Academic Integrity in Undergraduate Life at Duke University: A Report on the 2005-2006 Survey

Submitted by the Academic Integrity Council
May 24, 2006

Co-Principal Investigators
Judith Ruderman (Chair, Academic Integrity Council)
and Elizabeth Kiss (Director, Kenan Institute for Ethics)
with assistance from Matt Serra (Director, Trinity College Office of Assessment)

***Zoila Airall** (Assistant Vice President, Student Affairs)
 Owen Astrachan (Professor of the Practice, Computer Science)
***Paige Berges** (School of Law '07, GPSC representative)
 Jim Bonk (Professor, Chemistry)
***Sherryl Broverman** (Assistant Professor of the Practice, Biology)
***Stephen Bryan** (Associate Dean of Students & Director of Judicial Affairs)
***Tom Buchanan** (Trinity '07, Political Science; Vice Chair, Undergraduate Judicial
     Board)
 Krishnendu Chakrabarty (Associate Professor, Electrical & Computer Engineering)
 Tim Dodd (Executive Director, Center for Academic Integrity & Program Director,
     Kenan Institute for Ethics)
***Joe Fore** (Trinity '07, Biology and Public Policy Studies;Vice President for Academic
     Affairs, Duke Student Government)
***Molly Gregas** (Graduate Student in Biomedical Engineering, GPSC representative)
 Joseph Harris (Associate Professor, Department of English)
 Chris Lester (Trinity '08, Physics and Philosophy; Outreach Chair, Honor Council)
***Joe Nadeau** (Associate Professor of the Practice, Civil Engineering)
***Kathryn Nightingale** (Assistant Professor, Biomedical Engineering)
*V. Louise Roth (Associate Professor, Biology)
***Judith Ruderman** (Vice Provost for Academic and Administrative Services & Chair,
     Academic Integrity Council)
 Jonathan Schatz (Trinity '07 and Vice Chair, Honor Council)
***Jimmy Soni** (Trinity '07, Program II: Ethics; Chair, Honor Council)
 Susan Sterrett (Assistant Professor, Philosophy)
 Felicity Turner (Graduate student, History, GPSC representative)

*Survey Sub-Committee Member

Academic Integrity in Undergraduate Life at Duke University:
Survey Results 2005

Table of Contents

Academic Integrity in Undergraduate Life at Duke University: Survey Results 2005

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In the fall of 2005, Duke surveyed undergraduates, faculty, and graduate instructors on academic integrity. The survey was a follow-up to 1995 and 2000 self-studies and was of particular interest because it provided an opportunity to assess changes in attitudes and behaviors since the introduction in fall 2003 of the university's new honor code, the Duke Community Standard. The survey was conducted by the Academic Integrity Council (AIC), a university committee established in 2001 as a result of the 2000 self-study. AIC Chair Judith Ruderman and Kenan Institute for Ethics Director Elizabeth Kiss served as co-Principal Investigators, with Matt Serra of the Arts and Sciences Assessment Office providing technical support. A total of 718 first-year students, 1,293 upper-class students, 339 faculty, and 70 graduate instructors completed surveys. The upper-class student survey was part of a national survey led by Rutgers Professor Donald McCabe, founder of the Center for Academic Integrity.

Summary of Major Findings

The survey results suggest there has been a reduction in academically dishonest behaviors at Duke over the past five years. Indeed, Duke's upper-class student survey results more closely resembled those from the other honor code schools in McCabe's national sample than they did five years ago, an especially striking result since 13 of the 15 "code schools" in the 2005 sample have had an honor code in place far longer than Duke.

However, Duke students still reported seeing more cheating than students at other honor code schools and self-reported higher rates of some forms of cheating, especially falsifying or fabricating lab data. A higher percentage of Duke students than students at other honor code schools thought cheating is a serious problem on campus.

Duke faculty were even less sanguine than Duke students about cheating on this campus: a far higher percentage of faculty than students thought that cheating is a serious problem. Faculty also considered a wider range of behaviors "serious cheating." But faculty behavior appears to have changed little in the past five years, with one notable exception: far more faculty today provide information about academic integrity on their syllabi than faculty surveyed five years ago. The surveys revealed no increase in other faculty efforts to promote academic integrity, and, with the exception of plagiarism, Duke faculty were less likely than their peers at either honor code or non-code schools to discuss academic integrity policies with their students. This last result is especially worth noting, since students reported that faculty are their most important source of information about these policies.

First-year students arrive at Duke with high expectations for more meaningful learning and less cheating in college than in high school. A comparison of first-year with upper-class student results suggests that high schoolers are more likely than collegians to report

their peers for cheating. Upper-class students expressed fairly high support for Duke's academic integrity policies, but remain split on whether students should be expected to monitor others' integrity. Overall, students, faculty, and graduate instructors expressed moderate support for the view that the new Duke Community Standard contributes to a climate of academic integrity on campus.

A comparison between the Pratt School of Engineering and Trinity College of Arts and Sciences suggests that Pratt faculty may be better informed about policies and practices, more involved in promoting academic integrity, and more likely to believe that students should be expected to monitor their peers. A higher percentage of Pratt students believed the Duke Community Standard contributes to creating a culture of integrity, although more of them admitted to having fabricated lab data than Trinity students for whom the question was relevant.

Selected Survey Results

In the area of **student behavior**, surveys revealed:
- a drop, in most cases, in the percentage of upper-class students who report having engaged in specific academically dishonest behaviors, with unauthorized collaboration continuing to be the most prevalent of them (Table 1);
- similarity in levels of self-reported cheating between Duke and the national honor code school sample, with one notable exception, fabrication of lab data, where Duke students continue to report higher rates of academic dishonesty (Table 2);
- the effectiveness of honor code initiatives in reducing academic dishonesty, as suggested by the lower self-reported incidences of such behavior in schools with codes compared to those with no codes (Table 2);
- a higher rate at Duke than at other honor code schools of students observing cheating by their peers on tests or examinations (Table 3).

With respect to **faculty behavior**, surveys revealed:
- an increase in the percentage of faculty who provide academic integrity information on their syllabi, but no increase in other integrity promotion efforts (Table 4);
- less attention to classroom discussion of academic integrity policies than at either code or non-code schools, with the exception of plagiarism (Table 5);
- graduate students instructors are less well informed about integrity policies than other faculty but also more inclined to include relevant information on the syllabus and to teach techniques of proper citation. (Table 6).

Finally, survey questions related to **student and faculty attitudes** showed:
- greater concern among faculty than students that cheating is a serious problem on campus, although Duke students express this concern more frequently than their peers at other honor code schools do (Table 7);
- fairly high support by students for Duke's academic integrity policies and a perception by students of high faculty support for these policies (Table 8);

- far less confidence expressed by faculty that their colleagues support these policies (Table 9);
- moderate support by students, faculty, and graduate instructors for the view that the new Duke Community Standard contributes to a climate of academic integrity on campus (Table 10);
- far lower support by students for the view that the Community Standard contributes to a climate of integrity in social life (Table 11).

TABLE 1: DUKE UPPER-CLASS STUDENTS: SELF-REPORTED ACADEMIC DISHONESTY			
	1995	**2000**	**2005**
Unauthorized collaboration	42%	45%	29%
Copying a few sentences without footnoting	46%	38%	26% *(electronic source)*
			Unknown* *(written source)*
Receiving substantial unpermitted help on an assignment	23%	21%	22%
Falsifying lab or research data	42%	37%	21% *(lab)*
			3% *(research)*
Getting questions or answers from someone who has already taken a test	36%	24%	8%
Fabricating or falsifying a bibliography	29%	19%	10%

* This response was left blank due to a technical problem with the web survey.

TABLE 2: COMPARISON BETWEEN DUKE AND NATIONAL SAMPLE STUDENTS WHO HAVE ENGAGED "*ONCE/MORE THAN ONCE*" IN DISHONEST BEHAVIORS			
	Code Schools	Duke	No Code Schools
Unauthorized collaboration	24%	29%	40%
Copying a few sentences from an electronic source without footnoting them	28%	26% [1]	35%
Falsifying lab data	11%	21%	21%
Falsifying research data	3%	3%	5%
Getting questions or answers from someone who has already taken the test	8%	8%	21%
Receiving substantial unpermitted help on an assignment	21%	22%	28%
Fabricating or falsifying a bibliography	8%	10%	13%

TABLE 3: HOW OFTEN HAVE YOU SEEN ANOTHER STUDENT CHEAT ON A TEST/EXAM?					
	Never	Once	Few Times	Several Times	Many Times
Code Schools	77%	10%	11%	1%	1%
Duke	**69%**	**12%**	**16%**	**3%**	**1%**
Non -Code Schools	58%	13%	20%	6%	4%

[1] No Duke responses were recorded for copying a few sentences from a *written* source without footnoting; at the code schools the rate for this infraction was 25%.

TABLE 4: DUKE FACULTY EFFORTS TO PROMOTE ACADEMIC INTEGRITY			
	Duke Faculty 2000	Trinity Faculty 2005	Pratt Faculty 2005
Provide information on syllabus	28%	47%	57%
Remind students periodically about their obligations	45%	30%	50%
Discuss importance of integrity	45%	43%	45%

TABLE 5: IN THE PAST YEAR, MY INSTRUCTORS DISCUSSED *OFTEN* OR *VERY OFTEN* POLICIES CONCERNING:			
	Duke	Code Schools	Non Code Schools
Plagiarism	37%	36%	35%
Guidelines on group work or collaboration	30%	45%	38%
Proper citation/referencing-written sources	50%	58%	52%
Proper citation/referencing-Internet sources	40%	47%	43%
Falsifying/fabricating course lab data	12%	16%	18%
Falsifying/fabricating research data	13%	19%	20%

TABLE 6: GRADUATE STUDENT INSTRUCTORS VS. OTHER FACULTY			
	Graduate Student Instructors	Trinity Faculty	Pratt Faculty
NOT aware of Duke's faculty –student resolution process	70%	47%	20%
Include academic integrity information on syllabus	53%	47%	57%
Teach techniques of proper citation	67%	57%	30%

TABLE 7: CHEATING IS A SERIOUS PROBLEM ON MY CAMPUS			
	Agree/Agree Strongly	Disagree/Disagree Strongly	Not Sure
Duke upper-class students	14%	45%	41%
Students at all Code Schools	7%	66%	28%
Duke faculty (NOTE that original survey question was asked in the negative)	48%	14%	38%

TABLE 8: UPPERCLASS STUDENT ATTITUDES TO DUKE'S POLICIES				
	VERY LOW	LOW	HIGH	VERY HIGH
Student support of policies	4%	35%	55%	6%
Faculty support of policies	1%	10%	62%	27%
Effectiveness of policies	6%	37%	50%	7%

TABLE 9: FACULTY ATTITUDES TO DUKE'S POLICIES				
	VERY LOW	LOW	HIGH	VERY HIGH
Faculty support of policies	3%	40%	42%	2%
Effectiveness of policies	11%	49%	23%	<1%

TABLE 10: DOES DUKE COMMUNITY STANDARD CONTRIBUTE TO A CULTURE OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY?				
	Not at all	Some	Fair Amount	Significantly
Faculty	9%	50%	24%	7%
Graduate Instructors	11%	63%	19%	3%
Upper-Class Students	15%	39%	34%	9%

TABLE 11: DOES COMMUNITY STANDARD CONTRIBUTE TO INTEGRITY IN SOCIAL LIFE?				
	Not at all	Some	Fair Amount	Significantly
Upper-Class Students	47%	33%	14%	3%

Recommendations

These surveys revealed that Duke has made progress on academic integrity and they now point us to specific steps through which more progress can and should be made. We recommend the following courses of action:

A. Administration:
- Set clear expectation that the faculty will both promote academic integrity and address cases of academic dishonesty when they arise;
- Recognize the efforts of faculty in nurturing a culture of integrity;
- Better educate the faculty by providing clearer and more accessible information about policies and processes (for example, the use of the faculty-student resolution) along with best practices;
- Include a question about faculty efforts to promote academic integrity on both the instructor's form and the student course evaluation form for all undergraduate courses;
- Bring to the faculty, on a regular basis, statistics (such as the number and kind of judicial board cases) and survey results on student attitudes and behaviors (such as the frequency of lab data fabrication and the degree to which students rely on faculty for their own information about academic integrity);
- Improve the educational materials and orientation programs provided to students.

B. Faculty:
- Recognize the faculty's influence on student behavior and campus culture;
- Consider academic integrity issues to be central, not peripheral, to professional responsibilities as teachers;
- Promote academic integrity by
  - Explaining the rationale for, and requirements of, honest scholarship;
  - Referring to the Duke Community Standard on syllabi and in class discussion;

- Designing assignments, and modes of assessment, in ways that encourage meaningful learning and honest work (with special attention to laboratory and group work, which are shown by this survey to be particularly problematic);
- Seeking opportunities for greater intellectual engagement with students in classroom and co-curricular settings;
- Designate a departmental resource person for academic integrity to provide support and information for all faculty, including adjuncts, visiting professors, graduate instructors, teaching assistants, and undergraduate assistants;
- Follow reporting procedures as outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

C. Students:
- Recognize the importance of academic integrity to a Duke education and uphold the principles of academic integrity in personal behavior;
- Seek information about Duke's standards and policies, both as a whole and in particular courses;
- Recognize alternatives to dishonest behavior including
  - Asking questions when in doubt about course expectations, policies, and practices;
  - Developing good time management practices and asking for extensions when necessary.
- Take ownership of the obligation to improve and sustain a culture of academic integrity by
  - Challenging behaviors of peers that lend themselves to academic dishonesty;
  - Embracing the "obligation to act" in the face of peer dishonesty.

D. All Constituencies:
- Regularly revisit, discuss, and reaffirm the Duke Community Standard and its related policies, revising where necessary;
- Consider how the Duke Community Standard might be used more effectively to promote integrity in social as well as academic life.

Concluding Reflections

The 2005 surveys provided some encouraging news by revealing that we are making progress in curbing academic dishonesty on our campus. Although we can, and with attention, *will* do even better, we should be proud to know that we have strengthened the culture of academic integrity at Duke. Beyond the statistics about cheating and plagiarism, however, these survey results point to deeper issues of teaching, learning, and campus culture. In particular, they suggest that faculty can and should be doing more, through what they say and how they teach, to communicate the centrality of integrity to scholarly inquiry and authentic learning, and that taking academic integrity seriously requires efforts by all campus constituencies to make the Duke Community Standard a foundation of campus culture.

Academic Integrity in Undergraduate Life at Duke University:
Survey Results 2005

"I think this is a wise study to conduct, and I hope that people will respond honestly since it's anonymous. I think this is an issue that is worth addressing, as a university."
(Upper-class student)

I. Background. In October of 2005, the Academic Integrity Council, chaired by Judith Ruderman, in concert with Elizabeth Kiss, Director of the Kenan Institute for Ethics, and Matt Serra, Director of Assessment for Trinity College of Arts and Sciences, surveyed Trinity and Pratt undergraduates, and faculty teaching undergraduates, on their attitudes and behaviors related to academic integrity at Duke.

For **upper-class students** (sophomores through seniors) we tapped into the national survey funded by the Templeton Foundation and conducted by Professor Donald McCabe of Rutgers University, founding president of the national Center for Academic Integrity, which since 1997 has been based at Duke. McCabe has conducted research on this subject for many years, surveying schools with an honor code of any sort (referred to as "code schools") as well as schools with no honor codes. Duke has participated in McCabe's studies since 1990, and doing so every five years has permitted us to measure both progress and areas of concern, and to make recommendations accordingly. We note that McCabe's sample in 2005 was not the same as that in 2000—of the code schools, only three, including Duke, also participated in 2000.

McCabe utilized both a Web-based survey in 2005 and, for those schools willing (Duke was one of them), a paper survey administered to a smaller student sample. We concentrate on the Web survey results in this report because the number of respondents was 16 times larger than for the paper survey and more representative of the student body overall. However, we include an analysis of the results of the paper survey in Section VII. The Web and paper surveys provided opportunities for student comments.

In addition to the survey of upper-class undergraduates, we at Duke decided to conduct Web-based surveys of all our **first-year students** and our undergraduate **faculty**. For the survey of first-year students we adapted the instrument utilized by McCabe in the past. For the survey of faculty we basically used the same instrument we used in 2000, when McCabe had surveyed faculty as well as students. We surveyed all instructors of undergraduate courses over the previous four-and-a-half years (for whom we had email addresses), including regular rank faculty, adjuncts, and non-TA graduate students. The first year student survey and the faculty survey also contained the option for written comments on selected questions.

The Web survey instruments are included as Appendix B.

II. Response rates. All **first-year students** were invited to take the survey: of the 1,724 invitees, 718 responded, for a response rate of 42%. All **upper-class undergraduates**—

sophomores through seniors—were supposed to be invited, but we later discovered that Pratt juniors had been inadvertently omitted from the Web polling.[2] Of the invitees, 500 student names were randomly selected to receive a paper-and-pencil survey. Of the 4176 upper-class students invited to take the Web survey, 1293 responded, a rate of 31%. Of the 500 students invited by Professor McCabe to take the paper survey, only 81 responded, or 16%.

The **faculty** survey was sent to all instructors of undergraduate courses over the previous four-and-a-half years, from fall 2001 through fall 2005, including summers. These instructors numbered 1,591 and included 237 graduate students teaching their own courses. Excluding the graduate students, the number of faculty who were invited to participate was 1,354. Of these, 339 responded, for a response rate of 25%. Of the 237 graduate student instructors invited to take the survey, 70 responded, or 30%.

Response rate charts are included in Appendix A.

Given that we have two undergraduate colleges/schools, we compared response rates of Pratt and Trinity students and faculty. A higher percentage of Pratt **first-year** invitees responded than Trinity first-year students (47% from Pratt compared to 40% from Trinity). Trinity and Pratt **upper-class** students responded at about the same rate. A higher percentage of Pratt **faculty** than Trinity faculty responded: 31% of the engineering invitees completed the survey compared to 24% of the arts and sciences invitees. (These 295 arts and sciences respondents actually include four from the Nicholas School and one each from Fuqua, Nursing, Pediatrics, Immunology, and the Kenan Institute, all of whom taught at least one course in Trinity over the last 4.5 years.)

III. Demographics. When gauging the reliability of the data received from these surveys we must look at how representative the respondents are of the overall cohorts surveyed. Charts comparing the demographics of those invited to take the surveys with those who responded are located in Appendix A.

A. Demographics, First Year Student Survey:
Respondents were representative of the student population in terms of gender and, with the exception of African Americans, ethnicity as well. (African Americans constitute 9.5% of the invitees and 7.4% of the respondents.) Pratt students were overrepresented by 3% among the respondents, and Trinity underrepresented, by the same percentage. 67% of first-year student respondents attended a public high school, with 31% attending private schools, and a little over 1% either home-schooled or declined to reply—these figures roughly accord with the proportions in the first year class. Close to 95% of students reported a high school GPA of 3.5 to 4.0, indicating that the incoming students

---

[2] The committee considered a later survey of Pratt juniors only but decided against it for three reasons: we did not find any systematic differences in responses across classes; such a survey would result in a small sample size (perhaps 30-40 additional responses); and the responses would have to be treated separately because of the six-month lag between surveys.

tend to be high achievers academically, as expected. The first-year students who responded reported a wide range of intended academic majors.

B. Demographics, Upper-Class Student Survey:

Females were overrepresented among respondents by 5%. African Americans were underrepresented by about 2.5%, and Asians were slightly overrepresented by almost 2%. Otherwise the respondents were representative in terms of ethnicity. As well, Trinity and Pratt students were represented in proportion to the composition of the list of invitees. These students listed their primary major at the following rates: social science, 35%; science/math, 26%; humanities, 19%; engineering, 13%, the arts, 4%, and undecided, 3%. These percentages are comparable to those in the upper-class student body as a whole.

C. Demographics, Faculty Survey:

Women were overrepresented among faculty respondents, and men underrepresented, by about 9.5%. In terms of ethnicity, only Asian faculty were underrepresented, by 3.6% in Trinity and 7.1% in Pratt. We have no data on ethnicity for 5.5% of the invitees and 10.6% of the respondents.

In arts and sciences, humanities faculty were overrepresented by 5%. Engineering faculty were slightly overrepresented by 2.4%. However, there was an "other" category that was selected by 7.4% of the respondents.

In terms of rank, it is difficult to pinpoint representativeness because a smaller number of options were provided for self-reporting than are actually available in the faculty database. (See Appendix A, table 10.) We do not know, for example, whether some of those respondents who said they are "assistant professors" might, in fact, belong to another rank with "assistant" in the title. Similarly, "adjunct" is both a specific job title and a broad categorization—e.g., some visiting or contract instructors may regard themselves as "adjunct" even when their official title does not include the term.

Among graduate instructor respondents, women were overrepresented by about 8%. Hispanics were slightly overrepresented and Asians slightly underrepresented. The natural sciences and mathematics were somewhat overrepresented among respondents (a difference of 3.8%) whereas the social sciences were slightly underrepresented (3.2%) None of the graduate instructors came from Pratt.

IV. Comparisons to earlier Duke University upper-class student survey results:

Our 2005 results from upper-class students demonstrated in most cases a decrease (often a significant decrease) in acts of academic dishonesty since the surveys in 1995 and 2000. Let us first review the six categories in which our students self-reported the highest percentages of participation (one or more times since coming to Duke) in acts of academic dishonesty in 2005, comparing these figures to 1995 and 2000. The lowest percentage of self-reported cheating in each category is highlighted.

TABLE 1: SELF-REPORTED ACTS OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY			
	1995	**2000**	**2005**
Unauthorized collaboration	42%	45%	**29%**
Receiving substantial unpermitted help on an assignment	23%	**21%**	22%
Copying a few sentences without footnoting	46%	38%	**26%** **(electronic source)** **unknown** **(written source)** [3]
Falsifying lab or research data	42%	37%	**21%** (lab) **3%** (research)
Getting questions or answers from someone who has already taken a test	36%	24%	**8%**
Fabricating or falsifying a bibliography	29%	19%	**10%**[4]

V. Comparisons of Duke upper-class student responses to those at other schools. We might also ask how we are doing in relation to the other schools that McCabe surveyed this fall (only two of which, as noted, participated in the 2000 survey along with Duke). Let us compare the 2005 figures above with the results from the 15 schools surveyed by McCabe, including Duke, which have some sort of honor code. It is important to note that 13 of the 15 code schools in the sample have had honor codes for a longer time than Duke, in some cases far longer.[5]

As Table 2 shows, Duke's results overall were comparable to those of other code schools, with two exceptions: *falsifying lab data*, where our results were almost double those in

---

[3] In 2005, Don McCabe split the question into two: copying a few sentences from an *electronic* source without footnoting and copying from a *written* source. There was a computer glitch in the Duke survey, however, that resulted in Viewsflash, the relatively new secure Web survey tool, ignoring the question about "copying a few sentences from a written source without footnoting." Thus, students utilizing the Web survey had no opportunity to mark this choice. Duke's Office of Information Technology has investigated the matter and is confident that the collected survey data have integrity. For comparison purposes, 36% of respondents to the paper survey reported having copied a few sentences from an electronic source and 36% from a written source.

[4] Although the declines in self-reports about getting questions or answers and fabricating a bibliography look suspiciously steep, McCabe found that of the two other code schools participating in both the 2000 and 2005 surveys, the one with an integrity initiative similar to Duke's over the last five years has seen an almost identical drop as Duke has. (The third school, without a similar initiative, also exhibited a downward trend, although not as dramatic.) Personal communication from Donald McCabe, fall 2005.

[5] Personal communication from Donald McCabe, fall 2005.

the code school sample overall, and *unauthorized collaboration*, which Duke students reported at a 5% higher level.[6]

TABLE 2: COMPARISON BETWEEN DUKE AND NATIONAL SAMPLE, STUDENTS WHO HAVE ENGAGED "*ONCE/MORE THAN ONCE*" IN…			
	Code Schools	Duke	No Code Schools
Unauthorized collaboration	24%	29%	40%
Copying a few sentences from an electronic source without footnoting them	28%	26%[7]	35%
Falsifying lab data	11%	21%	21%
Falsifying research data	3%	3%	5%
Getting questions or answers from someone who has already taken the test	8%	8%	21%
Receiving substantial unpermitted help on an assignment	21%	22%	28%
Fabricating or falsifying a bibliography	8%	10%	13%

Is cheating a serious problem on campus? When asked whether *cheating is a serious problem* at Duke, 14% of our upper-class students said that it is. (Trinity students were slightly more likely to say that cheating is a serious problem at Duke [15%] than were Pratt students [11%]). In the code school sample that figure was half as much: only 7% thought their campus had a serious cheating problem. Overall, 45% of Duke students said that cheating is NOT a serious problem on our campus, compared to 66% at code schools. (Again, Pratt students were more likely than Trinity respondents to say that cheating is NOT a serious problem here.)

TABLE 3: IS CHEATING A SERIOUS PROBLEM ON MY CAMPUS?			
	Disagree/Disagree Strongly	Agree/Agree Strongly	Not Sure
Duke	45%	14%	41%
All Code Schools	66%	7%	28%

Let us look a little deeper into the discrepancy between Duke and the code school sample. Duke students differed substantively from the code schools in reporting seeing others cheat on tests or exams only in the category of seeing such cheating *a few times*: 16% of

---

[6] Only one other school in the 15 is like Duke in terms of the relatively short length of time it has been a code school and, according to McCabe, the Duke results demonstrate larger decreases in acts of academic dishonesty than those from that school.

[7] As noted above, no Duke responses were recorded for copying a few sentences from a *written* source without footnoting; at the code schools the rate for this infraction was 25%.

Duke students reported this compared to 11% at the code schools. For the combined choices *several times* and *many times* we were only two percentage points greater. As for self-reported (rather than observed) behaviors, we have already seen that, with the exception of falsifying lab data, Duke was not dissimilar from the code school sample. Is it possible that *lab cheating*—the one area where we seem to do far worse than the other code schools—accounted for the disparity between Duke and the others in the perception of the seriousness of cheating on campus? Is the atmosphere at Duke more intense and competitive than at the other schools? Do we have less of a sense of community here? Do students believe that even if *they* are not cheating, others are?

TABLE 4: HOW OFTEN HAVE YOU SEEN ANOTHER STUDENT CHEAT ON A TEST/EXAM?					
	Never	Once	Few Times	Several Times	Many Times
Code Schools	77%	10%	11%	1%	1%
Duke	69%	12%	16%	3%	1%
Non-Code Schools	58%	13%	20%	6%	4%

Sample comments from upper-class students
- Cheating is something that friends tell me goes on all the time at Duke, but I personally have seen it VERY rarely.
- A lot of kids at Duke cheat all the time. . . . The kids at Rice are no better raised than us and no brighter but for some reason the school has really fostered an ambience of "academic integrity."
- I believe cheating is a product of the overemphasis on grades at Duke. I wish everything was pass/fail.
- I have been very proud of my fellow Duke students with regard to the honor code and cheating. In those instances when a teacher has left the classroom during an exam, there have been NO digressions from morality as far as I could tell which represents a great difference from my high school experiences.
- Professors are too trusting, giving students the opportunity to cheat through lack of supervision only encourages dishonesty.

How likely are students to report on their peers? 40% of upper-class students agreed with the statement that *students should monitor others' integrity* (41% of Pratt respondents and 39% from Trinity). This figure was 50% at the code schools in McCabe's survey, the majority of which have longstanding honor code traditions. At Duke, 37% disagreed that students should monitor their peers, compared to 27% at the code schools. Here the discrepancy between Pratt and Trinity was more marked: fewer engineering students indicated that students should *not* monitor their peers than Trinity students: 29% (P) versus 38% (T). In other words, Pratt students were more likely than Trinity students to support monitoring of their peers.

TABLE 5: "STUDENTS SHOULD MONITOR THE INTEGRITY OF PEERS"		
	Agree	Disagree
Duke	40%	37%
Code Schools	50%	27%

When asked how likely it was that they would report an incident of cheating that they observed, more than a third (34%) of our upper-class students said it was *likely* or *very likely* that they would do so. (More Pratt than Trinity students selected these degrees of likelihood: 38% vs. 34%.) The overall Duke rate of 34% compared to 45% in the code schools, with the greatest difference in the *very likely* category: at Duke, only 4% indicated that they would be *very likely* to report on a peer compared to 11% in the code schools. The fact that only 3% rather than 34% of the Duke respondents have ever actually reported on a peer (according to the survey) suggests that it is easier to speak in the abstract than to act in reality.

Not surprisingly, when asked about reporting an observed incident of cheating by a close friend, 99% of Pratt students and 96% of Trinity students said they were unlikely to report such an infraction. What is considered loyalty to a friend, in combination with the onus against "snitching," trumps the value placed on academic integrity. The Duke student perception is that the *typical* Duke student would be even less likely than the respondent him/herself to report an observed incident of cheating by anyone: 23% of Pratt students and 17% of Trinity students said it was *likely* that the typical Duke student would report such a violation, and only 1% of both schools said it was *very likely*. Actual practice at Duke, we repeat, revealed that it is indeed highly unlikely (at 3%) for anyone to report on anyone else.

Nonetheless, Duke students might be ready with more education to help make incremental progress in changing the culture. When they were asked what students should do if they observe cheating, they chose telling their instructor, either with a name attached (24%) or without (23%), at the highest rates among the alternatives presented. Duke's recent revision of the "obligation to report" policy into an "obligation to act," delineating concrete examples of possible actions, including alerting an instructor or confronting a friend, may in the future alter student perception of what the word "monitor" might denote, and provide guidelines for how students might appropriately step up to the plate in accepting some responsibility for the overall climate of integrity at Duke.[8]

---

[8] **The "Obligation to Act" (effective fall 2006)**

The Duke Community Standard stresses the commitment that students share with faculty and administrators to enhance the climate for academic integrity at Duke University. The pledge beginning "I will not lie, cheat or steal in my academic endeavors" is followed by the additional affirmation, "nor will I accept the actions of those who do." Both statements, like the Duke Community Standard as a whole, are statements of principles.

How do our faculty practices compare? Comparisons about faculty practices from the *students'* perspectives revealed that in most cases our Duke instructors are not discussing integrity policies quite as much as those at the code schools surveyed, or, for that matter, as those at the schools with no honor code. Students were asked how often, in the past year, their instructors had discussed policies concerning various integrity issues. The combined rates for the selection of *often* and *very often* are found in the following table:

TABLE 6: IN THE PAST YEAR, MY INSTRUCTORS DISCUSSED *OFTEN* OR *VERY OFTEN* POLICIES CONCERNING:			
	Duke	Code Schools	Non-Code Schools
Plagiarism	37%	36%	35%
Guidelines on group work or collaboration	30%	45%	38%
Proper citation/referencing-written sources	50%	58%	52%
Proper citation/referencing-Internet sources	40%	47%	43%
Falsifying/fabricating course lab data	12%	16%	18%
Falsifying/fabricating research data	13%	19%	20%

From principles flow policies. Stemming from this so-called non-toleration clause ("nor will I accept the actions of those who do") is a policy that reflects an emphasis on taking constructive action of some sort if one witnesses or knows about dishonorable behavior connected to classroom assignments or activities.

In short, students who observe or hear about cheating are obligated to do something about it rather than to remain passive bystanders. They are obligated to take action. Several alternative courses of action are available, and students should feel free to discuss them with trusted advisors before choosing among them:

- Alerting the faculty member that cheating may be occurring in the course. This alert can be in any form, including anonymously. The information will allow the instructor to consider corrective measures and to address the topic with the class.

- Calling attention to the suspected violation as it is occurring, in either a public or a private manner.

- Identifying the suspected cheater to the faculty member of the course. The report will be treated in total confidence: the faculty member will not divulge the reporting student's name to anyone, and the reporting student is under no obligation to take the information any place else. The faculty member will then act on this information, as the Faculty Handbook requires; at the very least the faculty will let the suspected student know that his or her behavior has raised suspicion.

- Speaking directly with the student suspected of violating the Duke Community Standard, either to gain clarity about what happened or to put the person on alert that his or her behavior could have serious consequences.

- Notifying the Associate Dean for Judicial Affairs within the Dean of Students Office. The Associate Dean will speak with the faculty member about this information, maintaining the confidentiality of the source. The Dean and the faculty member will strategize about next steps.

Whatever the option chosen for reporting breaches of academic integrity, a student is responsible for doing *something*. This responsibility is an integral part of the Duke Community Standard and will help to build a community of honor whose values the Community Standard articulates.

Table 6 reveals that the one area in which we do as well as the code and non-code school samples as a whole is **plagiarism**: Duke undergraduates reported that their instructors discuss plagiarism *often* or *very often* at a rate of 37%, versus 36% for the code schools. The survey had two additional and separate questions pertaining to plagiarism: faculty discussion of proper citation practices for written sources and Internet sources. Here our faculty, according to their students, are less inclined than those at the code and non-code schools to highlight policies: 50% of faculty at Duke compared to 58% at the code schools and 52% at the non-code schools were reported to discuss citation practices for written sources *often* or *very often*, and 40% vs. 47% (code schools) and 43% (non-code schools) discuss citation practices for Internet sources. Nonetheless, the self-reported rate of plagiarism at Duke was about the same as that at the code schools surveyed—copying from an electronic source was 26% percent at Duke versus 28% at the code schools and 35% at the non-code schools; copying material word-for-word from a written source was 2% for Duke and the code schools and twice as much at the non-code schools. (What the *faculty* thought about their discussion of citation practices is found in Section VIII, below.) Interestingly, 39% of Pratt students and 35% of Trinity students to whom the question was deemed relevant indicated that paraphrasing or copying a few sentences of material from an electronic source without footnoting them in a paper is *trivial cheating* or *not cheating.* The overall percentage of Duke students choosing these responses was 38% compared to 31% at the code schools and 39% at the non-code schools. Given this attitude, the fact that Duke students did not self-report higher rates of this behavior (see Table 2 on page 5) suggests that the faculty message may be getting through. On the other hand, 19% of Duke upper-class students said they thought plagiarism on written assignments occurs *often* or *very often*, almost twice the rate as at the code schools (10%) and about the same as at the no-code schools (18%). Again we might ask what causes this disparity between practice and perception.

The greatest discrepancy in faculty practices from the students' perspective would seem to be with **guidelines on group work**: as Table 6, on the previous page, indicates, 30% of Duke respondents said their faculty provide such guidelines *often* or *very often* compared to 45% of the upper-class students at the code schools and 38% at the no-code schools. It must be noted, however, that when we drill down to the school level we find that in Pratt, 45% of the students reported that their professors discussed these guidelines *often* or *very often* in the past year; only 29% of the Trinity students replied in a similar fashion. Can we attribute this difference to the fact that group work may be more common in Pratt? Even though less than one percent of both Trinity and Pratt students said that the question did not apply to them (in other words, the question seemed equally relevant to Trinity and Pratt), Pratt faculty are perhaps more likely to address issues of collaboration because of the salience of group work in the engineering curriculum.

TABLE 7: INSTRUCTORS PROVIDE GUIDELINES FOR GROUP WORK "OFTEN" OR "VERY OFTEN" (TRINITY VS. PRATT):		
	Trinity	Pratt
Guidelines on group work or collaboration	29%	45%

How often is inappropriate group work occurring at Duke? 57% of upper-class students thought that **inappropriate sharing in group assignments** occurs *often* or *very often*, compared to 36% in the code school sample and 54% in the no-code sample. Pratt and Trinity responses were the same on this question. Issues of collaboration are extremely interesting and are discussed in the following section.

> *Sample comments from upper-class students*
> o Duke professors are not sending the same message regarding academic honesty. In fact, some professors do not make their standards clear until several weeks into the semester. Some seem to take it more seriously than others. Duke needs to have a clear approach to communicating the SAME message to all of its students.
> o Professors should communicate that it is just as serious to cheat on homework— this is so very prevalent!
> o Please talk more about collaboration. I don't think anyone has a clue of what is right and wrong and instead of asking they take advantage of the situation.

VI. Cheating at Duke by upper-class students: two issues of special concern.

      A. Unauthorized collaboration. In the 2000 survey, more students self-reported engaging in unauthorized collaboration (*working with others when asked for individual work*) than in any other behavior listed—the rate was 45%. We thought it important to look closely at this behavior in 2005, especially because collaborative work, typical in Pratt, is being increasingly emphasized in Trinity as well.

The latest data revealed that our students still self-report a fairly high degree of unauthorized collaboration, even though that percentage has gone down dramatically, as shown in Table 2 on p. 5, from 45% in 2000 to 29% in 2005 (31%P, 28%T). 43% of Pratt faculty (and about a third of Trinity faculty) reported seeing this practice at least once (25% said more than once) in their classrooms in "a typical academic year."

Pratt and Trinity students were almost evenly split in their assessment of the seriousness of this infraction, with about half rating it *trivial cheating/not cheating* and about the same rating it *moderate* or *severe* cheating. Interestingly, the faculty rated it *trivial* to almost the same degree as students,[9] with Pratt faculty being somewhat more likely than those in Trinity to label this infraction as *trivial* (50% P, 45% T).

      B. Falsifying lab or research data Because of the importance of lab and research data at a research university, we were also interested in comparing faculty and students in Trinity and Pratt on how serious they think these issues are and how often they have seen or engaged in such cheating. Approximately 40% of upper-class students in both schools who said that lab data are relevant to them report that falsifying lab data is *trivial*. 36% of Pratt respondents said they had falsified lab data versus 26% of Trinity students who deemed the question relevant to them.

---

[9] The faculty survey, unlike the students', did not offer a choice of moderate. Therefore, this report uses the term "non-trivial" as the opposite of trivial.

The 2005 upper-class student survey distinguished between falsifying "lab data" and "research data" in order to gauge whether students treat them differently. Far fewer students considered it *trivial cheating* or *not cheating* to falsify research data (13% P, 15% T for research data versus 47% P, 33% T for lab data), and only 3% of students in both schools said they had ever falsified research data. The dramatic discrepancy, both in attitudes and behaviors, between class-based lab work and independent research has important pedagogical implications, which we explore below.

The faculty survey lumped lab and research data together: 34% of Pratt faculty to whom lab or research data were relevant said they see fabrication of these data once or more than once in a typical academic year vs. 10% of Trinity faculty. A very low percentage of both faculties—approximately 3%—said that this was *trivial* cheating.

Only about a fifth (22%) of the Pratt students reported that their faculty talk about this matter of fabricating lab data *often* or *very often*; the figure was roughly the same (23%) for research data. We note that the figure was significantly lower for Trinity upper-class students: 14% of Trinity students for whom the issue of falsifying lab or research data was relevant said their faculty address these matters *often* or *very often*.

Students appear to be drawing a sharp distinction between class-based lab work and independent research. If a substantial percentage of students, especially engineering students, think that falsifying lab results is *trivial* cheating, and if a large percentage of them are actually engaging in this practice, then what does this say about the lab work?

Do we need to take a closer look at how labs are designed and graded and consider whether students are suggesting that lab work is not authentic enough to warrant their taking an honest approach to it? Is it clear to students that the goal of labs is to learn techniques and not to generate "correct" data? Do students think of their course labs as "canned"? Do they believe that faculty expect a particular outcome, and there is no benefit to reporting the "wrong" result and interpreting it (if they even were qualified to do so)? A discussion of the design of lab exercises and a rethinking and clarification of their learning goals would be a valuable response to these survey results.

Interestingly, many of the written comments in our survey of first-year students (see below, Section IX, p. 21) indicated that a prime reason for cheating in high school was that the assignments were considered a waste of time. We should note again the finding that our rate of self-reported fabrication of lab data was twice as high as that at the code schools in McCabe's study; even though we were better on this score, as on others, than the one other short-time code school in that sample (see footnote 5), our aspiration should be to lower this rate significantly. Certainly it is critical that we involve our TAs in this process; whether graduate students or advanced undergraduates, they have close association with Duke undergraduates in the laboratory.

Pratt students self-reported a higher degree of lab and computer program cheating than Trinity students (lab: P 37%, T 17%; computer: P 15%, T 4%); but that may be because many Trinity students said the question didn't apply to them. Trinity students reported

almost twice the rate of falsifying excuses than engineering students, without anyone saying the question didn't apply (T 14%, P 8%). Does the smaller school and a greater sense of community perhaps account for Pratt students' disinclination to falsify an excuse to delay an assignment? Or could this be because courses required in Pratt generally involve weekly homework sets, and weekly labs, and the quantity of assignments means that students can skip one or more without having the overall grade penalized significantly?

VII. Paper survey of upper-class students.
Five hundred randomly selected upper-class Duke students were invited by Professor Donald McCabe of Rutgers University to complete a pencil-and-paper survey. Of these, 81 or 16% responded. (The response rate for the paper survey was lower than that for the Web survey across all of the schools surveyed.) A comparison of the results of this paper survey with the main Web-based upper-class survey reveals some interesting differences.

Demographics. First, students who responded to the paper survey had a somewhat different demographic profile. A majority were male (54% versus 46%) whereas on the Web survey women respondents outnumbered men by 56% to 44%. In contrast to the Web survey, which yielded a fairly equal mix of sophomores, juniors and seniors among the respondents, the paper survey had a more uneven sample by class: 46% sophomores, 17% juniors, 37% seniors. Respondents to the paper survey also had a different mix of majors, with fewer science majors (19% paper, 26% Web) and more humanities majors (26% paper, 19% Web) in the mix.

Perceptions of Duke's climate and policies. Students who responded to the paper survey offered more positive ratings overall of Duke's climate for academic integrity. 68% rated student support for Duke's policies as *high* or *very high*, compared with 61% on the Web survey. 63% rated the effectiveness of Duke's policies as *high* or *very high*, compared with 57% of the Web respondents. More of them reported having received instruction on proper citation practices *often* or *very often* in the past year (60% vs. 50% for written sources; 49% vs. 40% for Internet sources). And 42% agreed that the investigation of suspected cheating was fair, compared with 25% of Web respondents.

TABLE 8: DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN PAPER & WEB SURVEY: ATTITUDES		
	Paper Survey	Web Survey
Student support of policies: High or Very High	68%	61%
Effectiveness of policies: High or Very High	63%	57%
Instruction on proper citation practices from the Web: often or very often	49%	40%
Instruction on proper citation practices from written sources: often or very often	60%	50%
Investigation of suspected cheating is fair: agree or agree strongly	42%	25%

Observed and self-reported behaviors. A less positive picture emerges, however, from the paper surveys when we turn to behaviors. While only 17% of respondents said they thought test cheating occurred *often* or *very often* on campus, 28% reported having observed test or exam cheating more than once. They also admitted to higher rates of academically dishonest behavior in a number of categories. More of them said they had copied another student's computer program (12% vs. 6% on the Web survey), copied on a test without another student's knowledge (10% vs. 5%), received unpermitted help on an assignment (30% vs. 21%), copied from an electronic source without footnoting (36% vs. 26%), or used a false excuse to obtain an extension (19% vs. 14%).

TABLE 9: DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN PAPER & WEB SURVEY: BEHAVIORS		
	Paper Survey	Web Survey
Copied another student's computer program	12%	6%
Copied on a test without another student's knowledge	10%	5%
Received unpermitted help on an assignment	30%	21%
Copied from an electronic source without footnoting	36%	26%
Used a false excuse to obtain an extension	19%	14%

Attitudes to dishonest behavior. Perhaps unsurprisingly, given their higher rates of self-reported dishonest behavior, respondents on the paper survey also expressed less disapproval of some of these behaviors than Web respondents did. This was most striking in the area of unpermitted collaboration. 63% consider "working with others when asked for individual work" *not cheating* or *trivial cheating*, compared with 48% on the Web survey. Similarly, 46% indicated that "receiving unpermitted help on an assignment" was *not cheating* or *trivial cheating*, whereas the figure on the Web survey was 38%. Almost half (48%) said that fabricating or falsifying lab data was *not cheating* or *trivial cheating*, compared with 37% of the Web respondents. And 39% rated the use of a false excuse to obtain an extension as *not cheating* or *trivial cheating*, compared with 28% of the Web respondents.

Inferences: Paper vs. Web. It is difficult to draw any conclusive inferences from the differences between the Web and paper survey responses since the sample sizes are so different (81 for the paper, 1,293 for the Web). Professor McCabe has speculated that students may be more willing to admit academically dishonest behavior on a pencil-and-paper survey mailed to an off-campus address, and the Duke results bear out this pattern to some extent, although respondents to the paper survey also had a more positive assessment of Duke's campus culture for academic integrity. We focus our analysis in this report on the Web results since the Web sample is much larger and more representative.

VIII. Faculty responses.

    A. Regular rank faculty and adjuncts.

        Seriousness of cheating on this campus. We have already noted that 14% of Duke's upper-class students thought cheating is a serious problem at Duke and 45% thought it isn't. The question was asked in the negative on the faculty survey: "Cheating is not a serious problem at Duke." 48% of the faculty disagreed strongly or mildly with that statement—in other words, faculty *did* think cheating is a serious problem and were three times more likely to say so than students. Indeed, the percentages were almost exactly reversed for faculty and students on both sides of the question: serious vs. not serious, with about 40% of both groups in the middle (i.e., unsure). There was no difference between Pratt and Trinity faculty on this question.

We need to explore what causes the discrepancy between faculty and student views on the seriousness of cheating on the Duke campus. *Faculty* results might suggest that faculty simply don't trust students. What about *student* results? Do students have a different and milder take than faculty on what constitutes cheating? The survey results seem to support this conclusion. For example, 53% of upper-class students considered falsifying or fabricating lab data to be *moderate* or *serious* cheating, compared to the 71% of faculty respondents who considered it to be *serious*. (Again, the choice of *moderate* was not offered to the faculty.) 59% of students deemed copying a few sentences from an electronic source without footnoting to be *moderate* or *serious* cheating, whereas 82% of faculty called this practice *serious* cheating.

A great majority of faculty (85% Pratt and 75% Trinity) thought the chances of a student's getting caught cheating are low. This may reflect a self awareness that they, as faculty, are not doing much to identify violators. Indeed, almost half of Pratt faculty and more than a third of Trinity faculty ded not think that faculty members try hard to detect cheaters. And 60% of Pratt and Trinity faculty (about the same as faculty responses in 2001[10]) did not think that Duke faculty members handle instances of student cheating in a uniform manner. A lack of understanding of the judicial process may keep faculty from trying to enforce academic integrity policies.

A related issue is what roles faculty think that *students* should play in the monitoring of academic integrity. Most faculty agreed that students should be held responsible for monitoring the integrity of their peers, as the following chart reveals:

---

[10] The 2000 Duke survey of 200 randomly selected faculty mistakenly included faculty who did not teach undergraduates; a follow-up analysis was therefore done to weed out the inapplicable data. The results listed for 2000 refer only to the 32 undergraduate faculty. In the spring of 2001, a follow-up survey was conducted with a shorter instrument, and 60 faculty responded (30%). The results on the second survey were usually much worse than on the first in terms of promotion of academic integrity.

TABLE 10: STUDENTS SHOULD BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR MONITORING THE INTEGRITY OF PEERS		
	Agree	Disagree
Pratt Faculty	61%	30%
Trinity Faculty	50%	36%

The percentage of faculty who agreed that students should monitor academic integrity was significantly higher than that found in the survey of upper-class students (see Table 5, p. 7).

Promotion of academic integrity. Results from the last McCabe-administered survey five years ago revealed that Duke faculty were less inclined than those at other code schools to promote academic integrity in the classroom. Although McCabe did not survey faculty in 2005, we decided to do so in order to compare our results with those from the last go-around, in order to determine whether better communication with, and education of, the faculty in the intervening years have borne fruit. Our results in 2005, as already noted, included responses from adjuncts and graduate students who have taught undergraduates in the past 4.5 years; in the previous surveys, these categories were not included. Graduate student results are discussed in the next section.

Because we were not bound by McCabe's questions this time, we asked for more information on the promotion of academic integrity than we had five years ago. Faculty could choose all relevant practices in response to this item. On a question worded the same as in 2000 (and 2001, see footnote 7)—***Provide information on the syllabus about cheating/plagiarism***—almost half (48%) of faculty respondents said they do so, compared with 28% in 2000 (and 10% in the follow-up survey in 2001). If we look at Trinity and Pratt separately, we find that 47% of Trinity faculty and 57% of Pratt faculty reported that they employed this technique. The overall percentage of 48% compares to 56% of faculty in private institutions with honor codes who reported in 2000 that they followed this practice. We have no means of assessing whether that rate has risen in the code schools in the last five years; we suspect that we are still below the code schools on this measure but moving in the right direction. Table 11, below, summarizes key results.

TABLE 11: FACULTY EFFORTS TO PROMOTE ACADEMIC INTEGRITY			
	Faculty 2000/01	Trinity Faculty '05	Pratt Faculty '05
Provide information on syllabus	28%/10%	47%	57%
Remind students periodically about their obligations	45%/NA	30%	50%
Discuss importance of integrity	45%/14%	43%	45%
Change exams regularly	83%/24%	63%	70%
Hand out different versions of an exam	28%/9%	21%	18%
Have students sign an honor pledge	N/A	55%	32%

In 2000-2001, faculty were asked if they *discuss the importance of integrity* with their students in class: 45% said they did in 2000, 14% in 2001—compared with 58% of private institutions with an honor code surveyed in 2000. In 2005, faculty were asked if they "discuss [their] views of honesty and academic integrity with [their] students" and 44% responded affirmatively (45% P, 43% T). This is an area in which we can and should do much more, especially in light of the information the students supplied about getting most of their information on integrity policies from faculty. (See below, section X. B., pp. 24-25.)

Prevention of violations. Of the faculty surveyed in 2000-2001, 83% (2000) or 24% (2001) said they *change exams regularly*. In 2005 the figure was 63% for Trinity and 70% for Pratt faculty. 59% of our upper-class students agreed that faculty change exams and assignments on a regular basis, compared to 52% at the code schools. Although there has been a dramatic drop since 2000 in the percentage of students saying they have gotten questions or answers from someone who has already taken a test, only 21% of the faculty reported that they *hand out different versions of an exam*, a lower percentage than in 2000 (though far higher than in 2001).

In terms of other possible ways of promoting integrity in academic endeavors, 56% of faculty respondents in 2005 said that they *teach techniques of proper citation*. (This compares to the 50% of students who said their instructors discuss proper citation for written sources and the 40% who reported that their instructors discuss proper citation methods for Internet sources.) More than 80% of faculty thought that they *communicate clear expectations* to their students, whether orally or in writing.

Responses to cheating. Most faculty reported that they had not observed cheating within the past two years. Of those who did observe cheating, the most common reaction was reprimanding the student (Pratt 41%, Trinity 38%) or changing a student's grade (Pratt 36%, Trinity 32%). The relatively new faculty-student resolution option was employed by 20% of Pratt and 15% of Trinity faculty.[11] Only 15% (14% of Pratt faculty and 17% of Trinity faculty) reported that they referred a matter to the Office of Judicial Affairs. It appears, then, that many faculty are not consulting with the Office of Judicial Affairs on instances of suspected academic dishonesty as required by the Faculty Handbook. See Section X, C. and D., below, for insights into possible reasons.

> *Sample comments from faculty*
> o Honor, academic and otherwise, is a learned trait. We, as faculty members, have the obligation to guide students in their maturity process.
> o [The Community Standard] contributes to a culture of academic integrity when it is discussed and referred to in class and on other occasions.
> o I can see from these questions that I have taken a lot for granted and that I can do a MUCH better job of promoting academic integrity.

---

[11] The Office of Judicial Affairs' documented annual use of the faculty-student resolution is far lower than these self-reported figures. Many faculty engaging in this process are clearly not coordinating it with the Office of Judicial Affairs, as the policy requires.

B. Graduate student instructors.

Perceptions of Duke's climate. Graduate instructor respondents (all of them were in arts and sciences) tended to be more critical of faculty behavior. 79% of them (compared with 67% of Trinity faculty) believe that some Duke faculty ignore incidents of cheating. A majority of graduate instructors disagreed with the statement that Duke faculty handle cheating in a uniform manner (64%) and that faculty try hard to detect cheaters (59%). Nearly 60% rated the faculty's support of Duke's academic integrity policies as "low" or "very low," compared with 40% of Trinity faculty. Graduate instructors were also less likely to support the idea that students should be held responsible for monitoring the academic integrity of other students: 44% of them disagreed with this statement, compared with 30% of Pratt faculty and 35% of Trinity faculty.

Knowledge of Duke's policies. In some instances, graduate instructors appeared less well-informed than other faculty about Duke's policies. 70% reported that they were not aware of the faculty-student resolution option (compared with 20% of Pratt and 47% of Trinity faculty). Over a quarter of graduate student respondents (27%) reported that they did not know what disciplinary measure would most likely be taken if a student was found responsible for a major violation of academic integrity; this result was similar to that of Trinity faculty (25%) but much higher than Pratt faculty (9%).

Promotion of academic integrity. At the same time, more graduate student instructors than other faculty reported that they employ information about cheating and plagiarism on the syllabus: of the 70 graduate instructors responding to the survey, 37 or 53% report doing so, compared to 48% of the other faculty, and 67% reported that they teach techniques of proper citation, compared with 57% of Trinity faculty.

TABLE 12: GRADUATE STUDENT INSTRUCTORS VS. OTHER FACULTY			
	Graduate Student Instructors	Trinity Faculty	Pratt Faculty
NOT aware of Duke's faculty –student resolution process	70%	47%	20%
Include academic integrity information on syllabus	53%	47%	57%
Teach techniques of proper citation	67%	57%	30%

Attitudes to academically dishonest behaviors. Graduate instructor respondents were more likely than other faculty to rate certain behaviors as *trivial* rather than *serious* cheating. For example, 17% considered "copying from another student during a test or exam without his or her knowledge" *trivial* cheating, compared with 11% of Trinity and 5% of Pratt faculty. A full 36% of graduate instructors rated "fabricating or falsifying a bibliography" as *trivial* cheating, compared with 23% of Pratt and 17% of Trinity faculty. These disparities were especially striking in questions related to unpermitted collaboration. 40% of graduate instructors rated "receiving substantial, unpermitted help on an assignment" as *trivial* cheating, whereas only 21% of Trinity and 32% of Pratt faculty did so. Similarly, "working on an assignment with others when the instructor

asked for individual work" was rated as *trivial* by 60% of graduate respondents and as *not cheating* by 6%, whereas only 42% of Trinity faculty considered this behavior *trivial* cheating and 3% *not cheating*.

Responses to cheating. Most graduate instructors reported that they had not observed cheating within the last two years. Those who had observed cheating reported a range of responses. Only 6% indicated that they had referred "1 to 2 incidents" and 1% that they had referred "3 to 5 incidents" to Judicial Affairs. A full 46% of respondents indicated that they had reprimanded students one or more times. 23% had changed a student's grade once or twice, and 4% had done so 3 to 5 times. Graduate student instructors are less likely than the other faculty surveyed to refer a matter to Judicial Affairs or to change a student's grade and more likely to reprimand a student.

Narrative comments. Several themes emerged from the graduate instructor narrative comments. A number of instructors reported that they or their colleagues had observed faculty ignoring cheating or had been advised by faculty not to pursue a case. Others commented on the emotional difficulty of confronting students they suspected of academic dishonesty. And several noted that they and their students needed more information. Here is a sampling:

Sample comments from graduate student instructors on why some faculty ignore cheating
○ We do not know how to deal with it appropriately – especially at the graduate instructor level.
○ It's easier to let it go. Faculty want to get research done, not hassle with students over misbehavior.
○ As a graduate instructor, all of the incentives push us to minimize these kinds of incidents.
○ There is too much emphasis on pleasing students – getting enough enrollment in classes and getting good evaluations. Professors pander to students at many levels.
○ As someone who has turned in several students for plagiarism, it is a painful thing to do. I think that the process for dealing with this at Duke is exceptionally good, but it is a difficult thing to realize that a student you have trusted and with whom you have developed a relationship is being dishonest with you.
○ [Faculty] don't care too much about students' development.

IX. First Year Students.

The survey of first-year students concentrated on the experience of secondary school and the expectations of college life at Duke.

How much cheating goes on in high school? There was no clear consensus among respondents as to whether cheating was a serious problem at their high school: about a third thought it was, about 2/5 thought it was not, and about a quarter were not sure. When asked about the prevalence of specific forms of cheating at their high schools—

plagiarism, unauthorized collaboration, test cheating, and falsifying or fabricating lab data—the largest group of first-year students, about 35-39%, thought that one or more different types of academic integrity violations *sometimes* occurred at their high schools. About a quarter of the respondents thought that plagiarism and test cheating occurred *often* or *very often*, and a third of them identified falsifying lab data as occurring at those frequencies. The violation that students most cited as occurring *often* or *very often* in high school (46%) was "students working together on assignments when the teacher specifically asked for individual work," a theme which was reiterated in their free responses later in the survey. The general observation is that cheating does seem to occur in high schools, and that students are aware of it, though they may have differing perceptions on the frequency with which cheating occurs.

Do high school teachers discourage cheating? 82% of Duke's first year students *agreed* or *agreed strongly* that teachers tried hard to discourage cheating. However, they did not feel that this effort was effective, as only 19% *agreed* or *agreed strongly* that students who cheated were frequently caught. Most students (60%) *agreed* or *agreed strongly* that the penalties for cheaters were significant.

Do high school students act in the face of integrity violations? Students seemed to be aware that cheating went on in their high schools, but they did not report fellow students: 89% of respondents said that they had not reported another student for cheating, a finding that underscores the culture of not "snitching" on friends/peers. Perhaps it is significant, however, that 11% of them *had* reported on another student in high school in spite of the anti-"ratting" culture (whereas only 3% of our upper-class Duke students have reported on a peer.) In their responses to other questions, the first-year students appeared to support anti-cheating measures and high penalties for cheaters who are caught. These observations seem to indicate that first-year Duke students do want a culture of integrity and are even more inclined than upper-class students to be actively involved in creating one. Our task is to give them the opportunity and support to move from rule by authority to the model of a community standard so that they become more rather than less inclined to participate actively in the creation of a Duke culture of integrity.

How do first-year students distinguish among violations? Given a range of possible academic integrity violations, most students clearly distinguished between minor and serious types of violations; for example, working or consulting with other students on individual assignments or paraphrasing a few sentences in a paper without citation were considered minor offenses (over 80% called this *trivial* or *moderate* cheating) while turning in work done by someone else or cheating on an exam were considered *serious* cheating (50-80% of respondents). Students seemed to distinguish cheating to get something done from cheating that gives an unfair advantage or is harmful to others. There was also an inverse relationship between the perceived severity of the offense and the number of students who reported committing the offense. Whether the students refrained from committing offenses that they consider serious out of a sense of ethics, or rated the ones they did commit as less serious as a way of rationalizing their actions, cannot be determined.

Why do students refrain from cheating? Regarding reasons for not engaging in cheating, students were able to choose more than one response. The most frequent reasons that students gave for not engaging in cheating were those that dealt with personal values (66%), respect for teachers (64%), or respect for self (57.5%) followed by fear of consequences (50%) and parental values (47.6%). The value of learning (42%), awareness of what constitutes cheating (33.5%), and respect for peers (33%) were the next most frequent responses, with religious values (22%) and value of the high school diploma (18%) coming in at the end. Overall, students tended to cite intrinsic versus extrinsic reasons for restraining from cheating. That respect for teachers was the second most frequent reason suggests the significant influence that instructors and professors have on student perceptions of and attitudes toward academic integrity.

What do incoming students expect from Duke? We have explored above what our incoming students reported their high schools were like. But what do they expect of the Duke culture? Most first-year students reported that they expect less cheating on tests/exams (70%) and on written assignments/projects (64%) than in high school. Having been on campus a little over one month, they were divided across the range of responses as to whether instructors at Duke seem to try hard to discourage cheating and whether cheaters are frequently caught, but 87.5% agreed or strongly believed that those who are caught will receive significant punishment. About a quarter of the students were unsure whether there is less peer acceptance of cheaters and more pressure to cheat than in high school, but almost half expressed a concern that the pressures at Duke are more likely to lead to cheating than the pressures they had already experienced.

Elaboration in free comments. The free comments sections of the survey provided additional information and/or underscored the importance of the pertinent questions. In the reasons given for cheating, there appeared to be four general reasons for their behavior:

1. Pressure, induced either by time constraints or desire for good grades;
2. Laziness/poor planning on the part of the student;
3. Assignment considered to be "unimportant," cheating as "trivial", and;
4. Uncertainty regarding which behaviors were considered inappropriate.

Explanations for cheating varied, but, by far, the largest single driving factor cited was "pressure," derived either from a lack of time or from the need to maintain good grades. The pressure to succeed, to get good grades, or to manage time was mentioned by 118 different students, or 16% of the respondents. In these instances, students seemed to find external sources on which to place the blame. Students who cited pressure as the cause for their cheating were much quicker to assign blame to the unfair expectations from teachers (in terms of workload), parents (expectations of success), or colleges (high admissions standards).

The next single largest reason cited was "laziness" or a lack of preparation on the part of the student. Students citing this reason tended to view cheating either as a last resort (because of procrastination) or simply a way to avoid extra studying/work. Regardless of

the exact cause, these answers generally demonstrated an awareness of cheating as an unacceptable means of coping with excessive workloads. As opposed to shifting the blame to other entities, students in this group tended to accept responsibility for their actions.

Sample comments from first-year students about cheating in high school
o Getting questions and answers from other classes had to be done, because a majority of your class was already doing it. If you didn't cheat, you'd be at a disadvantage. . . .
o Most small forms of cheating, such as asking for test questions from people who have already taken the test or using a few sentences from a website, are very common and accepted things.
o It was the easier way out. When the work just seems like busy work, it seemed like not a big deal.
o Our system was flawed, most classes were a joke and I felt that just because the teacher was not adequate doesn't mean I should get a bad grade.
o I was overwhelmed by the sheer scope of busy work a teacher gave us, was lazy and bored with the material, and did not think that cheating on homework was a huge deal.
o Usually when I cheated, I believed that the assignment was not worth-while and that I could get away with it easily.
o I feel working on an assignment with others, as long as everyone does their best and doesn't leech off of anyone, is a great way to learn. Studying in groups has always helped me better than studying for myself. As long as the assignment isn't a personal project or an extremely important paper, I don't see why an instructor would ask for individual work, since it only restricts avenues for learning.
o At competitive high schools, the race to get the best grades and be at the top was intense. Couple that with familial pressures and my own over-reaching sense of do-whatever-it-takes ambition and cheating seemed justified. Also, it's hard to feel guilty when everyone else is behaving the same way.
o The combination of academics and athletics, along with the social pressures to succeed, almost made minor cheating now and then a necessity.
o I played three varsity sports, chaired a community service organization, and started and ran a tutoring program. I didn't have much time for a lot of the work that was assigned, so . . . I found assistance for some assignments.

A common theme throughout the responses was that students seemed to cheat more extensively on assignments that were deemed "busy work" or unlikely to contribute significantly to the student's education.   One representative comment stated, "The assignments were trivial and did not do anything to advance my education. Any time saved could be used for more useful activities." The majority of these responses seemed to correspond to homework assignments and other small projects. Many students who cited this justification were also quick to point out the difference between this form of "trivial" cheating and dishonesty on larger assignments, such as papers or exams.

The final major category of reasons for cheating was lack of clarity with respect to the expectations of the assignment or unfamiliarity with what constitutes academic dishonesty. Many of these responses included statements describing situations in which the instructor neither expressly allowed nor forbade collaboration. Others expressed unfamiliarity with the norms of attribution and documentation. These students generally appeared reflective about their experiences and seemed to feel some guilt about their behavior after learning that it might have been a violation of academic ethics.

Overall, the free responses suggested that the first-year students are aware of what constitutes academic dishonesty and are thoughtful about their experiences. Many of the students provided fairly lengthy, detailed descriptions of what seems to be a single incident (or very small number of related incidents), perhaps suggesting that the act stood out in their mind as an anomalous event. Only 18 students said that they never cheated in high school. While this might at first appear a dismal result, it in fact suggests that students are broadening their definition of cheating to cover a wide array of actions. Listed behaviors included some that could be taken as borderline cases of dishonesty (e.g., collaboration on an assignment where it had neither been expressly forbidden nor allowed). In these gray areas, students generally preferred calling these acts examples of "cheating," whether or not they are culpable. This inclination ought to be encouraging, if only because a substantial number of students are concerned about, and even appear to show remorse for, acts that may have violated neither the letter nor spirit of their school's honor code.

When asked in a free response question what universities can do–especially for first-year students—to encourage academic integrity, the respondents had three general suggestions:

1. Create harsher penalties/enforce rules rigidly;
2. Increase efforts to educate students about the Duke Community Standard and academic integrity, and;
3. Relax the academic environment to reduce pressure for good grades.

The most common responses dealt with the creation and enforcement of harsher penalties for violating the Community Standard. Seventy-seven students claimed that the university should "discuss the consequences of cheating," while 49 cited the need to "enforce the rules with harsh penalties. These responses seemed to suggest three E's: Establish (stricter rules), Enforce, and Expel. Many of the responses indicated that students would be much less likely to cheat if they felt that they were likely to get caught and suffer extremely harsh penalties. Some students went so far as to suggest a zero tolerance policy, complete with immediate expulsion.

Students also cited the need for better communication of expectations regarding academic integrity. Different responses called for clarity on different levels. On the first level was the need to educate students on the tenets of the "honor code" (although the Duke Community Standard *is* Duke's undergraduate honor code, perhaps one indication of a lack of awareness about it was that few respondents referred to it by name) and

familiarize them with what behaviors constitute dishonesty more generally. The move from high school to college seems to suggest some higher regard for rules related to academic honesty. On another level, some students emphasized the importance of hearing clear faculty expectations for a particular course or assignment.

A significant number of students also suggested that the best way reduce dishonesty is to deemphasize grading as part of the academic enterprise. The responses seemed to argue that cheating is a direct response to pressure for good grades. Among the specific suggestions for creating this relaxed environment: more lenient grading, removing obstacles to obtaining extensions on assignments, and reducing workload overall.   Quite a few students suggested using pass/fail classes as a means for reducing emphasis on grades, with several recommending that all first year/first semester classes be taught on a pass/fail basis.

Overall, students expressed the belief that Duke was (and should be) committed to promoting a climate of academic integrity. Generally, they were optimistic that students would be open to abiding by the tenets of the Community Standard, so long as they are aware of them. However, they also believed that the policy must be backed by a serious commitment to assigning severe punishments to violators.

X. The honor code, judicial policies, and judicial processes.

        A. The Honor Code: How effective is the Duke Community Standard? On the question of how effectively the Duke Community Standard contributes to a culture of academic integrity at Duke, faculty, graduate student instructors, and upper-class students were comparable in their assessment: 81% of the faculty, 85% of the graduate students, and 82% of the upper-class students (77% of students on the written survey) said that it contributes at least somewhat to a culture of integrity. When we examine this question more closely, some interesting differences emerge. More students than faculty said that it doesn't contribute at all—15% to 9%—but more students than faculty said that it contributes a fair amount/significantly: 43% to 31% (22% for the graduate student instructors). Pratt students reported higher confidence in the Duke Community Standard than Trinity students: 90% of them thought that the honor code contributes to a culture of integrity compared to 82% of Trinity students. Only a third of the faculty reported having their students sign an honor pledge as a means of promoting academic integrity.

TABLE 13: DOES THE DUKE COMMUNITY STANDARD CONTRIBUTE TO A CULTURE OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY?			
	Not at all	Some	Fair Amount	Significantly
Faculty	9%	50%	24%	7%
Graduate Instructors	11%	63%	19%	3%
Upper-Class Students	15%	39%	34%	9%

> *Sample comments from students and faculty on the Duke Community Standard*
> o My understanding of the community standard is that it aims to provide an environment where people are taking honest and ethical steps towards a common goal or academic success. Along that path, students and faculty should feel like they can trust each other to be respectful of responsibilities. (upper-class student)
> o As long as it is the faculty's responsibility to enforce the honor code (i.e. that students don't view this as a shared responsibility) it will be hard to contribute to a culture of academic integrity. (faculty member)
> o The community standard (and previously the honor code) serves as a unifying statement for all students and faculty that cheating is not appropriate. Beyond that, the issue of cheating becomes an individual decision. (faculty member)

Almost half of Pratt and Trinity students were of the opinion that the honor code contributes nothing to a climate of integrity related to **social life**. Looked at the other way, the results are perhaps promising. The Duke Community Standard, instituted only 2.5 years before the administration of the survey, is unlike the previous honor code in including a pledge to act honorably in all aspects of Duke life; thus, the fact that more than half of the respondents thought the honor code contributes at least *some* in the non-academic realms might be measured as progress. This is an area for greater focus in the future.

TABLE 14: DOES THE DUKE COMMUNITY STANDARD CONTRIBUTE TO INTEGRITY IN SOCIAL LIFE?				
	Not at all	Some	Fair Amount	Significantly
Students	47%	33%	14%	3%

> *Sample comments from upper-class students on the DCS and social life*
> o I do not believe that the Community Standard should apply to social life (i.e. if a student is caught drinking off campus, this should not be a concern of the university.)
> o I hear about the Community Standard all the time, but in terms of practical application, I think most kids aren't really cheating in classes, but I see a fair amount of awful behavior that takes place socially and is very much in violation of/not in the spirit of the community standard.

B. Academic Integrity Policies: How aware are faculty and students? About the same percentage of upper-class students and faculty rated students' understanding of Duke's policies as *high* or *very high* (49% vs. 47%). In 2000, the rate was only 38% of students themselves, and 45%— about the same as now—of faculty.[12]

90% of upper-class students reported having been informed about Duke's integrity policies. Their information comes largely from faculty: 88% said they learned *some* or *a*

---

[12] The question was not asked in the 2001 follow-up survey.

lot about policies from faculty, a figure on a par with the code schools. The orientation program was the next greatest source of information, with 79% reporting knowledge gained from that source (compared to 93% at the code schools and 71% at the no-code schools) A little over a half (52%) reported gaining knowledge from the student handbook (a resource utilized by three-quarters of the respondents at the code schools and more than two-thirds [68%] at the no-code schools).

If faculty are the primary source of students' information on integrity policies, it is imperative that faculty be well-informed themselves. In 2005, 84% of upper-class students rated the faculty's awareness of policies as *high* or *very high*, compared to 78% in 2000. Only 29% of faculty responded in 2005 that their own understanding was *high* or *very high*, however—the same as the faculty rate in 2000 and far lower than in 2001.

With regard to one particular avenue for resolving allegations of academic misconduct—use of the faculty-student resolution—there was a big gap between engineering and arts and sciences faculty: in Pratt, 80% indicated that they were aware of this option and in Trinity only a little more than half (53%) indicated awareness. However, as noted in Section VIII (p.16), evidence suggests that many of those who reported using the policy are in fact either unaware of its requirements or unsupportive of its philosophy.

It appears, then, that better education is called for, perhaps even more so with the faculty than with the students.

C. Academic Integrity Policies: How effective are they and how much do students and faculty support them? On the question of the effectiveness of Duke's policies, students were much more positive than faculty: 62% of the faculty and 43% of upper-class students rated the effectiveness as *low* or *very low*; the rating of *high* or *very high* was given by 20% of faculty and 57% of students (compared to 78% of students in the code schools sample). In the case of students there has been some improvement since 2000, when respondents were evenly split between a low rating and a high one. The faculty results were ambiguous but not especially encouraging: the 2005 percentage of those rating the effectiveness of policies as *low* or *very low* (62%) compares with 74% in 2000 and 59% in 2001. The 2005 percentage of those rating the effectiveness of policies as *high* or *very high* (20%) compares with 26% in 2000 and 41% in 2001. Pratt students and faculty were slightly more likely than those in Trinity to rate the effectiveness of the policies unfavorably.

With regard to faculty and student *support* for Duke's policies, there were dramatic differences between Duke and the other schools sampled. Students expressed fairly high support for these policies (61% *high* or *very high*); however, this figure was 84% at the code schools. Students thought that faculty support these policies at a very high rate (89%), close to that at the code schools overall (92%). In contrast, Duke faculty said that only 44% of their colleagues show *high* or *very high* support of policy. The figure was far lower with Pratt faculty (30%) than with Trinity faculty (46%).

TABLE 15: UPPER-CLASS STUDENT ATTITUDES TO DUKE'S POLICIES				
	VERY LOW	LOW	HIGH	VERY HIGH
Student support of policies	4%	35%	55%	6%
Faculty support of policies	1%	10%	62%	27%
Effectiveness of policies	6%	37%	50%	7%

TABLE 16: FACULTY ATTITUDES TO DUKE'S POLICIES				
	VERY LOW	LOW	HIGH	VERY HIGH
Faculty support of policies	3%	40%	42%	2%
Effectiveness of policies	11%	49%	23%	<1%

Sample comments from faculty on why some faculty ignore cheating
o Because it has strong implications—eg, a student being suspended—and they might not want to be directly responsible for something like that. Or because they don't want to go through the hassle and time involved in seeing such a situation through to its conclusion.
o Because it is an inordinate hassle and ends up being hurtful to the professor (. . . a horrific evaluation on "Rate-my professor.com. . . .) and does essentially nothing to ensure that the student won't do this again.
o Because MOST (not all) faculty who are trying to get tenure or who have tenure and have active research agendas was to minimize the amount of time they spend teaching, which includes time dealing with cheating in their courses.
o Because our academic system is not severe on students who do cheat, but does take seriously student complaints (in evaluations, for example) about faculty; we are on some level expected to "please" them.
o Because no one tells professors anything about how they should handle this situation or any other.
o Because the expected costs of dealing with the problem exceed the expected benefits.
o It is not clear that the University will unwaveringly support the faculty member rather than the student and his/her influential parents.
o It's easier to look the other way.
o The downside of following through and having your observation challenged is not worth the upside of correcting the problem.
o The process is cumbersome and does not allow for a very nuanced approach. The prospect of turning an assignment into a legal proceeding is very unattractive.
o They do not want to be the one to destroy a future.
o When they are aware of cheating I do not think they ignore it. How they deal with it varies considerably.

D. Investigatory and Judicial Processes: What is the experience and perception? 80% of Pratt faculty respondents and 72% of Trinity faculty respondents had not referred a case to the Dean for Judicial Affairs in the past two years. The free responses on the survey, as the above sampling suggests, provided one possible reason: many voiced the opinion that it is a hassle to go through the process and faculty reap no

rewards for doing so. Of those who had referred a case (whether in the past two years or ever is ambiguously worded in this question), half were satisfied and half not, with no difference between Pratt and Trinity. (If we include graduate students instructors, 9% of the faculty who had referred cases were not satisfied but 15% were highly or very highly satisfied.) Perhaps because most of them had never referred a case, a large proportion of the faculty indicated that they did not know whether the judicial process is fair and impartial—45% of them said they were not sure (as compared to the 39% who agreed that it is fair and impartial). Sorted by Pratt and Trinity, the responses to the statement that "Duke's judicial process is fair and impartial" were as follows:

TABLE 17: "DUKE'S JUDICIAL PROCESS IS FAIR & IMPARTIAL"		
	Not Sure	Agree (mildly or strongly)
Pratt Faculty	43%	36%
Trinity Faculty	49%	40%

If faculty are not sure if the system is fair, impartial, uniform, or even effective—whether because of lack of knowledge or direct observation of the system—it is possible they will be less likely to use it. Students are aware that the faculty are not using it, although not the degree to which this happens. Only 43% of our upper-class undergraduates agreed that faculty report suspected cases of cheating, compared to 52% at the code schools (and 40% at the no-code schools).

Again, more education is needed. Despite not having reported many academic integrity violations, almost half of faculty held the perception that cheating is a serious problem at Duke. (This perception, like that of the students, may overestimate reality.)

Students were asked a more general question about the fairness and impartiality of the investigation of suspected cases of cheating. They indicated a small amount of knowledge and a great degree of skepticism: a full 61% of upper-class students were unsure of the fairness and impartiality of the process, and only a quarter to some degree thought the process *does* evidence those qualities. At the code schools, 47% thought the investigation of incidents of suspected cheating is fair.

XI. Major Findings and Inferences.

Upper-class students:
- Duke has seen a significant improvement since 2000 on many scores.
- Duke more closely resembles other honor code schools in levels of self-reported cheating than it did five years ago, with one notable exception, fabrication of lab data, where Duke students continue to report higher rates of academic dishonesty.
- Unauthorized collaboration continues to be the most prevalent form of academic dishonesty at Duke.
- Students at Duke observe test cheating by their peers at a higher rate than students at other honor code schools but less frequently than at schools with no codes.

- Twice as many Duke students than those in the overall code school sample think that cheating in general is a serious problem on campus. Yet their self-reported behaviors indicate that, with the exception of fabrication of lab data, rates of cheating at Duke are similar to those at other code schools. We could infer that our students are underreporting their own infractions. Or that they don't trust their peers. Or that the message has not been sent out and/or heard that by and large our students act honorably.
- Students learn about academic integrity policies largely from faculty and less so from orientation programs and students handbooks, especially as compared to the code schools (and, in the case of the "student handbook," to the no-code schools as well).

First year students:
- Many of these students report having seen a lot of cheating in high school.
- They come with high expectations that college will be different from high school, not only in level of cheating but—and this is related—in substantiveness of assignments.
- They may be more willing than upper-class students to monitor their peers, and thus the new "obligation to act" may prove effective, with more publicity and explanation, in changing our culture about who is responsible for academic integrity.

Faculty:
- Faculty have made great strides since 2000 in their willingness to engage in practices that help prevent instances of academic dishonesty: for example, in teaching techniques of proper citation and in changing exams regularly.
- With the exception of plagiarism, Duke faculty (according to student reports) are less likely than their peers at either code or no-code schools to discuss academic integrity policies and practices in the classroom.
- Faculty discussion of the standards of scholarship, and pitfalls to avoid, probably contributes to a decrease in instances of cheating, as suggested by the statistics on plagiarism (see Table 6).
- Faculty have made some progress in promoting academic integrity, by putting information on the syllabus; however, there is no change from 2000 in the rate of other efforts to promote integrity.
- In terms of "policing," faculty often do not bother to deal with cases of suspected breaches of academic integrity, believing that (1) it is too much of a hassle to deal with these issues and (2) they are not rewarded for doing so.
- Faculty are unaware of, confused about, or at worst ignoring expectations for responding to observations of academic dishonesty (as outlined in the Faculty Handbook).
- Faculty are more cynical and less sanguine about cheating at Duke than students.
- Faculty efforts may have led to the decrease in fabrication of lab data since some departments over the past five years have focused lab work on the methodology rather than the final answer.

- Graduate students instructors are less well informed about integrity policies than other faculty but also more inclined to include relevant information on the syllabus and to teach techniques of proper citation.

Pratt versus Trinity—Major differences and possible inferences to be drawn from them:
- More Pratt students (90%) than Trinity students (82%) think the Duke Community Standard contributes at least somewhat to a culture of integrity. Perhaps a smaller population leads to a greater sense of community.
- More Pratt students than Trinity students who say the question is relevant to them report engaging in fabrication of lab data: 36% vs. 26%. This might reflect the larger percentage of lab courses in the Pratt curriculum.
- More Pratt faculty (61%) than Trinity faculty (50%) agree that students should play a role in monitoring academic integrity. A smaller community may lead to more faith in students' willingness and abilities to shoulder this responsibility.
- More Pratt faculty than Trinity faculty put information on the syllabus about cheating/plagiarism: 57% vs. 47%. Since the engineering faculty is smaller, and the school more centralized, communication from the dean(s) may be more effective.
- More Pratt faculty than Trinity faculty have heard of the faculty-student resolution as an option for handling cases of policy violations: 80% vs. 53%. Perhaps with a smaller faculty the word has gotten around more easily; yet we also have the potential for misapplication of the policy if more know it exists but think it can be used for any violation.

The Duke Community Standard and judicial policies:
- Honor codes and related initiatives are effective in reducing academic dishonesty, as suggested by the lower self-reported incidences of such behavior in schools with codes compared to those with no codes.
- A large majority of faculty and upper-class students at Duke believe that the Community Standard contributes at least somewhat to Duke's culture of academic integrity.
- There is much more skepticism about the contribution of the Community Standard to Duke's social life.
- Upperclass students report fairly high student support for Duke's academic integrity policies (61%), but at a far lower rate than at either code (84%) or no-code schools (71%). Students rate the faculty support far higher than their own and at a level commensurate with that at code and no-code schools.
- Faculty, on the other hand, rate the level of faculty support of these policies at a far lower level than the students do (44% vs. 89%). Less than a quarter of faculty rate the effectiveness of Duke's policies as "high" or "very high," compared to 57% of the students. This student result is, however, far lower than that at both code(78%) and non-code schools (65%).
- The responses to some questions suggest that the "obligation to act" might become an effective means by which students can engage more directly in enhancing a climate of integrity.

XII. Recommendations. In any effective program, the responsibilities for enhancing a climate of academic integrity do not rest with any one constituency alone but rather with all: faculty, students, and administrators. We suggest the following courses of action to strengthen the climate of/for academic integrity at Duke University:

A. Administration:
- Set clear expectation that the faculty will promote academic integrity and address cases of academic dishonesty when they arise;
- Recognize the efforts of faculty in nurturing a culture of integrity;
- Better educate the faculty by providing clearer and more accessible information about policies and processes (for example, the use of the faculty-student resolution) along with best practices;
- Include a question about the promotion of academic integrity in undergraduate courses on both the instructor's form and the student evaluation form;
- Bring to the faculty, on a regular basis, statistics (such as the number and kind of judicial board cases) and survey results on student attitudes and behaviors (such as the frequency of lab data fabrication and the degree to which students rely on faculty for their own information about academic integrity);
- Improve the educational materials and orientation programs provided to students.

B. Faculty:
- Recognize the faculty's influence on student behavior and campus culture;
- Consider academic integrity issues to be central, not peripheral, to professional responsibilities as teachers;
- Promote academic integrity by
  - Explaining the rationale for, and requirements of, honest scholarship;
  - Referring to the Duke Community Standard on syllabi and in class discussion;
  - Designing assignments, and modes of assessment, in ways that encourage meaningful learning and honest work (with special attention to laboratory and group work, which are shown by this survey to be particularly problematic);
  - Seeking opportunities for greater intellectual engagement with students in classroom and co-curricular settings,
- Designate a departmental resource person for academic integrity to provide support and information for all faculty, including adjuncts, visiting professors, graduate instructors, teaching assistants, and undergraduate assistants;
- Follow reporting procedures as outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

C. Students:
- Recognize the importance of academic integrity to a Duke education and uphold the principles of academic integrity in personal behavior;
- Seek information about Duke's standards and policies, both as a whole and in particular courses;
- Recognize alternatives to dishonest behavior including
  - Asking questions when in doubt about course expectations, policies, and practices;
  - Developing good time management practices and asking for extensions when necessary.
- Take ownership of the obligation to improve and sustain a culture of academic integrity by
  - Challenging behaviors of peers that lend themselves to academic dishonesty;
  - Embracing the "obligation to act" in the face of peer dishonesty.

D. All Constituencies:
- Regularly revisit, discuss, and reaffirm the Duke Community Standard and its related policies, revising where necessary;
- Consider how the Duke Community Standard might be used more effectively to promote integrity in social as well as academic life.

XIII. Academic Integrity and Duke's Campus Culture: A Final Note

"I think there is no silver bullet. The best one can do is promote a culture of intellectual curiosity rather than competitive achievement. I feel strongly that the culture at Duke is too far toward the "stand out above others, get into the best professional schools" end of [the] spectrum vs. true intellectual pursuit, and I think we promote this in the way we market the university (not universally but it could move more the other way). Academic integrity is rewarded in true intellectual pursuit, but not when the payoff of the Duke experience is the specifics of where you go next. We need to sell the former from day one, when students consider applying."
(Faculty Member)

The 2005 surveys provided encouraging news by revealing that we are making progress on many fronts in highlighting academic integrity and in helping students make appropriate ethical choices. Although we can do even better, and, with attention, *will* do even better, we should be proud to know that we are taking strides in building a culture of academic integrity.

It is important not to lose sight of the fact that, beyond its specific findings on Duke's rates of cheating and plagiarism, these surveys prompt us to address deeper issues of teaching, learning, and campus culture.

They remind faculty of the need to make vivid to students the idea of the university as a community with common ends and shared expectations. Mentioning the honor code on the first day of class and/or including it on the syllabus is not enough: faculty need to communicate the importance of integrity to scholarly inquiry and authentic learning by what they say and how they teach. We need to explain students' responsibilities under the Duke Community Standard not as the duty to "rat" on each other but rather to be just and fair to one another, and to talk about citing others' contributions as a positive way of acknowledging our indebtedness to them. More generally, in everything from how we structure class discussion to how we design and grade assignments, we need to create meaningful learning experiences that challenge students to take intellectual risks and participate fully in their education.

Initiatives to promote academic integrity are important, but to be truly meaningful they must be connected to the broader campus culture. The need for integrity doesn't stop at the classroom door. We should strive for it to infuse all aspects of campus life, from specific issues such as behavior at parties or respect for common living spaces to how students understand their obligations to peers, instructors, Duke and the larger community, and themselves. These broader notions of integrity and responsibility require us to challenge the college "bubble," the prevailing societal view that the undergraduate years are a time when students can escape real-life responsibility and delay the onset of accountability before entering the "real world." They also require faculty to engage and support students in their lives beyond the classroom in ways many have been reluctant to do. Taking academic integrity seriously requires us to bridge the gap between college and "real life," to make the Duke Community Standard the true foundation of campus culture, and to instill an appreciation for how habits formed as students lay the foundations for a lifetime.

Appendix A: Response Rates and Demographics

Table 1: First Year Student Response Rates by Demographic

Academic Integrity Survey Fall 2005: First-Year Student Response Rates by Demographic

	First-Year Students	% of First-Year Students	First-Year Student Respondents	% of First-Year Student Respondents
Total	**1724**		**718**	**41.6%**
Gender				
Female	819	47.51%	348	48.47%
Male	905	52.49%	370	51.53%
Ethnicity				
AA	163	9.45%	53	7.38%
AI/AN	10	0.58%	4	0.56%
AP	363	21.06%	161	22.42%
Caucasian	927	53.77%	387	53.90%
Hispanic	110	6.38%	46	6.41%
Other	151	8.76%	67	9.33%

Tables 2 and 3: First-Year Students by College/School: Invitees and Respondents

First-Year Students by College/School

Table 2		First-Year Students	First-Year Students in Trinity	% of Total Students in Trinity	First-Year Students in Pratt	% of Total Students in Pratt
	Total	**1724**	**1371**	**79.52%**	**353**	**20.48%**
	Gender					
	Female	819	725	88.52%	94	11.48%
	Male	905	646	71.38%	259	28.62%
	Ethnicity					
	AA	163	152	93.25%	11	6.75%
	AI/AN	10	10	100%	0	0%
	AP	363	259	71.35%	104	28.65%
	Caucasian	927	732	78.96%	195	21.04%
	Hispanic	110	98	89.09%	12	10.91%
	Other	151	120	79.47%	31	20.53%

First-Year Survey Respondents by College/School

Table 3		First-Year Respondents	First-Year Respondents in Trinity	% of total respondents in Trinity	First year respondents in Pratt	% of total respondents in Pratt
	Total	**718**	**551**	**76.74%**	**167**	**23.26%**
	Gender					
	Female	348	307	88.22%	41	11.78%
	Male	370	244	65.95%	126	34.05%
	Ethnicity					
	AA	53	50	94.34%	3	5.66%
	AI/AN	4	4	100%	0	0%
	AP	161	106	65.84%	55	34.16%
	Caucasian	387	300	77.52%	87	22.48%
	Hispanic	46	42	91.30%	4	8.70%
	Other	67	49	73.13%	18	26.87%

Table 4: Upper-Class Student Demographics for Invitees and Respondents*

	Upper-Class Students	% of Upper-Class Students	Upper-Class Respondents	% of Upper-Class Respondents
Total	**4176**		**1293**	**31%**
Gender				
Female	2074	49.66%	714	55.2%
Male	2102	50.34%	579	44.8%
Ethnicity				
AA	442	10.58%	103	8.0%
AI/AN**	0	0.00%	0	0.0%
AP	651	15.59%	224	17.3%
Caucasian	2475	59.27%	781	60.4%
Hispanic	288	6.90%	81	6.3%
Other	316	7.57%	104	8.0%
No Reply	4	0.10%	0	0.0%

* Pratt Incoming 2003 not included in survey

**This ethnic category was not used prior to 2004 so some American Indian/Alaskan Natives for earlier incoming classes may be categorized under "Other"

Tables 5 and 6: Upper-Class Students by College/School for Invitees and Respondents*

Upper-Class Students by College/School

		Upper Class Students	Upper Class Students in Trinity	% of Upper Class Students in Trinity	Upper Class Students in Pratt	% of Upper Class Students in Trinity
Table 5	**Total**	**4176**	**3654**	**87.5%**	**522**	**12.5%**
	Gender					
	Female	2074	1932	93.15%	142	6.85%
	Male	2102	1722	81.92%	380	
	Ethnicity					
	AA	442	422	95.48%	20	4.52%
	AI/AN**	0	0		0	
	AP	651	531	81.57%	120	18.43%
	Caucasian	2475	2161	87.31%	314	12.69%
	Hispanic	288	263	91.32%	25	8.68%
	Other	316	274	86.71%	42	13.29%
	No Reply	4	3	75%	1	25%

Upper-Class Respondents by College/School

		Upper-Class Respondents	Upper-Class Respondents in Trinity	% of Upper-Class Respondents in Trinity	Upper-Class Respondents in Pratt	% of Upper Class Respondents in Trinity
Table 6	**Total**	**1293****	**1063**	**82.21%**	**158**	**14.86%**
	Gender					
	Female	714	632	88.52%	46	7.28%
	Male	579	431	74.44%	112	19.34%
	Ethnicity					
	AA	103	91	88.35%	6	11.65%
	AI/AN***	0	0		0	
	AP	224	176	78.57%	40	21.43%
	Caucasian	781	635	81.31%	100	18.69%
	Hispanic	81	69	85.19%	6	14.81%
	Other	104	92	88.46%	6	11.54%

* Pratt Incoming 2003 not included in survey

**Breaking respondents into Trinity and Pratt yields a total of 1221. We used students'
responses to what program they were in and removed 72 responses of NA and Undecided.

***This ethnic category was not used prior to 2004 so some American Indian/Alaskan Natives for earlier
incoming classes may be categorized under "Other"

Table 7: Faculty Demographics for Invitees and Respondents

	Faculty Invited	% of Total Faculty Invited	Faculty Respondents	% of Faculty Respondents
Total	**1354***		**339**	**25.0%**
Gender				
Female	458	33.8%	148	43.7%
Male	874	64.5%	191	56.3%
No Data	22	1.6%	0	0.0%
Ethnicity				
AA	60	4.4%	11	3.2%
Asian/Indian	106	7.8%	14	4.1%
Caucasian	1079	79.7%	271	79.9%
Hispanic	32	2.4%	7	2.1%
No Data	77	5.7%	36	10.6%

*We sent the survey to 1354 instructors who had taught an undergraduate course over the last 5 years.
Graduate instructors have been removed from this list based on job code numbers as of 2-21-06

Table 8 and 9: Faculty by College/School for Invitees and Respondents*

Faculty Invitees by College/School

	Faculty Invitees	Faculty invitees in Trinity	% of Faculty Invitees in Trinity	Faculty invitees in Pratt	% of Faculty Invitees in Pratt
Total	**1354***	**1211**	**89.4%**	**143**	**10.6%**
Gender					
Female	458	436	95.20%	22	4.80%
Male	874	759	86.84%	115	13.16%
No Data	22	16	72.72%	6	27.28%
Ethnicity					
AA	60	57	95%	3	5%
Asian/Indian	106	88	83.02%	18	16.98%
Caucasian	1079	966	89.53%	113	10.47%
Hispanic	32	28	87.5%	4	12.5%
No Data	77	72	93.51%	5	6.49%

Table 8

*We sent the survey to 1354 instructors who had taught an undergraduate course over the last 5 years.
Graduate instructors have been removed from this list based on job code numbers as of 2-21-06

Faculty Respondents by College/School

	Faculty Respondents	Faculty Respondents in Trinity**	% of Faculty Respondents in Trinity	Faculty Respondents in Pratt	% of Faculty Respondents in Pratt
Total	**339**	**295**	**87.0%**	**44**	**13%**
Gender					
Female	148	136	91.89%	12	8.11%
Male	191	159	83.25%	32	16.75%
Ethnicity					
AA	11	9	81.82%	2	18.18%
Asian/Indian	14	11	78.57%	3	21.43%
Caucasian	271	236	87.08%	35	12.92%
Hispanic	7	4	57.14%	3	42.86%
No Data	36	35	97.22%	1	2.78%

Table 9

**Includes A&S-286, Fuqua-1, Kenan-1, Nursing-1,Pediatrics-1,Immunology-1,Environ-4)

Table 10: Faculty Demographics: Ranks of Invitees and Respondents

Respondents			Invite Lists	Trinity Invite		Pratt Invite	
Rank (self-reported)	#	%	**Rank**	#	%	#	%
Adjunct Professor	27	8%	Adjunct Professor	6	0.5%	15	10.4%
Assistant Professor	68	20%	Assistant Clinical Professor	9	0.7%	0	0.0%
Associate Professor	53	16%	Assistant Professor	135	11.2%	32	22.2%
Full Professor	85	25%	Assistant Prof. of the Practice	24	2.0%	0	0.0%
Professor_Practice	30	9%	Assistant Research Professor	21	1.7%	0	0.0%
Lecturer	25	7%	Associate Professor	160	13.2%	76	52.8%
Other	48	14%	Associate Prof of the Practice	32	2.6%	4	2.8%
NA	3	1%	Associate Research Professor	6	0.5%	0	0.0%
Total	**339**	**100%**	Associate Clinical Professor	1	0.1%	0	0.0%
			Professor	334	27.6%	1	0.7%
			Clinical Professor	1	0.1%	0	0.0%
All Faculty--Invite Lists	#	%	Research Professor	12	1.0%	0	0.0%
Rank			Visiting Professor	35	2.9%	0	0.0%
Adjunct Professor	21	1.6%	Emeritus	6	0.5%	0	0.0%
Assistant Clinical Professor	9	0.7%	Professor of the Practice	21	1.7%	0	0.0%
Assistant Professor	167	12.3%	Lecturer	38	3.1%	1	0.7%
Assistant Prof. of the Practice	24	1.8%	Visiting Lecturer	19	1.6%	0	0.0%
Assistant Research Professor	21	1.6%	Instructor	292	24.1%	4	2.8%
Associate Professor	236	17.4%	GADV	1	0.1%	0	0.0%
Associate Prof of the Practice	36	2.7%	UNDF	54	4.5%	0	0.0%
Associate Research Professor	6	0.4%	No Data	3	0.2%	11	7.6%
Associate Clinical Professor	1	0.1%	**Total**	**1210**	**100.0%**	**144**	**100.0%**
Professor	335	24.7%					
Clinical Professor	1	0.1%					
Research Professor	12	0.9%					
Visiting Professor	35	2.6%					
Emeritus	6	0.4%					
Professor of the Practice	21	1.6%					
Lecturer	39	2.9%					
Visiting Lecturer	19	1.4%					
Instructor	296	21.9%					
GADV	1	0.1%					
UNDF	54	4.0%					
No Data	14	1.0%					
Total	**1354**	**100.0%**					

Appendix B: Survey Instruments