Review
Pedagogy, not policing. Positive approaches to academic integrity at the university.

**Tyra Twomey, Holly White and Ken Sagendorf (Eds.). (2009).
Syracuse, New York: The Graduate School Press, Syracuse University.**

Ursula McGowan
University of Adelaide
ursula.mcgowan@adelaide.edu.au

At last, here is a complete volume that aims to promote a series of positive and educationally sound approaches to academic integrity that are, to my mind, long overdue. The book is, as the editors point out, the product of the Future Professoriate Program (FPP) of the Syracuse University Graduate School. Its aim is to inspire readers to "feel affirmed as educators":

> It is good to remember that in many ways, promoting academic integrity is not something new we have to conform to; it is something that happens naturally whenever we are active learners and thoughtful educators. (p. 2)

In questioning some of the familiar assumptions about academic integrity which pose barriers to active learning and thoughtful pedagogy, this volume represents a welcome leap forward to wrench the primary focus away from policing and punishment and directing it towards sound teaching practice.

The book is presented in four parts. Part 1: *Theory into Practice* contains six chapters that examine academic integrity from a range of perspectives from "intellectual autonomy", "freshman composition", a "preventative classroom environment", and the "economy of education" to "cheating" and the "dilemma of originality". Part 2: *Graduate Students* deals with "ethical issues" and "mentoring relationships" in two chapters. Part 3: *The People Behind the Policies* contains five chapters from the perspectives of a "first-time instructor", a "student athlete" and "behind the administrator's desk"; to explorations of "hating dishonesty without becoming emotionally involved" and the "import of cultural difference" on the understanding of plagiarism, particularly in relation to students from some Asian cultures. Part 4 provides six chapters of *Strategies for TAs* (Teaching Assistants) to achieve *Integrity in Assessment*.

David Horacek's chapter on intellectual autonomy sets the tone for the book. This is the chapter that most clearly departs from the trend of conflating cheating with plagiarism and breaches of academic integrity. It begins by disentangling the notion of "honour codes" from the "codes of academic integrity". Honour codes, according to the author, embrace the entire range of "honourable behaviours", while the codes of academic integrity include "all the norms that govern research, not merely the explicit prohibitions" such as dishonesty, collusion, cheating, and the like (p. 10). Horacek presents a crucial argument here: that it is not the place of universities to see themselves as guardians and legislators of morality. To support his argument, he makes the point that, if it were indeed their role, universities would have to legislate

over much more than just cheating and plagiarism. Instead, he describes their role as the developers of communities of researchers and promoters of codes that govern the practice and integrity of research. It follows then that their students must be seen as initiates into research communities and that the task of universities is to provide an environment in which students can learn to understand and internalise these codes as they mature into competent researchers and reach "intellectual adulthood" (p. 14).

For communicating the outcomes of their research, students also need to develop the language of their specific community. It is through language that student plagiarism is generally identified, much of which may be inadvertent while initiates are unaccustomed to the structures and language conventions that characterise their disciplines (McGowan, 2005). The issue of academic writing development is addressed by Pangborn who proposes a change from a learning environment in which it is unsafe to make errors or take risks while learning the academic conventions, to one in which it is possible to "cultivate genuinely purposeful thinking-through-writing, with much less cheating than presently occurs" (p. 24). Like the codes of research communities, so also the characteristic languages of these communities need to be developed through guidance and feedback.

These sentiments are further supported by David Nentwick's chapter on ethical issues in graduate writing. He argues that the "so-called crisis in academic integrity in graduate students" writing should be addressed by the entire academic and administrative community and suggests something that is not easily accepted by discipline based academics, but merits another look, that:

> Faculty can, if given proper administrative support (such as professional development opportunities), increase their efforts to incorporate writing – and discussions of writing – into their courses... (p. 64)

If one agrees with the thoughtful statement by Schuehler Sherwood that "there is little a scientist does that is more important than communicating through written results" (p. 140), the incorporation of writing into mainstream teaching may not be so far from the mark (see also McGowan, 2008).

In the chapter on "Culture and Academic Norms" in Part 3, Sidney Greenblatt provides a refreshingly apt historical scan through Chinese history and culture that demonstrates convincingly how a long and valued tradition of learning has produced very different conceptions of text ownership from those practised in the modern Western world. Importantly this chapter is free of that patronising air that is sometimes discernible when such cultural differences are identified as differences in "values".

Some of the practical strategies of Part 4 take a more traditional line than the title promises, as they largely continue to conflate academic integrity with the prevention of cheating and outlining ways of preventing its occurrence in large classes, the "dreaded lab report" and exams; applying "intercultural concepts" for a better understanding of the issues from a student perspective; and the pros and cons of using the text-matching service *Turnitin* for plagiarism detection. There is a mixture of traditional policing strategies and sensible pedagogy. Policing, with the inevitable focus on general dishonesty, rather than on the integrity specific to academic endeavour, includes strategies for eliminating possibilities for dishonest behaviour (Udermann & Lamers, pp. 114–115). An example of sound pedagogy is Danielle Schuehler Sherwood's advice to TAs to make use of assessment to guide students into honestly reporting the results of their experiments, rather than manipulating data in their lab reports. Assessment criteria thus become a tool for encouraging academic integrity (see also Carroll, 2002, p. 35) by awarding "more points for the analysis than the actual numbers" and so removing the incentive to change their results (pp. 138–140). Together with her view of the importance of written communication, these are

two basic approaches to promoting academic integrity that could usefully have been developed further to do justice to the theme of the book (see also McGowan, 2005).

In summary then, and to return to the editors' aim to affirm teachers in promoting academic integrity by supporting students and staff as "active learners and thoughtful educators", the tenor of this book provides academics and policy makers in universities and colleges – at least the English-speaking world over – with food for thought. The editors put forward the idea that while the prevailing attitude to academic integrity is constrained by considerations of morality, and students are "policed" rather than "initiated", staff and students suffer under a cloud of fear and distrust by which the conditions for active learning and thoughtful pedagogy are undermined. The opening chapters set the scene for a fresh look at what the real purpose of university learning actually is by outlining two essential domains for students as initiates: firstly, the internalising of the norms and codes of the research community; and secondly, acquiring the language features that characterise the written output of their research. Such ideas have begun to be fostered in publications (see for example, Boyer Commission, 1998; McGowan, 2008; Willison & O'Regan, 2007) and it is to be hoped that many more publications along these lines will be spawned by this thoughtful and practical book.

Reviewer

Ursula McGowan is Deputy Director of the Centre for Learning and Professional Development responsible for academic staff development at the University of Adelaide. She is bilingual (German-English) and is experienced in staff and student development on issues for international and local students from language backgrounds other than English. Her recent publications have focused on mainstream strategies for inducting students into the academic discourse, with a view to minimising the incidence of inadvertent plagiarism.

References

Boyer Commission (1998). *Reinventing undergraduate education: A blueprint for America's research universities*. Stony Brook, NY: Carnegie foundation for University Teaching. Retrieved June 17, 2007, from: http://naples.cc.sunysb.edu/Pres/boyer.nsf/

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

McGowan, U. (2005). Does educational integrity mean teaching students NOT to 'use their own words'? *International Journal for Educational Integrity 1*(1) http://www.ojs.unisa.edu.au/index.php/IJEI/issue/archive

McGowan, U. (2008). International students: A conceptual framework for dealing with unintentional plagiarism. In T. S. Roberts (Ed.), *Student plagiarism in an online world: Problems and solutions* (pp. 92–107). Information Science Reference, Hershey, New York. ISBN 978-1-59904-801-7.

Willison, J., & O'Regan, K. (2007). Commonly known, commonly not known, totally unknown: A framework for students becoming researchers. *Higher Education Research and Development, 26*(4), 393–409.