non-Disclosure Agreement

Rev.com acknowledges that in order to provide the services to Alexandra A. Escobar (hereinafter "Researcher") who is a researcher in a confidential study with the University of Phoenix, Inc., Rev.com must agree to keep the information obtained as part of its services (as more fully described below) confidential. Therefore the parties agree as follows:

1. The information to be disclosed under this Non-disclosure Agreement ("Agreement") is described as follows and shall be considered "Confidential Information": All audio files and documented transcripts related to said confidential study.

   All information shall remain the property of Researcher.

2. Rev.com agrees to keep in confidence and to use the Confidential Information for transcription only and for no other purposes.

3. Rev.com further agrees to keep in confidence and not disclose any Confidential Information to a third party or parties for a period of five (5) years from the date of such disclosure. All oral disclosures of Confidential Information as well as written disclosures of the Confidential Information are covered by this Agreement.

4. Rev.com shall upon Researcher's request either destroy or return the Confidential Information upon termination of this Agreement.

5. Any obligation of Rev.com under this Agreement shall not apply to Confidential Information that:

   a) Is or becomes a part of the public knowledge through no fault of Rev.com;
   b) Rev.com can demonstrate was rightfully in its possession before disclosure by Researcher/ research subjects; or
   c) Rev.com can demonstrate was rightfully received from a third party who was not Researcher/research subjects and was not under confidentiality restriction on disclosure and without breach of any nondisclosure obligation.

6. Rev.com agrees to obligate its employees or agents, if any, who have access to any portion of Confidential Information to protect the confidential nature of the Confidential Information as set forth herein.

7. Rev.com shall defend, indemnify and hold the Researcher and the University of Phoenix harmless against any third party claims of damage or injury of any kind resulting from Rev.com use of the Confidential Information, or any violation of by Rev.com of the terms of this Agreement.

Current version 032012

8. In the event Rev.com receives a subpoena and believes it has a legal obligation to disclose Confidential Information, then Rev.com will notify Researcher as soon as possible, and in any event at least five (5) business days prior to the proposed release. If Researcher objects to the release of such Confidential Information, Rev.com will allow Researcher to exercise any legal rights or remedies regarding the release and protection of the Confidential Information.

9. Rev.com expressly acknowledges and agrees that the breach, or threatened breach, by it through a disclosure of Confidential Information may cause irreparable harm and that Researcher may not have an adequate remedy at law. Therefore, Rev.com agrees that upon such breach, or threatened breach, Researcher will be entitled to seek injunctive relief to prevent Rev.com from commencing or continuing any action constituting such breach without showing or providing evidence of actual damage.

10. The interpretation and validity of this Agreement and the rights of the parties shall be governed by the laws of the State of Florida

11. The parties to this Agreement agree that a copy of the original signature (including an electronic copy) may be used for any and all purposes for which the original signature may have been used. The parties further waive any right to challenge the admissibility or authenticity of this document in a court of law based solely on the absence of an original signature.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, each of the undersigned has caused this Agreement to be duly executed in its name and on its behalf:

Printed Name of Third Party Vendor: David Abrameto
Signature: [redacted]
Address: [redacted]
Date: 1/24/14

Printed Name of Researcher: Alexandra A. Escobar
Signature: Alexandra A. Escobar
Address: [redacted]
Date: 01/16/2014

Appendix F

Non-Disclosure Form: Peer Reviewer

Non-Disclosure Agreement

Richard Dettling acknowledges that in order to provide the services to Alexandra Escobar (hereinafter "Researcher") who is a researcher in a confidential study with the University of Phoenix, Inc., Richard Dettling must agree to keep the information obtained as part of its services (as more fully described below) confidential. Therefore the parties agree as follows:

1. The information to be disclosed under this Non-disclosure Agreement ("Agreement") is described as follows and shall be considered "Confidential Information": all interview transcripts, interview summaries, field notes, and other documents related to said confidential study.

   All information shall remain the property of Researcher.

2. Richard Dettling agrees to keep in confidence and to use the Confidential Information for peer audit, including review of the data, audit trail, codes, and themes only and for no other purposes.

3. Richard Dettling further agrees to keep in confidence and not disclose any Confidential Information to a third party or parties for a period of five (5) years from the date of such disclosure. All oral disclosures of Confidential Information as well as written disclosures of the Confidential Information are covered by this Agreement.

4. Richard Dettling shall upon Researcher's request either destroy or return the Confidential Information upon termination of this Agreement.

5. Any obligation of Richard Dettling under this Agreement shall not apply to Confidential Information that:

   a) Is or becomes a part of the public knowledge through no fault of Richard Dettling;
   b) Richard Dettling can demonstrate was rightfully in its possession before disclosure by Researcher/ research subjects; or
   c) Richard Dettling can demonstrate was rightfully received from a third party who was not Researcher/research subjects and was not under confidentiality restriction on disclosure and without breach of any nondisclosure obligation.

6. Richard Dettling agrees to obligate its employees or agents, if any, who have access to any portion of Confidential Information to protect the confidential nature of the Confidential Information as set forth herein.

7. Richard Dettling shall defend, indemnify and hold the Researcher and the University of Phoenix harmless against any third party claims of damage or injury of any kind resulting from Richard Dettling's use of the Confidential Information, or any violation of by Richard Dettling of the terms of this Agreement.

v.1014

8. In the event Richard Dettling receives a subpoena and believes it has a legal obligation to disclose Confidential Information, then Richard Dettling will notify Researcher as soon as possible, and in any event at least five (5) business days prior to the proposed release. If Researcher objects to the release of such Confidential Information, Richard Dettling will allow Researcher to exercise any legal rights or remedies regarding the release and protection of the Confidential Information.

9. Richard Dettling expressly acknowledges and agrees that the breach, or threatened breach, by it through a disclosure of Confidential Information may cause irreparable harm and that Researcher may not have an adequate remedy at law. Therefore, Richard Dettling agrees that upon such breach, or threatened breach, Researcher will be entitled to seek injunctive relief to prevent Richard Dettling from commencing or continuing any action constituting such breach without showing or providing evidence of actual damage.

10. The interpretation and validity of this Agreement and the rights of the parties shall be governed by the laws of the State of Florida.

11. The parties to this Agreement agree that a copy of the original signature (including an electronic copy) may be used for any and all purposes for which the original signature may have been used. The parties further waive any right to challenge the admissibility or authenticity of this document in a court of law based solely on the absence of an original signature.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, each of the undersigned has caused this Agreement to be duly executed in its name and on its behalf:

Printed Name of Additional Researcher/Third Party/Vendor: RICHARD DETTLING
Signature: [signature]
Address: [redacted]
Date: DECEMBER 8th, 2014

Printed Name of Researcher: Alexandra A. Escobar
Signature: Alexandra A. Escobar
Address: [redacted]
Date: 12-8-14

v.1014

Appendix G

Peer Reviewer Summary

A review of the raw data of Alexandra Escobar's research of the education department at Esperanza University was conducted as a quality measure to assess Escobar's coding schemata. The reviewer examined the interview transcripts with the lens of micropolitics to help enhance the trustworthiness and credibility of Escobar's coding processes. The reviewer is well versed in the literature on academic integrity. To help enhance the reviewer's knowledge of micropolitics, the reviewer read Escobar's literature review on micropolitics to examine the data from this lens as much as possible.

The reviewer examined the original interview transcripts and the interview summaries to provide an interpretation of the data. This was done prior to reviewing Escobar's coding scheme to ensure an objective review of the data. The reviewer coded each participant's interview according to the initial themes that emerged. As each additional interview transcript summary was read, the reviewer refined the coding scheme. After all of the data was examined, the reviewer refined each category to four main themes that emerged from the data. These four themes were: 1) Current techniques and potential improvements to administrative methods to deter students not to plagiarize; 2) Student and faculty assumptions, perspectives, and beliefs about plagiarism; 3) Stakeholder interactions concerning plagiarism; and 4) Standards, processes, and punishment to motivate students not to plagiarize.

After identifying these four main themes, the reviewer then reviewed Escobar's five themes. A table was created to show the alignment between Escobar's coding scheme and the reviewer's scheme.

Escobar's Coding Scheme	Alignment with Reviewer's Code Scheme	Comments/Observations
Shared mission is balanced with individual approach	Standards, processes, and punishment to motivate students not to plagiarize. Stakeholder interactions concerning plagiarism	The reviewer felt Escobar's coding scheme was well supported by the data and in full alignment of the reviewer's interpretations of the data.
Formal policies accompanied by informal approaches	Standards, processes, and punishment to motivate students not to plagiarize.	The reviewer felt Escobar's coding scheme was well supported by the data and in full alignment of the reviewer's interpretations of the data.
Faculty serves as gatekeeper to the teaching profession.	Student and faculty assumptions, perspectives, and beliefs regarding plagiarism	The reviewer interpreted the faculty participants' stance on plagiarism and gatekeepers to the profession more as an issue related to the faculty members' personal standard, rather than a unique characteristic relative to the Education department. However, this may be also influenced by the reviewer's background as a Business administrator and faculty member and Escobar's role as an administrator with the College of Education in her place of employment.

Unused potential for maximizing resources	Current techniques and potential improvements to administrative methods to deter student plagiarism	The reviewer felt Escobar's coding scheme was well supported by the data and in full alignment of the reviewer's interpretations of the data.
Faculty feel only limited direct and indirect pressures	Standards, processes, and punishment to motivate students not to plagiarize. Student and faculty assumptions, perspectives, and beliefs regarding plagiarism	The reviewer felt Escobar's coding scheme was well supported by the data and in full alignment of the reviewer's interpretations of the data.