Creating Faculty Development Programming to Prevent Plagiarism: Three Approaches

38

Tricia Serviss

Contents

Abstract

Teaching writers to write from sources is so difficult that faculty from across disciplines seek professionalization and support, often motivated by worry about student plagiarism. This chapter surveys three different approaches to faculty development programming designed to create a culture of academic integrity at the postsecondary level. These three approaches to faculty development programming include focusing on conceptualizations of plagiarism, emphasizing best practices, and calling for a holistic approach. This chapter reviews and arranges scholarship within these three approaches. Ultimately, the holistic approach to faculty development in response to plagiarism emerges as the most promising way forward.

T. Serviss (✉)
English Department, Santa Clara University, Santa Clara, CA, USA
e-mail: trishserviss@gmail.com

Introduction

Twenty-first century undergraduate and graduate students navigate complicated worlds of writing and research tasks throughout their careers. Students are challenged to conduct research and present that research in writing that reflects their awareness of audience, of disciplinarity, of genre, and of academic integrity expectations. These challenges are complex and interdependent. Yet often faculty across the curriculum are not adequately prepared and supported as they teach, assign, and evaluate academic writing. In fact some faculty present research and writing tasks as simple activities in the assignments they create; the feedback and evaluation faculty provide to students after they finish the assignment can mistakenly reinforce the notion that research and writing tasks are easy to perform in a complicated digital world. Scores of scholarship from writing studies (Anson 2003; Blum 2011; Howard 1993; Howard et al. 2010; Jamieson and Howard 2012; Kleinfeld 2011; McClure and Clink 2009; Russell 2002; Schwegler and Shamoon 1982; Shi 2004, 2012), information literacy (Corbett 2010; Head and Eisenberg 2009, 2010), psychology (Landau et al. 2002; Roig 2001), and applied linguistics (Pecorari 2003) indicate that dealing with unfamiliar sources for academic purposes is difficult for all student writers. Explicit teaching about research and writing practices, strategies, and textual production is required along with assessment of the student's ultimate written product. However, when "academic integrity" compliance becomes the focus of conversations among higher education professionals, these nuanced understandings of source-based academic writing instruction are lost. Explicit instruction about how to locate, evaluate, integrate, and cite sources becomes lost in the shadows when worries about academic integrity compliance alone dominate the conversation. Current research suggests that explicit instruction is necessary for students to avoid plagiarism and perhaps even move beyond compliance toward student success.

The ways that faculty present and evaluate student writing tasks – and the student's ultimate navigation of these tasks – teach students how they ought to write and integrate sources into their writing. The curriculum, teaching, mentorship, and assessment provided by faculty solidify and concretize student understandings of academic integrity over time, influencing student conceptualization of academic integrity and shaping their actual practices for individual assignments, courses, and institutions. Thus, professional development surrounding plagiarism influences students and teachers alike in our understanding of plagiarism, our best practices for teaching students to write well beyond compliance, and our abilities to support one another in these endeavors.

Conversations about student writing become fused with discussions of academic integrity, obscuring things for students and faculty alike. Important conversations about plagiarism and the complicated matters attached to plagiarism in academic writing – research, source use, and citation practices – become obscured when plagiarism is lumped into broad conversations about academic integrity. The result, often, is curriculum focused on complying with academic integrity standards as a vague whole rather than addressing the nuanced and difficult tasks of writing well

with sources that students must manage. In essence, faculty often assign rather than teach research-based writing, wrapped in conversations about compliance with academic integrity standards so as to avoid plagiarism. Students and faculty work to comply with such abstract standards to avoid plagiarism without collectively grasping what plagiarism in particular is, how it happens, or what might be done pedagogically to avoid it.

All faculty who assign writing become responsible for navigating plagiarism in concept, in practice, and within the specific contexts of their disciplines, classrooms, and campus communities. As students learn to write across different academic disciplines and for different audiences, faculty across disciplines are expected to prepare thoughtful curriculum and to develop effective pedagogical strategies that light the way for students. These expectations mean that faculty themselves need robust support as they design assignments for students, strategize ways to provide productive feedback, and ultimately evaluate and assess student work for both its course-specific content and its adherence to broader academic conventions such as academic integrity. Thus, faculty and administrators alike are still left asking: what kinds of faculty development programming best equip faculty to mentor students striving to become ethical writers and researchers, mindful of potential plagiarism issues? What programming best includes and prepares the trifecta of higher education learning: students, faculty, and administrators in coherent, cumulative ways? This chapter explores these questions with three potential approaches in reply: conceptualization of plagiarism as faculty development, study and adoption of best practices as faculty development, and use of a holistic approach as faculty development in response to plagiarism.

The Role of Faculty Development in Plagiarism Culture

In an era of persistent angst about student writer competence, where can faculty turn for such crucial support? For many institutions of higher education in the United States, the answer to this important question has historically been embodied in two places: centers devoted to teaching excellence or faculty development initiatives led by individuals on a particular campus. These efforts therefore vary wildly from institution to institution, yet clear patterns in the approaches adopted by these initiatives emerge. The development of these initiatives offers useful context for the roles these centers play now in faculty development surrounding plagiarism.

Ouellett (2010) historicizes the evolution of faculty development in US higher education, characterizing faculty development programs as born from the 1950s when universities designed structures to support faculty in their scholarship, often known as sabbaticals (2010, p. 5). The student movements of the 1960s and 1970s demanded more faculty accountability for the quality and relevance of higher education teaching, resulting in the first US center for teaching excellence, the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching, created at the University of Michigan in 1962 (Ouellett 2010). This era likewise led to the founding of the Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education (POD)

in the United States in 1974 that connected and established some best practices for such faculty development initiatives. The founding of the POD lead to what Sorcinelli et al. (2006) call the Age of the Developer in the 1980s when universities and colleges began to readily partner with granting organizations to launch and incentivize faculty development programs focused upon improving teaching. The 1990s, according to Sorcinelli et al. (2006), marked a sudden shift in thinking as faculty development efforts reoriented away from the teacher toward the learning and scholarship of learning and teaching. Ouellett (2010) and Sorcinelli et al. (2006) agree that faculty development has now entered into a new era focused upon networking; faculty development programs and leaders now focus upon connecting teacher-scholars to one another more than developing particular programming of their own design. The history of faculty development in the United States itself is a helpful framework for thinking about professionalization surrounding plagiarism. Research (Ouellett 2010; Sorcinelli et al. 2006) tells us that US faculty development approaches evolved in several stages: conceptualization of professionalization programming, aggregation of best practices for this programming, the shift from studying teaching to studying learning, and most recently the establishment of professional, interdependent networks as a new kind of programming. Likewise, faculty development about plagiarism issues has evolved in a series of stages. Faculty development programs once focused primarily on understanding different perceptions of plagiarism before working to enumerate some best practices for teaching students to avoid plagiarism, becoming invested in detecting plagiarism, and more recently establishing a networked, cultural view toward professional development about plagiarism. This chapter depicts this evolution of faculty development programming focused upon plagiarism to provide options to readers interested in developing such programming of their own.

Establishing Shared Conceptualization of Plagiarism as Faculty Development

Some of the earliest commentaries about faculty development revolve around academic integrity in higher education (Bowers 1964; Drake 1941; Hartshorne and May 1928). Such scholarship typically points out the alarming increase of academic integrity violations within student papers. Even more typically such scholarship struggles to determine *how* such plagiarized student writing came from seemingly well-crafted curriculum. More contemporary scholarship (Compton and Pfau 2008; Kellogg 2002; McCabe 2003; McCabe and Trevino 1993; Moeck 2002; Trevino et al. 1998) about student plagiarism makes a similar move, making arguments that plagiarism is indeed an epidemic and bringing definition to the term *plagiarism* via case studies and longitudinal studies. This thread of research describes student and faculty definitions and perceptions of plagiarism, as well as hypothesizing about *why* collegiate plagiarism happens. Providing descriptions of attitudes and uncovering patterns related to student plagiarism, this genre of research emerges as a tool for professional development.

Descriptive research becomes introductory reading material for participants in faculty development programming, establishing shared conceptualization and perception of plagiarism. Thus, one approach to faculty development surrounding plagiarism prevention is born from this scholarly conversation; the approach endeavors to establish common conceptualization of plagiarism within a campus community. The faculty development curriculum, through this approach, becomes a reading-focused endeavor. Faculty read scholarship (see above list for examples) that declares plagiarism a pandemic of higher education. This conceptualization approach is distinguished from others through an emphasis on the need for *reactions* to plagiarism (often in the form of judicial processes and procedures) rather than on *prevention* of plagiarism through pedagogical intervention.

The establishment of the International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI) consortium in 1992 is often invoked as a visible origin of such contemporary conversations focused upon conceptualizations of academic integrity and therefore plagiarism. Faculty development programming about contemporary academic integrity often begins with faculty education about the issue, a kind of course in conceptualizing plagiarism. Within this approach, faculty are typically offered incredibly useful descriptive research about attitudes, practices, and policies of students and their fellow faculty in response to academic integrity issues (Davis 2000; Davis et al. 1992; Davis and Ludvigson 1995; DeVoss and Rosati 2002; Genereux and McLeod 1995; Haines et al. 1986; Power 2009; Purdy 2005; Ritter 2006; Sutherland-Smith 2008). Faculty are educated through these shared readings, familiarizing themselves with research about academic integrity, particularly research about student and faculty perspectives and behaviors alongside research describing institutional academic integrity policies and their complications.

These reading-based approaches to faculty development programming pivot around several threads of research and publications that establish the problems of academic integrity for faculty, a starting point for further professionalization. The cornerstone of such conceptualization approaches to faculty development about plagiarism is the work of McCabe, a scholar trained to conduct research about business management but invested in academic integrity concerns in higher education. McCabe's initial quantitative research, describing student attitudes about academic integrity, dominated conversations about academic integrity throughout the 1990s in the United States. McCabe surveyed 6,096 students from 31 colleges and universities, both 2-year and 4-year colleges in the United States, to understand why students violate academic integrity codes (McCabe 1992, 1993). Writing about that survey, McCabe describes what he calls the "situational ethics" students use to explain their violation of institutional academic integrity codes. McCabe analyzes student responses and finds students remorseless and self-assured about their violations (McCabe 1993, p. 657). Often anthologized as foundational research about academic integrity, McCabe's longitudinal study focuses on student attitudes; analysis of these attitudes establishes the prominence of academic integrity – including plagiarism – on college campuses. McCabe's scholarship, then, becomes a foundation for early faculty development efforts to combat plagiarism as well as a directive, urging faculty development centers and leaders to not only educate their

faculty on the concepts of academic integrity and plagiarism, but study their conceptualization of these issues as well.

Thus, McCabe, along with collaborator Trevino, began to study institutional and faculty responses to academic integrity violations (McCabe 1993; McCabe and Trevino 1993, 1996; McCabe et al. 1999, 2012). After two decades of research, McCabe et al. (2012) ultimately advocate that faculty development initiatives focused upon plagiarism prevention shift their attention to work on campus-wide honor codes. McCabe et al. (2002) present a data-driven argument that "traditional academic honor codes are generally associated with lower levels of student academic dishonesty" (357). An academic honor code, in this context, is typically a short document that defines acceptable academic behaviors for students in an attempt to articulate the campus community's shared values and resulting expectations (Campbell 1935; Canning 1956; Fass 1986; McCabe and Trevino 1993; Melendez 1985). When a campus adopts an honor code (often a few short sentences describing agreed upon campus-wide academic standards), students and faculty are required to adhere to the code's expectations. When students violate any part of the honor code, they typically face previously established consequences (such as receiving a failing grade in the course, facing expulsion from the institution, receiving an academic integrity violation mark on permanent transcripts, etc.). In this way an honor code is an educational tool that defines academic integrity issues – such as plagiarism – for the campus community. An honor code, theoretically, creates shared understanding of expectations and determines a stable conceptualization of things like plagiarism for students and faculty alike. At the same time, honor codes also make the consequences for academic integrity violations transparent, defining a procedure for reporting plagiarism cases as well as naming potential consequences that might result from these proceedings.

McCabe et al. (2002) find that faculty teaching at institutions with defined honor codes was more likely to report students and adhere to the predetermined consequences for the violation as listed in the honor code's accompanying materials. According to McCabe et al. (2002), faculty teaching at institutions without an honor code were less likely to report students suspected of violations and more likely to deploy consequences themselves. Thus, several studies led by McCabe et al. (1999, 2002, 2012) find that although faculty are generally reluctant to report students and thereby involve themselves in administrative processes on campuses without honor codes, faculty at institutions with defined honor codes are more likely to report students. Ultimately, McCabe et al. (2002, 2012) argue that campuses without shared conceptualizations of plagiarism (without honor codes) have less compliance with academic integrity expectations. Campuses with some shared understanding of plagiarism (those with honor codes) have more compliance with academic integrity expectations.

McCabe et al. argued for the establishment of honor codes as the best faculty development approach to preventing plagiarism. They suggest that both the process of creating an honor code, as a campus community, and the code itself will lead to shared conceptualization of plagiarism and therefore curb its occurrence. Their studies also led researchers to question the effectiveness of such an approach.

Some researchers argued that faculty themselves might be complicit in student academic integrity violations (Compton and Pfau 2008; Stearns 2001). Others argued that administrators ought to be held more accountable for the cultures of academic integrity that evolve on individual campuses (Aaron 1992; Bertram Gallant 2007; Bertram Gallant and Drinan 2008; Jordon 2001; Whitley and Keith-Spiegel 2001b). These scholarly conversations would also be included in the conceptualization approach to faculty development surrounding plagiarism, programming centered around educating faculty about plagiarism as a phenomena and encouraging dialog in hopes of achieving some consensus about plagiarism itself.

Ultimately, the research tradition premised upon description of faculty, students, and institutional attitudes toward academic integrity (Duggan 2006; Flint et al. 2006; Hart and Friesner 2004; Park 2004; Pickard 2006; Sutherland-Smith 2010; Vicinus and Eisner 2008) offers useful concretization of the challenges contemporary college and university communities face. Offering readings from this research tradition is a viable faculty development option for combating plagiarism. Sharing descriptive scholarship is, however, a very initial step in professionalizing faculty about plagiarism. Faculty development programming that introduces different attitudes, patterns, and responses to student plagiarism helps a campus community strive for greater compliance with shared expectations. More robust approaches to faculty development about plagiarism, discussed below, offer explicit ways for faculty to go well beyond mere compliance with institutional policy and move toward curricular redesign and pedagogical interventions that avoid plagiarism entirely.

Moving from Conceptualization to Adopting Best Practices

Handbooks, guidebooks, white papers, institutional websites, monographs, and articles outlining best practices for faculty to use in avoiding and responding to student plagiarism and academic integrity violations abound to varying degrees of utility and productivity (Blum 2011; Carroll 2002, 2013; Carroll and Appleton 2001; McKeever 2006; Council of Writing Program Administrators 2003; Harris 2002a, b; Harris and Lockman 2001; Howard 1993; Kantz 1990; Marsh 2007; Johns and Keller 2005; Lipson 2008; Macdonald and Carroll 2006; Walden and Peacock 2006; Weber-Wulff 2014). Too numerous to ever fully account for, texts describing and prescribing best practices to faculty, administrators, and students alike populate faculty development initiatives. These kinds of text seem to offer stable, certain strategies and courses of action, making them attractive for faculty development programming. These best practices texts often *become* the most substantive part of a faculty development initiative about plagiarism. The adopted best practices book is distributed to every faculty member during orientation, showcased in faculty development workshop, or used as a guide for construction of an institution's own best practices list or paradigm. Sometimes the best practices text becomes an organizational tool, directing how and when a faculty development series about

plagiarism addresses different topics (what to write in your syllabus, how to craft effective writing assignments, how to teach information literacy strategies, etc.) and distinguishes areas in need of attention (how to assess your institution's plagiarism policy, how to develop campus-wide educational campaigns about plagiarism, etc.).

While these best practices texts can be useful as an introductory guide to plagiarism concerns or for responding to a very specific need, broad set lists of best practices and strategies as a faculty development approach can also become quite limiting. These "best practices" texts often present strategies in abstraction, far removed from the contexts – from the research or campus community – from which they originally arose. Thus, this best practices faculty development approach can create a similar abstract result as faculty focus on seemingly guaranteed strategies and policies while overlooking their own particular contexts and campus community's needs. This chapter therefore provides a brief overview of best practices texts that constitute this faculty development approach that relies upon such texts as the curricular foundations of faculty development programming.

Jude Carroll's *A Handbook for Deterring Plagiarism in Higher Education* (2002) embodies all that best practices texts can offer to the best practices faculty development approach; the text attempts to be comprehensive, synthesizing research about student plagiarism in relationship to recommended practices. Drawing on select pieces of recent scholarship addressing student behaviors and motivations related to plagiarism, Carroll offers faculty readers ways to understand plagiarism as a curricular problem. Analyzing elements of the curriculum – course objectives, individual assignments, assessment tools, and institutional policies – as opportunities for preventing plagiarism, Carroll suggests a multilayered approach that moves faculty thinking away from student motives alone and toward considering elements of instruction from course design to chapters dedicated to "detection" and "punishment." The handbook, like others of its kind (Harris 2002b; Lathrop and Foss 2000; Whitley and Keith-Spiegel 2001a), offers a broad overview of research, situating lived pedagogical experiences within conversations about the complicated nature of plagiarism and the challenges of ethically assessing student writing itself. Carroll's handbook stands out among the others, however, in that it offers best practices as a kind of faculty development curriculum.

Counter to Carroll's handbook, Laura DeSena's *Preventing Plagiarism: Tips and Strategies* (2007) is a practitioner's guide to preventing plagiarism, delivering theories and practices faculty ought to explore, born from her own classroom experiences. In this way, DeSena's less useful text is a counterpoint to Carroll's very helpful handbook; DeSena instructs faculty about plagiarism prevention broadly based upon her own individual experiences rather than theorizing about how instruction surrounding plagiarism might best work as a result of research and scholarship. Rather than grounding her definitions of complex textual issues such as plagiarism and paraphrasing in the research traditions of writing studies, for example, DeSena describes the terms and the best practices she recommends simply and with certainty born from her classroom experience rather than the intersecting research traditions about authorship (Howard 1993, 1995), the psychology of

plagiarism (Roig 2001; Roig and deTommaso 1995), student writing development (Howard et al. 2010; Pecorari 2003), information literacy (Head and Eisenberg 2009), and more that continue to evolve.

Speaking directly to faculty across disciplines, DeSena calls for pedagogical offense, suggesting that faculty require students to prove they engaged in a process. DeSena also advises faculty "asking [students] to turn in potential cheat sheets—material you asked them not to consult" to make faculty diligence against plagiarism a clear and present danger to students (65). Offense-driven interventions occupy most of DeSena's handbook, thus positioning faculty in an adversarial stance toward students, compared with the mentorship stance advanced by Carroll. Faculty development programming according to DeSena's adversarial model prepares faculty to wage a war on plagiarism by making most pedagogical decisions with plagiarism prevention and detection – rather than student learning – in mind. While useful in some ways, this kind of approach to faculty professional development focuses student and institutional attention on the *threat of plagiarism* rather than fostering pedagogical practices and curricular designs that build a community of ethical writers and researchers.

The two monographs examined here in detail exemplify the extremes within the genre of existing plagiarism best practices texts that form the foundation for many faculty development programs about plagiarism. These two approaches (texts that forward research-supported practices and texts that forward practices based upon personal experiences) reflect the two most dominant approaches currently available in guidebooks and handbooks focused on preventing plagiarism in higher education and substantiating the best practices approach to faculty development. One fosters better faculty understandings of student learning as a result of curriculum, assessment strategies, and plagiarism policies (Carroll), while the other text encourages cultures of pedagogical offense that rely upon practices of detection rather than prevention (DeSena). While both Carroll's and DeSena's handbooks prompt readers to consider which practices might best sustain them and their students, Carroll's handbook presents the questions, findings, and even recommendations circulating in data-driven research about plagiarism. Thus, using best practices texts, like Carroll's handbook, that provide pedagogical and curricular suggestions alongside supporting research represents a best practices approach that can propel faculty development programming on a campus beyond compliance toward a shared inquiry about how students learn to write with sources.

Fashioning Best Practices into an Holistic Approach to Faculty Development

Successful faculty development programming intended to prevent plagiarism on college campuses begins by establishing a sense of shared conceptualization of plagiarism which becomes a foundation for identifying and refining a sense of best practices on that campus. While these two approaches to faculty development are very helpful in responding to plagiarism issues, it does not seem enough.

Ideally, campus communities move beyond simple compliance with plagiarism policies and establish healthy, bustling academic writing cultures on campus. The final professionalization approach described in this chapter, which some call the holistic approach to faculty development (Macdonald and Carroll 2006), embodies this call for programming that not only prevents plagiarism but moves beyond compliance with academic integrity regulations into a more utopian campus culture where writers and pedagogues thrive together.

To shift campus culture from plagiarism compliance to wellness, a campus community needs to not only share an understanding of plagiarism – what it looks like, how it works, how to prevent it, how to pedagogically respond to it – but also share responsibility for that wellness as students, faculty, staff, and administrators. With this sentiment of shared responsibility comes a renewed commitment, ideally, to the notion that faculty share in the success and failures of academic integrity cultures on campus in unique ways. This shift is embodied in the scholarship of two communities: information literacy scholars and writing across the curriculum scholars.

Information literacy specialists working in libraries propose a more central role for what Smith (1997) calls "instructional librarians," library staff members whose primary role is providing embedded information literacy instruction within an ongoing discipline-specific course. While this kind of embedded literacy instruction was quite well established in 1997, Smith calls for a reorientation of the purpose of the embedded instruction in information literacy. Smith's perspective is the culmination of several years of information literacy publications (Leckie 1996; Sonntag and Ohr 1996; Werrell and Wesley 1990) issuing research-based calls for curricular reform in higher education. Librarians argue that they ought to focus more attention on teaching *faculty* about ethical and effective research practices than students for a change. Information literacy scholarship shifts by the end of the twentieth century, as scholars advocate for the holistic education of faculty across the curriculum, not just writing teachers, as the best way to prevent postsecondary plagiarism. Several courses of action are suggested: instructional librarians ought to invest in campus-wide conversations; librarians ought to explicitly teach faculty about source use, research, plagiarism, and the teaching of information literacy whenever they can; and more. In this way, collaboration across campus units, across specialties and institutional roles, emerges as a professional development initiative itself.

Other disciplinary contingents such as writing program administrators in the United States adopt a similarly holistic approach to faculty development surrounding plagiarism. The Council of Writing Program Administrators (CWPA) issued a white paper (2003) that defines plagiarism as a complex, complicated issue. The document, however, makes an important claim that plagiarism ought to be understood, in classroom settings, as an instance "when a writer deliberately uses someone else's language, ideas, or other original. . .materials without acknowledging its source" (1). Thus, this white paper, often used to explain what plagiarism *is* and how to avoid it during faculty development workshops, argues "deliberate use" is a distinguishing feature of plagiarism. Plagiarism, in the CWPA document, is defined as a deliberate act of appropriation and distinguished from

"misuse of sources" that is defined as "carelessly or inadequately citing ideas and words borrowed from another source" (1). The document distinguishes between intentional appropriation (plagiarism) and failure to master source use and citation convention (misuse of sources). Even more important is the CWPA document's argument that interdisciplinary faculty share responsibility for preventing plagiarism through robust teaching – not just assigning – of writing alongside librarians and writing faculty. The CWPA charge includes teaching students definitions of plagiarism in disciplinary context, designing curriculum that positions research as a series of tasks and practices, and complying with institutional policies.

Calls to reorient approaches to plagiarism prevention abound early in the twenty-first century; most converge around the idea that pedagogical intervention is the best way to prevent plagiarism (rather than detection). A successful pedagogical intervention, meanwhile, requires the holistic efforts of an entire campus. Anson (2003) argues for faculty reeducation focused on designing writing assignments that foster student engagement. Hall (2005) outlines a series of steps to achieve this holistic approach to faculty development about plagiarism. He calls for the creation of interdepartmental anti-plagiarism learning modules that faculty design together for students as well as faculty development-supported curriculum workshops. The holistic approach that Anson and Hall both describe appears in scholarship beyond the United States at the same time. Macdonald and Carroll (2006) provide case studies of recent public plagiarism scandals at UK universities as evidence for their argument that the only way to adequately address plagiarism is to create holistic institutional approaches for individual campuses. Oxford Brookes University conducts a self-assessment to evaluate plagiarism culture on campus (Macdonald and Carroll 2006), appoints an anti-plagiarism leader on campus, develops evaluation criteria to determine when plagiarism has occurred, and engages the campus in dialog about that criteria to establish a shared definition of plagiarism. They use other such case studies that outline the evolution of interrelated campus assessments, interdepartmental leaders, transparent response process, and a longitudinal self-study of those components in relationship to one another. The key, they argue, is the creation of an articulated faculty development plan that asks faculty to consider all the *pieces* of plagiarism prevention.

The rather explicit, concrete holistic approaches to faculty development in the scholarship of Smith (1997), the CWPA (2003), Anson (2003), Hall (2005), and Macdonald and Carroll (2006) are largely absent from faculty development scholarship up to this point. McCabe and Pavela (2004) advocate faculty development programming that addresses plagiarism prevention by advocating for definition campaigns, asserting plagiarism's proper definition. Likewise, Hutton (2006) advises administrators to focus narrowly upon communicating definitions and expectations. Scanlon (2010, p. 164) gestures closest to the holistic approach when he recommends that plagiarism detection software alone is not enough and must be paired with explicit instruction in authorship studies when writing is assigned. These practices offered by McCabe and Pavela (2004), Hutton (2006), and Scanlon (2010) each gesture toward a holistic approach to faculty development that works to mobilize and articulate all the moving parts involved with education

on campus. However, these approaches ultimately remain focused on individual elements of the plagiarism prevention mosaic as they offer particular pedagogical strategies and goals rather than connected and networked ones.

The holistic approach to faculty development picks up momentum. Jamieson (2008) similarly calls for a reconsideration of one-policy and one-class plagiarism prevention solutions, arguing that the "use of universal source-use policies and generic instruction in first-year composition or the equivalent actually reduces the ability of students to join the discourse communities of the disciplines and undermines the very goals of composition (to increase communication and help students invent the university)" (81). Jamieson argues that since instructors require student flexibility as they write across different scenarios, our policies – and faculty development strategies – need to be models of such flexibility. In a similar vein, Anson (2008) calls on institutions to create greater support for faculty and students through programmatic and curricular development. These new supports, he argues, ought to engage students and faculty in diverse kinds of low-stakes writing assignments. Chen and Van Ullen (2011) concretize these calls by designing and evaluating their own plagiarism workshops, designed to assist international students and the faculty who teach them. Using pre- and post-tests to gauge effectiveness of the workshops, Chen and Van Ullen suggest workshops for international students that engage students and their faculty in dialog about different kinds of sources, the cultural nature of academic integrity, and plagiarism conceptualizations as well as introductions to information literacy.

Other research-driven teacher preparation and faculty development programming research continues to emerge. Current principal researchers of the Citation Project (Rebecca Moore Howard, Sandra Jamieson, and Tricia Serviss), an ongoing US research study of undergraduate source use, argue that data-driven research findings can serve as meaningful foundations for faculty development programming (Jamieson 2014; Jamieson and Howard 2012; Serviss and Jamieson 2012), especially for novice teachers (Serviss 2014). Holistic faculty development programming might begin with the introduction of ongoing research (such as the Citation Project or Project Information Literacy) that provides conceptualizations of plagiarism, evaluates current "best practices" for preventing plagiarism, and then engages faculty in a self-study that culminates in their identification of parts that need attention and articulation as they construct a holistic action plan together.

Summary

The landscape of faculty development programming for faculty who teach, assign, and assess college-level writing across the curriculum is becoming more diverse and robust. The chapter traces three stages of faculty development programming in response to plagiarism: conceptualizing plagiarism in order to establish agreed upon definitions, pursuing the "best practices" needed to prevent plagiarism and manage it when it occurs, and aspiring to a holistic approach to faculty development programming – and holistic approaches to plagiarism itself – that connects all the

crucial parts of academic integrity culture (students, faculty, staff, administrators) and moves our goal well beyond compliance. While the best practices approach offers a useful place to initiate faculty development programming, fostering dialog within campus communities, it is not ideal in helping faculty assess and respond to local curricular and pedagogical problems.

The third approach described in this chapter, the holistic approach to faculty development, is the most promising. The holistic approach to faculty development brings together data-driven research about student development with identified sites of pedagogical intervention and potential methods (workshops, curriculum redesign, etc.) for engaging faculty. As faculty participate in programming born from research, the conversation is reoriented on teaching as inquiry as well as evaluation. This orientation differs from the other approaches outlined in this chapter because its ultimate goal is a synthesis of student learning, curriculum, pedagogy, policy, and procedures that moves the campus community (students, faculty, administrators) from compliance with academic integrity expectations on campus to engagement with and mastery of ethical academic research, authorship, and writing practices.

References

Aaron, R. M. (1992). Student academic dishonesty: Are collegiate institutions addressing the issue? *NASPA Journal, 29*(2), 107–113.

Anson, C. (2003). Student plagiarism: Are teachers part of the solution or part of the problem? *Essays on Teaching Excellence: Toward the Best in the Academy, 15*(1).

Anson, C. (2008). We never wanted to be cops: Plagiarism, institutional paranoia, and shared responsibility. In R. Howard & A. Robillard (Eds.), *Pluralizing plagiarism: Identities, contexts, pedagogies* (pp. 140–157). Portsmouth: Heinemann.

Bertram Gallant, T. (2007). The complexity of integrity culture change: A case study of a liberal arts college. *The Review of Higher Education, 30*(4), 391–411.

Bertram Gallant, T., & Drinan, P. (2008). Toward a model of academic integrity institutionalization: Informing practice in postsecondary education. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 38*(2), 25–44.

Blum, S. D. (2011). *My word!: Plagiarism and college culture*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Bowers, W. J. (1964). *Student dishonesty and its control in college*. New York: Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University.

Campbell, W. G. (1935). *A comparative investigation of the behavior of students under an honor system and a proctor system in the same university*. Los Angeles: University of Southern California Press.

Canning, R. (1956). Does an honor system reduce classroom cheating? An experimental answer. *Journal of Experimental Education, 42*, 291–296.

Carroll, J. (2002). *A handbook for deterring plagiarism in higher education*. Oxford: Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning Development.

Carroll, J. (2013). Institutional issues in deterring, detecting and dealing with student plagiarism. In *Joint Information Systems Committee Meeting, 2004*, London.

Carroll, J., & Appleton, J. (2001). *Plagiarism: A good practice guide*. Oxford: Oxford Brookes University and Joint Information Systems Committee.

Chen, Y. H., & Van Ullen, M. K. (2011). Helping international students succeed academically through research process and plagiarism workshops. *College & Research Libraries, 72*(3), 209–235.

Compton, J., & Pfau, M. (2008). Inoculating against pro-plagiarism justifications: Rational and affective strategies. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 36*(1), 98–119.

Corbett, P. (2010). What about the "Google effect"? Improving the library research habits of first-year composition students. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College, 37*(3), 265–277.

Council of Writing Program Administrators. (2003). Defining and avoiding plagiarism: The WPA statement on promising practices. Retrieved from http://wpacouncil.org/files/wpa-plagiarism-statement.pdf

Davis, S. (2000). Teaching practices that encourage or eliminate student plagiarism. In A. Lathrop & K. Foss (Eds.), *Student cheating and plagiarism in the Internet era – A wake-up call* (pp. 182–187). Englewood: Libraries Unlimited.

Davis, S. F., & Ludvigson, H. W. (1995). Additional data on academic dishonesty and a proposal for remediation. *Teaching of Psychology, 22*, 119–122.

Davis, S. F., Grover, C. A., Becker, A. H., & McGregor, L. N. (1992). Academic dishonesty: Prevalence, determinants, techniques, and punishments. *Teaching of Psychology, 19*(1), 16–20.

DeSena, L. H. (2007). *Preventing plagiarism: Tips and strategies*. Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English.

DeVoss, D., & Rosati, A. (2002). It wasn't me, was it? Plagiarism and the Web. *Computers and Composition, 19*, 191–203.

Drake, C. A. (1941). Why students cheat? *Journal of Higher Education, 12*(4), 418–420.

Duggan, F. (2006). Plagiarism: Prevention, practice, and policy. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 31*(2), 151–154.

Fass, R. A. (1986). By honor bound: Encouraging academic honesty. *Educational Record, 67*, 32–35.

Flint, A., Clegg, S., & Macdonald, R. (2006). Exploring staff perceptions of student plagiarism. *Journal of Further and Higher Education, 30*(02), 145–156.

Genereux, R. L., & McLeod, B. A. (1995). Circumstances surrounding cheating: A questionnaire study of college students. *Research in Higher Education, 36*(6), 687–704.

Haines, V., Diskhoff, G., LaBeff, E., & Clark, R. (1986). College cheating: Immaturity, lack of communication, and the neutralizing attitude. *Research in Higher Education, 25*, 342–354.

Hall, J. (2005). Plagiarism across the curriculum: How academic communities can meet the challenge of the undocumented writer. *Across the Disciplines: A Journal of Language, Learning, and Academic Writing 2*. Retrieved from http://colostate.edu/atd/articles/hall2005.cfm

Harris, R. (2002a). *Anti-plagiarism strategies for research papers*. Retrieved from http://virtualsalt.com/antiplag.htm

Harris, R. (2002b). *The plagiarism handbook*. Los Angeles: Pyrczak Publishing.

Harris, R. A., & Lockman, V. (2001). *The plagiarism handbook: Strategies for preventing, detecting, and dealing with plagiarism*. Los Angeles: Pyrczak Publishing.

Hart, M., & Friesner, T. (2004). Plagiarism and poor academic practice–a threat to the extension of e-learning in higher education? *Electronic Journal on E-learning, 2*(1), 89–96.

Hartshorne, H., & May, M. A. (1928). *Studies in deceit*. New York: Macmillan.

Head, A. J., & Eisenberg, M. B. (2009). *Lessons learned: How college students seek information in the digital age. Project information literacy first year report with student survey findings.* University of Washington's Information School. Retrieved from http://projectinfolit.org/images/pdfs/pil_fall2009_finalv_yr1_12_2009v2.pdf

Head, A. J., & Eisenberg, M. B. (2010). Truth be told: How college students evaluate and use information in the digital age. Available at SSRN 2281485.

Howard, R. M. (1993). A plagiarism *pentimento*. *Journal of Teaching Writing, 11*(2), 233–245.

Howard, R. M. (1995). Plagiarisms, authorships, and the academic death penalty. *College English, 57*, 788–806.

Howard, R. M., Serviss, T., & Rodrigue, T. (2010). Writing from sources, writing from sentences. *Writing and Pedagogy, 2*(2), 177–192. doi:10.1558/wap.v2i2.177.

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.

Jamieson, S. (2008). One size does not fit all: Plagiarism across the curriculum. In R. M. Howard & A. E. Robillard (Eds.), *Pluralizing plagiarism: Identities, contexts, pedagogies* (pp. 77–91). Portsmouth: Heinemann.

Jamieson, S. (2014). Breaking the cycle of ineffective research instruction: Reimagining information literacy collaborations. In *Annual Convention of the Conference on College Composition and Communication*, Indianapolis, March 21, 2014. Retrieved from http://site.citationproject.net/?page_id=27

Jamieson, S., & Howard, R. M. (2012). Reading across the curriculum: The implications of citation project research for WAC and WID. Keynote address. In *International Writing Cross the Curriculum Conference*, Savannah, June 9, 2012. Retrieved from http://site.citationproject.net/?page_id=27

Johns, J., & Keller, S. (2005). *Cite it right: The SourceAid guide to citation, research, and avoiding plagiarism*. New York: SourceAid LLC.

Jordon, A. E. (2001). College student cheating: The role of motivation, perceived norms, attitudes, and knowledge of institutional policy. *Ethics & Behavior, 11*, 233–247.

Kantz, M. (1990). Helping students use textual sources persuasively. *College English, 52*(1), 74–91.

Kellogg, A. P. (2002). Students plagiarize online less than many think, a new study finds. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 48*(23), 44–47.

Kleinfeld, E. (2011). Writing centers, ethics, and excessive research. *Computers and Composition Online*. Retrieved from http://www2.bgsu.edu/departments/english/cconline/ethics_special_issue/Kleinfeld/writing-centers-ethics.html

Landau, J. D., Druen, P. B., & Arcuri, J. A. (2002). Methods for helping students avoid plagiarism. *Teaching of Psychology, 29*(2), 112–115.

Lathrop, A., & Foss, K. (2000). *Student cheating and plagiarism in the Internet era: A wake-up call*. Englewood: Libraries Unlimited.

Leask, B. (2006). Plagiarism, cultural diversity, and metaphor – Implications for academic staff development. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 31*(2), 183–199.

Leckie, G. J. (1996). Desperately seeking citations: Uncovering faculty assumptions about the undergraduate research process. *Journal of Academic Librarianship, 22*, 201–208.

Lipson, C. (2008). *Doing honest work in college: How to prepare citations, avoid plagiarism, and achieve real academic success*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

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

Marsh, B. (2007). *Plagiarism: Alchemy and remedy in higher education*. Albany: SUNY Press.

McCabe, D. L. (1992). The influence of situational ethics on cheating among college students. *Sociological Inquiry, 62*(3), 365–374.

McCabe, D. L. (1993). Faculty responses to academic dishonesty: The influence of honor codes. *Research in Higher Education, 34*(5), 647–658.

McCabe, D. L. (2003). Promoting academic integrity: A US/Canadian perspective. In H. Marsden & M. Hicks (Eds.), *Educational integrity: Plagiarism and other perplexities, proceedings of the inaugural educational integrity conference, University of South Australia, Adelaide, November 2003* (pp. 3–11).

McCabe, D. L., & Pavela, G. (2004). Ten (updated) principles of academic integrity: How faculty can foster student honesty. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 36*(3), 10–15. 875687703095/00091380409605574.

McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (1993). Academic dishonesty: Honor codes and other contextual influences. *The Journal of Postsecondary Education, 64*(5), 522–538.

McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (1996). What we know about cheating in college: Longitudinal trends and recent developments. *Change,* 29–33.

McCabe, D. L., Trevino, L. K., & Butterfield, K. D. (1999). Academic integrity in honor code and non-honor code environments: A qualitative investigation. *The Journal of Higher Education, 70*(2), 211–234.

McCabe, D. L., Trevino, L. K., & Butterfield, K. D. (2002). Honor codes and other contextual influences on academic integrity: A replication and extension to modified honor code settings. *Research in Higher Education, 43*(3), 357–378.

McCabe, D. L., Butterfield, K. D., & Trevino, L. K. (2003). Faculty & academic integrity: The influence of current honor codes and past honor code experiences. *Research in Higher Education, 44*(3), 367–385.

McCabe, D. L., Butterfield, K. D., & Trevino, L. K. (2012). *Cheating in college: Why students do it and what educators can do about it.* Baltimore: John's Hopkins University Press.

McClure, R., & Clink, K. (2009). How do you know that? An investigation of student research practices in the digital age. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy, 9*(1), 115–132.

McKeever, L. (2006). Online plagiarism detection services – Savior or scourge? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 31*(2), 155–165.

Melendez, B. (1985). *Honor code study.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

Moeck, P. G. (2002). Academic dishonesty: Cheating among community college students. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 26*, 479–491.

Ouellett, M. (2010). Overview of faculty development: History and choices. In K. J. Gillespie, D. L. Robertson, & Associates (Eds.), *A guide to faculty development* (2nd ed., pp. 3–20). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Park, C. (2004). Rebels without a clause: Towards an institutional framework for dealing with plagiarism by students. *Journal of Further and Higher Education, 28*(3), 291–306.

Pecorari, D. (2003). Good and original: Plagiarism and patchwriting in academic second-language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*(4), 317–345. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2003.08.004.

Pickard, J. (2006). Staff and student attitudes to plagiarism at University College Northampton. *Assessment & Evaluation, 31*(2), 215–232.

Power, L. G. (2009). University students' perceptions of plagiarism. *The Journal of Higher Education, 80*(6), 643–662.

Purdy, J. P. (2005). Calling off the hounds: Technology and the visibility of plagiarism. *Pedagogy, 5*(2), 275–295.

Ritter, K. (2006). Buying in, selling short: A pedagogy against the rhetoric of online paper mills. *Pedagogy, 6*(1), 25–51.

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

Russell, D. R. (2002). *Writing in the academic disciplines: A curricular history* (2nd ed.). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Scanlon, P. M. (2010). Student online plagiarism: How do we respond? *College Teaching, 51*(4), 161–165. doi:10.1080/87568770309596432.

Schwegler, R. A., & Shamoon, L. K. (1982). The aims and process of the research paper. *College English, 44*(8), 817–824.

Serviss, T. (2014). Breaking the cycle of ineffective research instruction: Preparing new writing teachers. In *Annual convention of the conference on college composition and communication*, Indianapolis, March 21, 2014. http://site.citationproject.net/?page_id=27

Serviss, T., & Jamieson, S. (2012). Enriching the writing curriculum using findings from the Citation Project: A post-convention workshop on using citation context coding as part of faculty development and assessment. In *Georgia conference on information literacy*. Savannah: Coastal Georgia Center. September 24, 2012. Retrieved from http://site.citationproject.net/?page_id=27

Shi, L. (2004). Textual borrowing in second-language writing. *Written Communication, 21*(2), 171–200.

Shi, L. (2012). Rewriting and paraphrasing source texts in second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 21*(2), 134–148.

Smith, R. L. (1997). Philosophical shift: Teach the faculty to teach information literacy. In *Annual conference for the Association of College and Research Libraries*, Nashville. Vol. 20: 2004.

Sonntag, G., & Ohr, D. M. (1996). The development of a lower-division general education, course-integrated information literacy program. *College & Research Libraries, 57*, 331–338.

Sorcinelli, M. D., Austin, A. E., Eddy, P. L., & Beach, A. L. (2006). *Creating the future of faculty development: Learning from the past, understanding the present*. Bolton: Anker.

Stearns, S. A. (2001). The student-instructor relationship's effect on academic integrity. *Ethics & Behavior, 11*(3), 275–285.

Sutherland-Smith, W. (2008). *Plagiarism, the Internet, and student learning*. New York: Routledge.

Treviño, L. K., Butterfield, K. D., & McCabe, D. L. (1998). The ethical context in organizations: Influences on employee attitudes and behaviors. *Business Ethics Quarterly, 8*(03), 447–476.

Vicinus, M., & Eisner, C. (2008). *Originality, imitation, and plagiarism: Teaching writing in the digital age*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Walden, K., & Peacock, A. (2006). The i-Map: A process-centered response to plagiarism. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 31*(2), 201–214.

Weber-Wulff, D. (2014). *False feathers: A perspective on academic plagiarism*. Berlin: Springer.

Werrell, E. L., & Wesley, T. L. (1990). Promoting information literacy through a faculty workshop. *Research Strategies, 8*(4), 172–180.

Whitley, B. E., & Keith-Spiegel, P. (2001a). *Academic dishonesty: An educator's guide*. Mahwah: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.

Whitley, B. E., Jr., & Keith-Spiegel, P. (2001b). Academic integrity as an institutional issue. *Ethics & Behavior, 11*(3), 325–342.