

Integrity in Undergraduate Life at Duke University: A Report on the 2011 Survey

March 2012

- **Dan Ariely**, Fuqua School of Business
- **Lee Baker**, Trinity College of Arts & Sciences and Office of the Provost (ex officio)
- **Tony Brown**, Sanford School of Public Policy
- **Stephen Bryan**, Student Affairs (ex officio)
- **Kaveh Danesh**, Duke Student Government
- **Ted Graham**, Graduate and Professional Student Council
- **Noah Pickus**, Kenan Institute for Ethics, Sanford School of Public Policy (chair)
- **David Schaad**, Pratt School of Engineering
- **Suzanne Shanahan**, Kenan Institute for Ethics, Sociology
- **Nick Valilis**, Duke Honor Council

Special thanks to Leslie Roth for her excellent work on survey construction, data analysis, and interviews, and thanks also to Stephen Vaisey, Walter Sinnott-Armstrong, Jennifer Cook, and Caroline Luther.



SUMMARY

In the spring of 2011, the Academic Integrity Council and the Kenan Institute for Ethics surveyed 2000 Duke undergraduates about integrity inside and outside the classroom and conducted in-depth interviews with graduating seniors. The survey and interviews document:

- Marked reductions in academic dishonesty in key areas of concern.
- Significant gaps between the large numbers of students perceived to be cheating vs. the smaller number of students self-reporting cheating.
- Rising numbers of students reporting inappropriate collaboration.

The survey and interviews also represent Duke's first effort to understand the relationships among integrity in different domains (academic, social, work, and civic) and raise key questions about how a Duke education can and should affect multiple dimensions of a student's sense of integrity. Key findings include:

- What students regard as unethical behavior varies across academic, social, work, and civic domains of life.
- Students cluster into three broad categories in terms of those who act largely honestly, those who act less honestly but primarily in the classroom, and those who act the least honestly in most domains.
- When students see behavior they consider unethical they are reluctant to take action.

Below we highlight three primary areas of analysis and suggest areas for further research, reflection, and action.

PERCEPTION VS. REALITY OF CHEATING

- The data points to a marked reduction in academic dishonesty in three key areas that were identified as problem areas five years ago. The percentage of students reporting fabricating or falsifying a bibliography and falsifying or fabricating lab data has dropped by almost one-third since our last survey, and copying or paraphrasing without attribution has dropped by 40%. In part, these results may reflect the influence of a series of initiatives to promote academic integrity that Duke has undertaken since 2005.
- The number of students reporting that they have witnessed various forms of dishonesty inside and outside the classroom far exceeds the number of students who report having participated in it. Students estimate that twice as many students fabricate lab data than those reporting doing so, three times as many are perceived to exaggerate qualifications on a resume than actually report doing so, and four times as many are thought to be unfaithful to romantic partners than those reporting being unfaithful.
- Either students under-report their levels of dishonesty or students have a wildly inaccurate sense of the prevalence of dishonesty at Duke. Given the magnitude of the gap between behavior and perception we expect that purported norms and actual norms do differ. Duke has a significant opportunity to publicize these results and to make it clear that ethical behavior is, in fact, the norm.

THE ETHICS OF COLLABORATION

- Survey findings indicate an increase in academic dishonesty over the past five years in two categories about collaboration. Receiving unpermitted help increased by almost 20% over the past five years and working on an assignment with others when the instructor asked for individual work increased nearly 15%. The rate is now above the rate of other honor code schools in 2005 and on par with non-honor code schools in 2005. (2010 national survey data is not yet available.)
- Interdisciplinary collaboration and team-based projects have become increasingly crucial in the public and private sectors. Simultaneously, universities are integrating more teamwork into the classroom. But do faculty and students understand how to balance the need to work and learn together against the need to measure individual ability?
- Survey and interview responses suggest that students are uncertain about when collaborating with their peers raises issues of integrity. Duke has a real opportunity to establish clear, consistent strategies and best practices in communicating integrity standards for teamwork.

INTEGRITY INSIDE AND OUTSIDE OF THE CLASSROOM

- The 2011 survey went beyond previous surveys to explore issues of integrity both inside and outside of the classroom. More than 50% of students reported downloading copyrighted music without permission; 40% of students reported having knowingly disclosed information imparted in confidence; 35% of students reported faking an illness; while 34% reported covering up for someone who is deliberately slacking off on a group project.
- When asked about behaviors outside of the classroom, students reported that they consider romantic cheating and driving under the influence of drugs and alcohol to be the most unethical actions from a list of 15 choices. They perceived the least unethical issues (in order of least severity) as: covering up for slacking off on a group project, pirating copyrighted music, using a fake ID, taking office supplies for personal use, covering up for a friend's excessive drinking/drug use, and faking an illness. One group of students reported acting largely honestly (53.1%); a second group reported acting less honestly but primarily in academic settings (29%); and a third group reported acting the least honestly in all or most categories *except* on unauthorized help and collaboration (17.9%).
- While we lack national data to place Duke students in a comparative context, these findings raise intriguing questions about the meaning of integrity. How does and should a college education affect students in and outside of the classroom? (i.e., Does using a fake ID to get into a club relate to cheating on an exam? Should it?) Duke has an opening to develop opportunities for students to reflect on the findings in this report. Students and faculty can frame and address broad, open-ended questions and, in doing so, take further ownership of the Duke Community Standard and its commitment both to deliberation and to a culture of integrity.

Integrity in Undergraduate Life at Duke University

A Report on the 2011 Survey

March, 2012

Overview of Survey

In the spring of 2011, Duke surveyed 2000 undergraduates about integrity inside and outside the classroom and conducted in-depth interviews with graduating seniors. Five hundred first-years, 500 sophomores, 500 juniors, and 500 seniors were sent the electronic survey. Approximately 32% completed the survey with close to equal proportions of respondents coming from each class. About 45% of respondents were male and about 55% were female (see Appendix). The survey was a follow-up to and extension of the 1995, 2000, and 2005 surveys of academic integrity at Duke.

This survey represents Duke's first effort to understand the relationships among and between integrity in different domains and identifies several broad themes for further research, reflection, and action including: What are the boundaries for group and individual work? How does integrity inside the classroom relate to integrity outside the classroom? If fewer students are acting dishonestly, why does the perception remain that cheating is widespread? The Academic Integrity Council and the Kenan Institute for Ethics collaborated on survey design and analysis.

Part One: Integrity Inside the Classroom

This survey examines five types of academic integrity:

1. Fabricating or falsifying a bibliography
2. Falsifying or fabricating lab data
3. Copying or paraphrasing a few sentences of material from an electronic source—e.g. from the internet—without footnoting it in a paper
4. Receiving unpermitted help on an assignment
5. Working on an assignment with others when the instructor has asked for individual work

Overall, we found that there are three rough categories of students: those who do not act dishonestly (57.4%); those who act selectively dishonestly, primarily in the two categories of unauthorized collaboration (35.2%); and those who act dishonestly across the board (7.4%) (see Charts 1a and 1b).

Are students acting dishonestly less or more than five years ago? The results are mixed. In three out of five categories Duke saw a marked reduction in academic dishonesty over the past 5 years (see Chart 2). Both *fabricating or falsifying a bibliography* and *falsifying or fabricating lab data* were reduced by almost one-third. *Copying or paraphrasing* was reduced by 40%. In part, these results may reflect the influence of a series of initiatives to promote academic integrity that Duke has undertaken since the last survey in 2005 (see sidebar).

Nonetheless, despite these interventions we also see increased academic dishonesty over the past five years in two categories about collaboration. *Receiving unpermitted help* increased almost 20% over the past five years and *working on an assignment with others when the instructor asked for individual work* increased nearly 15%. The rate is now higher than that of other honor code schools in 2005 and on par with the percentage reported at non-honor code schools in 2005 (see Chart 3). (2010 national data is not yet available.)

Overall, 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 resemble the lower rate of dishonesty at other honor code schools in a 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, questions about the rise of unpermitted help raise important new questions about collaboration: Is this because of an increased use of team and group work in courses? How are expectations for group work communicated by faculty across the disciplines? Are students receiving mixed messages? Do students knowingly choose to collaborate when they know they should not? Most important, what should be the rules of the road for maintaining individual integrity in collaborative efforts?

National research on academic dishonesty among undergraduates in 2005 found that only 32% of undergraduates surveyed indicated that "working with others on an assignment when asked for individual work" was a serious offense, compared to 82% of faculty who indicated it was a serious behavior, and that "receiving unpermitted help from someone on an assignment" was perceived as a serious offense for 44% of undergraduates compared to 85% of faculty members"(McCabe, 2005).

EXAMPLES OF UNIVERSITY-WIDE ACADEMIC INTEGRITY INITIATIVES 2005-2011

- ✓ Changed emphasis on lab assignments from "getting the right answer" to the methodology involved
- ✓ Online plagiarism tutorial required of all first-year students before registering for the spring semester
- ✓ Orientation session by the Office of Student Conduct with all new Writing 20 instructors about preventing and responding to plagiarism in their classes for first-year students
- ✓ Targeted outreach to subpopulations (e.g., international students and student-athletes) to proactively educate on potential academic pitfalls and strategies to avoid them
- ✓ Concurrent session during first-year orientation, sponsored by the Honor Council, on academic integrity and overall honor at Duke
- ✓ Speech by the Honor Council president on the first night students are here about the Duke Community Standard and the University's commitment to a climate of honor and integrity
- ✓ Symbolic signing of the Duke Community Standard at the end of orientation week
- ✓ Outreach to academic departments about the three Ps: Prevention, Promotion, and Policing for academic integrity

Further research on graduate business programs found that 28% of students surveyed admitted to inappropriate collaboration compared to 23% of non-business students. Students in this study suggested that faculty members send mixed messages regarding teamwork and that because corporations value collaborative skills it is appropriate for them to engage in those activities now, even when not permitted by a faculty member on a specific assignment. The authors suggest the problem is made worse by inconsistent approaches by faculty and that students may not always understand whether or not collaboration is acceptable. They also observe that teamwork itself adds to the problem: as group norms among student teams lead to high levels of cohesiveness and loyalty, team members become less likely to prevent unethical behavior or report it (McCabe, Butterfield, & Trevino, 2006).

“[I]f it’s a matter of not everyone doing equal work you just try to ignore it or work around it.”

Generational Considerations

It may also be that generational characteristics shaped by technology and social networking have changed social norms among so-called “Millennials.” Millennials have become adults in an age of collaboration, sharing and social networking,” writes Kirsti Dyer, “first playing together in organized play groups, then chatting and texting each other on the phone and socializing daily, on various social networks . . . For these students, sharing, networking and socializing occur on a day-by-day if not hour-by-hour basis.” Incidents in the news about online “study groups” on social networking sites, she suggests, have blurred the meaning of integrity in collaborative environments, as have faculty who embrace social networking and online resources as part of creative collaborative assignments (Dyer, 2010).

Interviews with outgoing Duke seniors echoed these observations. Many students thought that the inappropriateness of unauthorized collaboration varies and that working together is valuable to the learning process. One senior said: *“I guess the gray area for me would be . . . whether or not it is actually okay to copy someone’s homework without really actually putting effort into it. And I think what I’ve actually done in the past is sit down with people from my class and do it together. Even though I might not know a question, at least I’m learning through someone else and they can help me through it rather than just copying word for word.”*

Another said: *“I’m more flexible about homework because I think so much of homework assignments is just finding answers to the same problems . . . If I was a faculty person, I would just acknowledge that certain homework assignments should be open to group work because ultimately . . . it’s your responsibility to learn the material. So, maintaining that very clear space of ‘it’s totally fine for you to work on this together, remember the point is for you to learn.’”*

“I’ve noticed the more teachers care about their classes, then the more investment they have in it. Students recognize that and it’s not about the grade anymore, it’s about [whether] the teacher respects their work.”

This advice to faculty regarding collaboration came up in other interviews as well: *“I don’t know that I’d assign take home exams unless I wanted [students] to work together, which I don’t even*

think is a bad thing. I feel like part of the reason there's so much cheating is because of the competition, because of the idea of the bell curve."

Students also reported that the interest and motivation of the course instructor influences their integrity. *"I've noticed the more teachers care about their classes, then the more investment they have in it,"* one student said. *"Students recognize that and it's not about the grade anymore, it's about [whether] the teacher respects their work."*

The views of another senior on the perils of group work exemplified the survey finding that most students choose to take no action when fellow students are not contributing equally to group projects: *"I've found that I work well in pair situations, but I've been in some situations where . . . if it's a matter of not everyone doing equal work you just try to ignore it or work around it."*

Seniors also mentioned the perception of unauthorized collaboration in less "gray" areas such as in-class and out-of-class tests. One student said he was aware of situations in which students in one section of a class, after taking a test, would then share questions and answers with students from different sections taking the same test at a later time: *"[T]he way people do it, it's just like natural, well, of course you would do that, it's like is this even wrong?"*

Another said: *"For something like an exam where it's obvious that you should be working alone, even then it's kind of challenging because a lot of people still do work together. And I think the biggest point of frustration there is you wanting to work together with other people but at the same time still feeling bad about it and knowing that other people are definitely working together and it's a leg up and it's not really fair."*



It's clear from the data, the literature, and our own students that faculty and administrators need to think carefully about how to help students navigate collaborative and individual efforts. The challenge is to encourage and promote teamwork while drawing clear lines when individual effort is needed. Student groups also need to have open conversations about how to navigate the tensions of inappropriate collaboration and so-called "social loafers" who may not contribute equally to teams.

The survey results, student interviews, and popular and academic literature also point to an intersection of ideas regarding new societal and generational norms regarding creativity, collaboration, and integrity. Our current generation of undergraduates lives in a “mash-up” culture in which art, music, film, programming code, current events, and ideas are constantly blended and re-blended, posted on Facebook, tweeted and re-tweeted so that ideas iterate rapidly. In this world, where are the lines delineating creativity, borrowing, and innovation from stealing, cheating, and a lack of integrity? Our undergraduates are not alone in finding it confusing to navigate this territory. New avenues of interdisciplinary research are needed to tie together analyses from law, behavioral psychology, philosophy, sociology, business, and other disciplines.

Part Two: Integrity Outside the Classroom

This survey is distinct in considering broader questions of integrity among Duke students. The survey included both the five academic indicators identified above and 15 other indicators (see Chart 4). These other indicators fell into three domains: social, work, and civic. Our interest is in disentangling the relationship between academic and other forms of integrity. That is, for example, are Duke students equally honest with friends and off campus as they are in their classrooms?

"If you're willing to compromise in one area even a little bit, then it's easy to compromise in others."

Overall, we found three rough categories of students (see Chart 5a). There is the group that reported acting *largely honestly* (53.1%); a second group that reported acting *less honestly but primarily in academic settings* (29%); and a third group that reported acting *the least honestly except on unauthorized help and collaboration* (17.9%). This last

group was characterized by their reported use of fake IDs, driving while under the influence, the use of Adderall without a prescription as a study aid, and cheating on a romantic partner while in an exclusive relationship (see Chart 5b).

When it comes to these other domains, certain findings stand out (see Chart 4). First, *downloading copyrighted music without permission* was something more than 50% of the students responding reported engaging in (legal integrity) and 81% reported having witnessed this behavior. This is the single largest proportion of students engaging in any of the identified behaviors. We also see that more than 40% of students have *knowingly disclosed information imparted in confidence* (social integrity). *Faking an illness* and *covering up for someone who is deliberately slacking off on a group project* are also fairly common with 35% and 34%, respectively, of students reported having engaged in these activities.

"Exaggerating on your resume? My mom TOLD me to do that."

When students were asked if they feel that acting dishonestly in academics spills over into other realms of their life, most students said yes. One commented that she wouldn't be surprised if Bernie Madoff "*wasn't the most ethical student.*" Another remarked: "*Exaggerating on your resume? My mom TOLD me to do that . . . Whereas cheating in a relationship is like very*

hurtful . . . that's one of the worse ways of cheating because you're screwing with someone's emotions and their trust in you."

Another student described a process of small compromises:

"[If you're willing to compromise in one area even a little bit, then it's easy to compromise in others, especially if it's in the same general area. Like if you're willing to compromise on cheating here, if you know you can get away with certain things, integrity violations . . . I think it makes it a little easier to say, here's a little bit, here's a little bit .

"[Y]ou hold that sense of self and that integrity and dignity in other aspects of your life, your work, your relationships. You won't have to be something more than you are."

. . . [I]t's definitely easier for people to say, well, you know, it's not that big of a deal and then when you become desensitized to that then a little bit more is not that big of a deal."

One student said if a student feels they are good enough they don't need to cheat to succeed: *"[Y]ou hold that sense of self and that integrity and dignity in other aspects of your life, your work, your relationships. You won't have to be something more than you are."*

The same student commented on whether or not behaviors on the survey were more or less ethical: *"Oddly, I don't think any of the cheating I've done was really acceptable at all, it was just more a matter of whether I could get away with it or not. Personally, morally, I don't like it because it screws things up . . . I don't think there is a line that should be drawn: a little cheating is okay and a lot isn't."*

Another student commented, however, that he felt the work world might encourage him to be unethical:

"I think integrity is somewhat less of an issue in the workplace because things are very goal-driven; you try to do whatever you can to get the company ahead and to make your product. The company I'm about to work for has this anonymous forum where if you see unethical conduct, you can report it. But . . . it's still not a good idea. If my whole group is doing a certain thing that maybe isn't necessarily meeting all the rules, I would probably feel obliged to just go with it instead of questioning authority?"

What we also see, however, is that across the board the number of students who reported having witnessed various forms of dishonesty far exceeds the number of students who have reported participating in it. Some of the most striking examples include:

- More than 63% of students have witnessed someone *cheating on a romantic partner* while only 8% admit to having engaged in cheating themselves.
- More than 52% of students have witnessed *the use of Adderall or other stimulant medication without a prescription* while only about 9% acknowledge doing so themselves.

- More than 37% have witnessed fellow students *exaggerate qualifications when applying for a job* while only 11% claim to have done such exaggerating themselves.
- More than 25% percent of respondents have witnessed a fellow student *parking in a handicapped space without a permit* while only 6% admit to having done so themselves.

In some sense this difference is to be expected. But if we combine the findings here with those in Chart 6, we see the perception of dishonest behavior across domains (academic, social, work, legal) far exceeds actual engagement in dishonest behavior. Students perceive their peers to be far less honest than they claim to be—often dramatically so. Students estimate that twice as many students fabricate lab data as do, three times as many exaggerate qualifications on their resume, and four times as many are thought to be unfaithful to romantic partners.

"Oddly, I don't think any of the cheating I've done was really acceptable at all, it was just more a matter of whether I could get away with it or not."

This finding can be explained three ways. First, students may in fact have underreported their levels of dishonesty. Second, students may have overinflated their depiction of others to rationalize their own behavior. Or third, students may have a wildly inaccurate perception of their peers – they imagine dishonesty is more prevalent than it might actually be. **Given the magnitude of the gap between behavior and perception we expect that purported norms and actual norms do differ and we need to find ways to make it clear to students that ethical behavior is, in fact, the norm.** This discrepancy between behavior and purported norms is consistent with other work at Duke on alcohol consumption and sexual behavior.

Demographic Differences in Behavior

Next we take a closer look at the demographics of engagement in the behaviors surveyed.

Note that when a difference is statistically significant it is marked on the chart with an asterisk.

- First we explore variations by gender (see Chart 7). While there is some variation between men and women in academic categories, it is minimal. In other domains some interesting variation does emerge. Women were almost twice as likely as men to acknowledge *cheating on a romantic partner* (10.34% vs. 5.19%) while men were 30% more likely to report *driving while under the influence*.
- Second, we examine class standing (comparing freshman to all other classes) and this is where we see the most dramatic variation (see Chart 8). With the single exception of *receiving unpermitted help on an assignment*, first year levels of dishonesty were consistently lower. Upper class students were almost twice as likely to copy or paraphrase, twice as likely to take office supplies, more than three times as likely to use a false ID, and more than four times as likely to forward a confidential email.
- Third, Chart 9 illustrates differences between the Pratt School of Engineering and Trinity College. These differences may reflect the different nature of the curriculum and policies in Pratt and Trinity.

Does Duke create cheaters? Probably not. At cursory glance it appears that seniors at Duke are far more dishonest than first year students. But the survey asked about dishonesty during the students' time at Duke. Seniors have had three times as many opportunities to act dishonestly. We would then, of course, see a higher prevalence of dishonesty among seniors. Once we take time into account, it does not appear that seniors are more likely to be dishonest. We use Chart 10 to further disentangle these possible interpretations.

“It shouldn't be taboo to call somebody out on integrity or just talk about it. I think it's kind of taboo to do that.”

Chart 10 asks about behavior in high school. We find that dishonest behavior was consistently more prevalent in high school across all domains. The comparison is not a precise one as we are comparing reports of behavior over four years in high school to reports of behavior that varies from one to four years at college. Still, there is some indication that students may act with greater integrity at Duke than in high school. Taking Charts 8 (class standing) and 10 (high school) together we can conclude that seniors are not

more dishonest than first year students, and that the differences observed in the data are at least partially attributable to duration in college.

Student Perceptions of and Responses to Unethical Behavior

What sorts of behaviors do students think are unethical and what do they do about it? In Charts 11-16 we explore student perceptions about integrity.

Chart 11 arrays how students perceived the ethics of 20 behaviors on a scale from 1 to 9 – 1 is perfectly unethical and 9 is perfectly ethical. Most behaviors were more unethical than ethical but few were deemed strongly unethical.

Overall, students seemed to differentiate between perceived “victimless” behaviors and behaviors affecting others. Cheating on a romantic partner while in an exclusive relationship was rated most unethical (average 1.92) and driving while under the influence was a close second at an average of 2.09. Behaviors such as covering up for a slacker on a group project or pirating music from the internet were seen in almost neutral terms and rated at an average of 4.44 and 4.40 respectively.

How do students judge appropriate punishments? Charts 12a, 12b, 12c, and 12d explore the issue of sanctions for academic dishonesty. More specifically they identify what students viewed as the most appropriate sanctions and the most likely sanctions for various violations of the community standard. For each of the five types of academic dishonesty (receiving unpermitted help, fabricating a bibliography, falsifying lab data, working with others when instructed not to, copying or paraphrasing material) students were asked which of the following sanctions were either appropriate or likely: nothing, oral/written reprimand, faculty/student resolution, lowered grade on assignment, zero grade for assignment, “F” grade for course, academic probation, suspension, expulsion.

Students' sense of the appropriateness and likelihood of sanction were fairly similar to each other and across behaviors. Despite students' views that academic integrity violations are unethical (see Chart 11), across the board they were not in favor of more serious punishments. Very few students saw nothing, a lowered grade for the course, an F for the course, academic probation, suspension, and expulsion as either likely or appropriate. Most students said that an oral/written reprimand, faculty/student resolution, lowered grade for the assignment, or zero grade for the assignment was both most likely and most appropriate. Again this was consistent across types of academic dishonesty. Lowered grades or zero grades were deemed most likely and most appropriate across types of behavior. In the two categories deemed most unethical by students (paraphrasing/copying without footnoting and falsifying a bibliography) more students chose "lowered grade on an assignment" as the most appropriate response but perceived the harsher punishment of "zero grade on an assignment" as the more likely consequence.

It is striking that, with few exceptions, across all of the academic categories – regardless of perceived severity – there were mismatches between what students thought was an appropriate punishment and which punishment they thought was likely. For instance, in every category of academic dishonesty, fewer students thought that academic probation was appropriate than those who thought it was likely. In all cases the percentage of students who thought that academic probation is likely was at least double the number of students who thought it was appropriate. (For example, on Chart 12a, "Copying or Paraphrasing Material without Footnoting It," 6.79% thought probation was appropriate, compared to 17% who reported that it was a likely punishment)

We did not survey students about punishments for social categories, but it is interesting that the social categories students chose as the most unethical (driving under the influence of drugs or alcohol and cheating on a romantic partner) are categories in which the real life consequences differ dramatically in legal consequences.

When students see unethical behavior, what do they do? Chart 13 examines the student response to various behaviors and the extent to which they are likely to take action when they witness such behavior. The survey inquired about eight behaviors that relate to four key terms in the Duke Community Standard – "honesty, fairness, respect, and accountability" – and asked if a student had ever witnessed such behavior and what, if anything, they did in response. These behaviors included: theft from peers/faculty/staff; malicious deception of peers/faculty/staff; leaving a large mess for others to clean up; posting anonymously disparaging comments on the internet; discriminating against peers/faculty/staff; slacking off on a group project; and failing to seek medical attention for someone who was dangerously inebriated.

Students at Duke have clearly witnessed all of these behaviors. 88% of students claimed to have seen someone leave a large mess and 74% have seen someone slacking off on a project. 44% have

" Other than drinking, I don't think the university should be too concerned with everything people are doing. I mean, if someone robs a bank or commits a serious crime like assault or whatever, then maybe there is a valid case, but if it's just white-collar stuff, I don't think the university should supervise that."

witnessed other students post anonymous disparaging comments.

Students are, however, often reluctant to take action. In all but three categories, the majority of students reported taking no action. In the category with the highest percentage of students reporting NOT taking any action, *posting anonymous disparaging comments on the internet*, only 24% of students took any sort of action. And only 10% publicly called attention to the behavior. Here, as in most cases, the preferred action was to speak directly with the individual. About 56% of students did take action when someone was slacking off on a group project and again, the preferred intervention was to speak directly to the individual. Very rarely was the choice of response to alert a residence hall, Student Affairs, or other staff member. Even in the case of failure to seek medical attention only 11% of students said they alerted staff.

Interviews with outgoing seniors seemed to follow this data. One senior said:

“People aren’t respectful toward people in service positions on campus. I think they’re largely dehumanized. They’re not kind and respectful the way they are to other students; I think there’s some class integrity issue there”

“[I]f I see something that violates university policy and I’m not a victim of it, I don’t really see myself as having to get involved.”

Another student reported confusion about the Duke Community Standard and saw a difference between “victimless” unethical behavior and behaviors affecting others:

“I think the Duke Community Standard is one of those vague and open-ended things. I think it’s better intended for people to interpret it the way they see is right. For example, where it says you should take action if you think something is being violated, well, it’s not well-defined what that means, and people have been very critical of that. Like what does taking action mean . . . I don’t think it would be right to use that to incriminate someone for not going out of their comfort zone just to defend the Community Standard. Because, you know, there are issues of retaliation if someone confronts someone who may be violating a rule. Retaliation is seen as much less of an issue when you’re a victim of it. Like if my dorm mates are playing loud music and I try to get them to stop, or report them if they don’t stop, I’m a victim of that. But if it’s something more victimless, or you’re not the victim, it’s seen as socially wrong to get involved.”

Still another student questioned how far the university should be involved in policing behavior: *“Other than drinking, I don’t think the university should be too concerned with everything people are doing. I mean, if someone robs a bank or commits a serious crime like assault or whatever, then maybe there is a valid case, but if it’s just white-collar stuff, I don’t think the university should supervise that.”*

Why do students take action and why do they fail to do so? Chart 14 explores these issues further by inquiring *why* a student would take action. With the exception of cases of harassment or someone needing medical attention, personal beliefs were the driving explanation for behavior. In these two cases, concern for the person/group affected was a stronger motivation.

Students often did not see a role for themselves in taking action. Chart 15 explores reasons for NOT taking action. Here, across the board, “not my business” was the most frequent explanation for not intervening in every category. For example, 28% of students reported taking no action in the category of “failing to seek medical attention for someone dangerously inebriated,” and 35% cited “not my business” as their reason for not intervening. 59% of students reported feeling that malicious deception was not their business and 55% of students said that witnessing someone posting disparaging comments was not their business. Personal risk, not considering the behavior unethical, and loyalty were much less often cited as reasons for inaction. Of students who reported not taking action, 21% of students said that taking action when a large mess was left by fellow students violated social etiquette. Similarly, 25% and 26% of students said that taking action when someone was discriminating against others or slacking off on a group project (respectively) violates social etiquette.

What does this mix of apathy and adherence to perceived social etiquette tell us about students? Further analysis of why and how students define “not my business” and “violates social etiquette” could prove revealing. This reticence is especially interesting at a time when our students are increasingly civically engaged. As one student put it, “*seeking knowledge in the service of society [and] trying to go into the global health field . . . that is a reflection of what Duke taught me as far as integrity toward society.*”

Students rely on personal codes of ethics more than any other factor in guiding their behavior. Chart 16 arrays the reasons students give for NOT engaging in academic dishonesty. A personal ethical code and self-respect were the two most cited reasons with 90% and 81% of students respectively choosing these reasons. Even fear of consequences takes a backseat to personal values with only 75% citing this as an explanation. Parents’ values and respect for values are also noted by almost 2/3rds of respondents. Respect for peers and religious values are both cited the least as an explanation.

“Seeking knowledge in the service of society . . . trying to go into the global health field . . . that is a reflection of what Duke taught me as far as integrity toward society.”

Finally, Chart 17 tries to understand the kinds of circumstances under which students might find academic dishonesty acceptable. Students were asked to rank certain circumstances from 1-100 with 1 being never acceptable and 100 being always acceptable. **Across the board students did not seem to identify circumstances where cheating is acceptable.** There was also little variation in responses. None of the averages even reached 30. Lack of preparation and current grade did not even rank an average of 20. Poor teacher quality, belief that others are cheating, a time crunch, etc. did not seem to make cheating any more acceptable for the average respondent.

References:

- Kirsti Dyer, "Challenges of maintaining academic integrity in an age of collaboration, sharing and social networking." (paper presented at the Technology, Colleges and Community Conference, Honolulu, Hawaii, April 20-22, 2010) Available at <http://etec.hawaii.edu/proceedings/2010/Dyer.pdf>, accessed on March 1, 2012
- D.L. McCabe, "Cheating among college and university students: A North American perspective." *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 1(2005), 10-11.
- D.L. McCabe and D. L., Butterfield, K. D., & Trevino, L. K. "Academic dishonesty in graduate business programs: Prevalence, causes, and proposed action." *The Academy of Management Learning and Education ARCHIVE*, 5(2006), 294-305.