Criminal intent or cognitive dissonance: how does student self plagiarism fit into academic integrity?

R. Todd Hartle, Lindy Kimmins and Henk Huijser
University of Southern Queensland, Australia

Abstract The discourse of plagiarism is speckled with punitive terms not out of place in a police officer's notes: detection, prevention, misconduct, rules, regulations, conventions, transgression, consequences, deter, trap, etc. This crime and punishment paradigm tends to be the norm in academic settings. The learning and teaching paradigm assumes that students are not filled with criminal intent, but rather are confused by the novel academic culture and its values. The discourse of learning and teaching includes: development, guidance, acknowledge, scholarly practice, communicate, familiarity, culture. Depending on the paradigm adopted, universities, teachers, and students will either focus on policies, punishments, and ways to cheat the system or on program design, assessments, and assimilating the values of academia. Self plagiarism is a pivotal issue that polarises these two paradigms. Viewed from a crime and punishment paradigm, self plagiarism is an intentional act of evading the required workload for a course by re-using previous work. Within a learning and teaching paradigm, self plagiarism is an oxymoron. We would like to explore the differences between these two paradigms by using *self plagiarism* as a focal point.

Key Ideas

- The paradigm of crime and punishment considers plagiarism to be a deliberate act of cheating.

- The paradigm of learning and teaching considers plagiarism to be a sign that students have not been assimilated into the academic culture.

- Depending on the paradigm assumed, universities will either focus on policies, review procedures, and penalties or on program design, academic development and support, and embedding academic values.

- Academic staff will either focus on course specifications, detection, and student intention or on constructivist alignment, assessment design, and learning opportunities.

- Students will either focus on seeking loopholes, being conscientious, working the system, or on learning objectives, course content, and academic values.

- Responses to self plagiarism are ideal focal points for examining these two paradigms as they are highly polarised.

Discussion Question 1 Self plagiarism – is it an oxymoron as the same assignment may meet two different outcomes, or is it an attempt to gain two grades from putting in effort for one?

Discussion Question 2 Is submitting part of your doctoral dissertation as a journal article also self plagiarism, and should we be punished ourselves?

Discussion Question 3 Is there a correlation between time spent on a piece of assignment, and learning outcomes achieved? Is so, why?

Introduction

The discourse surrounding an issue is an important clue to the way it is perceived and the way it is managed. The discourse surrounding academic integrity issues like plagiarism indicates two very distinct sets of perspectives, values, and assumptions. We assert that these perspectives can be described as paradigms (Kuhn, 1962), especially the mutually exclusive, discrete nature of paradigms and the fact that any given paradigm is able to account for all decisions, behaviours, and policies, albeit with different values and judgements. The polarisation we engage in here is referring to the values, assumptions, and perspectives that lie behind any actions or policies, and not to the actions or policies themselves.

The most common discourse surrounding plagiarism is adversarial and punitive: detection, prevention, misconduct, rules, regulations, conventions, transgression, consequences, deter, trap … , so much so that it could be termed a 'crime and punishment' paradigm (McGowan, 2005a). This paradigm positions academic staff as police officers in this strange new world with its academic culture. In this paradigm, students are viewed as potential miscreants in the system. As Anson (2008, p. 140) notes, "increasingly, our higher-education institutions are interpreting student plagiarism through the lens of criminality, producing elaborate documents and procedures designed to punish offenders and legally safeguard themselves in the process". In other words, there is an assumption that students will try to 'cheat' when given the opportunity, and that it is therefore the job of academic staff to prevent it. However, Anson goes on to argue that "a 'solution' to plagiarism that focuses primarily on policy, detection, and punishment does nothing to advance our presumed mission, which is education" (2008, p. 140).

Thus, he points us to the second discourse, which has a focus on learning and acculturation. This discourse includes terms like development, guidance, acknowledgement, scholarly practice, communication, familiarity, and culture. We have labelled the paradigm that leads to this discourse a "teaching and learning" paradigm. This paradigm encourages a process of assimilation into the academic world. The basic assumption is that the academic culture of knowledge creation is inherently valuable, but that its associated characteristics and conventions need to be taught and developed over a period of time. Complicating matters further is the nature of academic knowledge itself, which is far from stable, and results in different understandings of what constitutes 'common knowledge' (England, 2008; Huijser, 2008). Mistakes will be made by students as they learn about this academic culture of knowledge, and these mistakes are assumed to be part of the 'learning curve' of acculturation.

Just as referencing involves more than quotations, so too does academic integrity involve more than just plagiarism. Students need to understand how to write academically, a significant part of which involves an ability to integrate quotes into their work, or to paraphrase other people's ideas. Thus, academic integrity involves understanding the rules of academic engagement and participating in the ongoing construction of knowledge. Without this interaction, plagiarism, whether intentional or not, is often the result. Success at university, therefore, involves students being able to immerse themselves in the research culture of their strange (and perhaps brave) new world, and it involves teachers developing the skills needed to allow their students to swim.

Paradigms of Academic Integrity

Thomas Kuhn (1962) popularized the term 'paradigm' as a description of a certain perspective or filter for working in science, which shifts over time. The same term can be used to consider different ways of looking at academic integrity. The term paradigm is particularly applicable to views on academic integrity because different views have different basic assumptions, different core values, a universal perspective, and most importantly, a mutually exclusive, discrete nature. Paradigms do not evolve gradually. Instead, as people find an increasing number of problems with their current paradigm, they start looking for new paradigms to consider, and at some point they switch from one paradigm to another. Finally, paradigms are perspectives held or used by individuals, not by institutions or sectors. While the policies of a university may be directed and chosen using the paradigms of their writers, the policies are not paradigms themselves. Even though at the individual level, the values and assumptions that an instructor uses to make decisions about teaching methods are part of that person's paradigm, the actual actions taken by the instructor are not.

Sutherland-Smith's 'plagiarism continuum' model (2008) is a thorough integration of a variety of theoretical perspectives on acts of plagiarism and the policies and actions which can be taken to either prevent or address plagiarism. However completely Sutherland-Smith has managed to map out all possible combinations of intention, teaching approaches, and punitive approaches, one element is consistently mentioned throughout the book, but does not appear in the model. This element is the set of values and assumptions, or *paradigm*, which is used to make relative comparisons among this vast array of actions and policies. Our thesis states that while the actions, behaviours, and policies surrounding plagiarism issues can easily be modelled in a continuum model such as Sutherland-Smith's, the values and assumptions used to choose among those actions are better modelled using Kuhn's (1962) concept of discrete paradigms. We would also assert that by considering the paradigms used to make choices in policy writing, course design, and academic responses regarding plagiarism, much misunderstanding and ineffective action can be avoided.

We propose that two paradigms for considering academic integrity are currently in use in tertiary education. The first is a paradigm of crime and punishment and the second is a paradigm of teaching and learning. Crisp assertions imply these two paradigms, without explicitly describing them as such, when he notes that "there has been something of a polarisation of opinion in staff at universities between those who regard plagiarism as an 'educational and training issue', and those who regard it as an 'honesty and reputation' issue" (2007, p. 3). These paradigms and the differences in their implications thus need to be considered when contemplating academic integrity, writing academic policy, and dealing with academic integrity issues in a university setting. We also propose that the idea of 'self-plagiarism', where students submit the same piece of work for more than one assignment, can be used as a pivotal concept for examining and defining these perspectives as academic integrity paradigms because the differences in the implications are potentially extreme.

.

Crime and Punishment: The primacy of property and conditioning criminals

One paradigm that we will call the 'crime and punishment' paradigm has been the dominant paradigm in tertiary education for some time, although this appears to be shifting more recently. McGowan for example, in a recent book review, identifies "a welcome leap forward to wrench the primary focus away from policing and punishment and directing it towards sound teaching practice" (2009, p. 35). Within the crime and punishment paradigm the focus is on a piece of academic work as a product, or the result of academic labour, rather than the "process of finding information" (Fielden & Joyce, 2008, p. 15). A book, article, or even an original idea is equated with a handmade chair. An academic has put investment, time, effort, and skill into creating an idea, and it is now their property, just as a self-employed carpenter built and therefore owns a chair. The carpenter and the academic can do what they want with their property, but if someone takes it without paying, it is considered stealing. Students are required to use other academics' work to build their own products in the form of assignments, but they have to pay for it by properly citing the work. If they do not they are implying that they cut down the tree and carved out the legs of their chair, when in reality they stole them from their neighbour's workbench.

In this paradigm, plagiarism is a deviant behaviour which allows the student to profit from other people's work. The incentives for criminal behaviour are high, and our academic society cannot rely on the 'moral fortitude' of our students to police themselves. We must condition them not to plagiarize by making clear, consistent, and painful punishments for infractions. We must also do all we can to detect these crimes and deal with them swiftly. After all, this is about 'academic standards', which must be upheld at all cost! Inconsistent, mild, or irregular punishments will only set a precedent that allows the criminal students to get away with their crimes. As Grossberg notes, "despite disclaimers, the language and labels of criminal violation permeate all discussions of plagiarism and define it in most people's minds. It is considered theft, the act of stealing another's words or ideas and therefore one of the most serious of all academic crimes" (2008, p. 161).

This crime and punishment paradigm that Grossberg is referring to can be found at all levels of academic involvement. Anecdotal comments made by academic colleagues and articles in academic journals (e.g. Kaner & Fiedler, 2008; McCart & Jarman, 2008; Rosales, et al., 2008; Vatz, 2009) demonstrate an assumed crime and punishment paradigm by practitioners with minimum academic ethics backgrounds. McGowan warns in this respect 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" (2009, p. 37). Some are beginning to heed such advice by explicitly teaching about ethics and its relation to plagiarism as part of academic culture (Cogdell & Aidulis, 2008). On the other end of the spectrum however, Robinson-Zanartu *et al.* (2005) present a large-scale survey of 270 school psychology faculty members on their characterization of the severity of various plagiarism-like scenarios and their recommended actions, reports, and sanctions for each. This represents an example of an extensive analysis of attitudes towards plagiarism that is primarily situated in the crime and punishment paradigm. Both the survey and article contain only the briefest mentions of anything pedagogical about dealing with plagiarism, despite the fact that the

written responses to this survey included numerous comments about using instances of plagiarism as a learning tool. In fact, the authors are confused and dismayed that, while their subjects had highly correlated perceptions of the severity of plagiarism cases, their reactions to those cases were highly variable. Cosma and Joy (2008) performed a similar survey-based study to define what source-code plagiarism is for computer programming courses. Their survey was even more biased towards the crime and punishment paradigm to the point where they labelled responses which may have come from a teaching and learning paradigm as "controversial responses". These controversial responses represented almost 19% of their responses. We would suggest that maybe the variation and controversy comes from a subset of respondents who approached plagiarism from within a teaching and learning paradigm, yet were still trying to respond within the framework of a crime and punishment survey. These studies stand in stark contrast to Crisp's (2007) and Eriksson and Sullivan's (2008) far more balanced studies of staff attitudes to dealing with plagiarism, despite the fact that a significant proportion could be situated within the crime and punishment paradigm we have identified. Finally, Galles, Graves, Sexton, & Walton (2003) are an example of teachers who have adopted the crime and punishment paradigm to the point that they have modified a detection versus punishment model used in automobile speed limit assessments and applied it to the concepts of cheating and plagiarism.

Treating plagiarism as a moral/ethical issue (Blum, 2009) might seem to be an alternative paradigm to that of crime and punishment, but in reality it simply shifts the responsibility for policing from the educators and administrators to the students and their peers. This is not necessarily a problem, as long as the implications of what such ethical responsibility entails are explicitly being taught (Cogdell & Aidulis, 2008; Harris, 2001; Omenn, 2008). While Blum (2009) considers an ethical perspective to be different from that of legality, she states that a third perspective of education is preferable to either.

Teaching and learning: Culture at the core and forming foreigners

A second paradigm, which we call the 'teaching and learning' paradigm, is slowly becoming more common (Twomey, White, & Sagendorf, 2009), but is not yet as common as crime and punishment. In the teaching and learning paradigm, academia is a foreign culture with its own values, procedures, language and artefacts. Many of these are tacit, making it difficult for them to be understood and adopted. Thinking, writing, rigorous critical analysis, and publishing are not products, they are ways of life (McGowan, 2005a). More importantly, teaching, learning, and acculturation of new members are central values to this culture. Students are foreign visitors who are applying for citizenship. Making errors while learning how to properly reference the works of others is not considered a law infringement, but a learning activity that provides opportunities to practise procedures in their new culture (Carroll, 2002). If students fail to properly cite a reference, they are demonstrating a lack of reflection and metacognition required to rigorously track the evolution of their ideas back to their original sources. Similarly, they have yet to learn more discipline-specific lessons around objectivity, the history and folklore of their discipline, and the skills of critically analysing and comparing others' ideas (Jamieson, 2008; McGowan, 2005a). Finally, they are demonstrating that they do not yet value the creativity of other

academics enough to offer them praise for their work. In short, plagiarism is not a crime, but a failure to meet the learning objectives of the assignment and is evidence that the student has not adopted the academic culture yet.

Plagiarism is also considered a serious issue in the teaching and learning paradigm, but the means for correcting it are very different. If a foreigner trying to learn our ways commits an error, it becomes a teachable moment. Plagiarism can be used by an academic to create a useful cognitive dissonance in the student, which can only be resolved by a constructivist learning approach (Biggs, 2003). Avoiding plagiarism does not come from making the rules and punishments clear up front, but by altering the learning objectives so that the values of the academic culture are more explicit. This involves outlining and explicitly teaching about 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" (McGowan, 2009, p. 37). Detecting plagiarism is not about policing behaviour, but about providing feedback on the level of learning being done by the student, and providing opportunities to alter their constructs. It is therefore also about providing "a positive incentive by rewarding behaviour that is considered important" (Crisp, 2007, p. 7).

Plagiarism seen from the teaching and learning paradigm in the literature can be tentative and cryptic as in the case of McCuen (2008) who appears to appropriate the crime and punishment discourse, but then describes a teaching and learning analysis of how to influence the decision making process of potential plagiarists, or Boeckelman-Post (2008) who reviews the classroom behaviours that influence plagiarism. Conversely, the teaching and learning paradigm can be quite explicit as in Culwin (2008) who presents an experiment that lowered the incidence of plagiarism by using a proactive teaching and learning paradigm, or Beute, van Aswegen and Winberg (2008) and Jian *et al.* (2008), who looked at the role of culture and academic staff members' behaviour on students' decisions to plagiarise.

The nature of paradigms

On a superficial level, both paradigms can appear to be very similar. Both paradigms are based on the belief that plagiarism is wrong and should be prevented, detected, and altered. Both paradigms can make use of course outlines, learning objectives, assessment rubrics, policy, plagiarism detection tools, punishments, and teaching techniques to prevent and deal with plagiarism incidents (Bhattacharya & Jorgensen, 2008). Two academics holding different paradigms in a discussion about plagiarism could easily 'talk past' one another in the belief that they see plagiarism in the same way, but all along have very different beliefs and assumptions.

However, deep central differences do exist, which not only change the understanding of plagiarism, but can lead to large differences in the means of dealing with academic integrity policy and implementation (Crisp, 2007). In addition, it is sometimes difficult, if not impossible, to find a compromise or grey area between the two. It may be possible for one academic to perceive one incident of plagiarism from one paradigm and another incident from the other paradigm. For example, if a student puts a word-for-word quote from the

textbook directly into her assignment text without quotation marks, but includes the proper in-text citation in parentheses as if she had paraphrased the ideas, the examiner may consider this infraction to be a teaching moment indicative of a lack of acculturation (Harris, 2001). If, however, the student fails to use the in-text citation, the same examiner may consider the infraction to be a criminal act of plagiarism that requires punishment.

Another scenario which appears to be a compromise between the paradigms is the ability to incorporate similar teaching behaviours using either paradigm. Two different examiners may both use text-matching software, but the teaching and learning examiner might provide the results to the students as feedback on how to improve their assignments in a later revision, while the crime and punishment examiner might use the results as part of their final grading rubric and remove points for the amount of plagiarism detected. This diverse use of text-matching software is reflected in Crisp's (2007) discussion of the use of Turnitin by academic staff. When the two examiners compare their teaching methods, they might both assume they are viewing plagiarism from the same paradigm with slightly different styles. However, rigorous reflection will likely show that one paradigm is being stretched to incorporate aspects of the other rather than reaching a true compromise.

The different values placed on effort versus criteria make compromise particularly difficult. For the crime and punishment paradigm, the purpose of assessment is to evaluate the effort, time, and work that was put into assignments. More effort means more value and should result in a higher mark. Plagiarism is an attempt to receive a high mark by stealing someone else's effort. Within the teaching and learning paradigm by contrast, assessments are activities designed to see whether the student has attained certain criteria, passed a certain stage, or developed a certain skill. Indeed, assessments can be designed in such a way that they prevent plagiarism, as Salmons (2008) has shown. If students provide evidence of having reached the goal, they receive high marks, if not, they receive low marks.

Another difference is the centrality of acts like plagiarism in the teaching context. Within the crime and punishment paradigm, plagiarism is a deviant behaviour that sits entirely outside of the teaching context. It is an act performed by morally deficient students who need to be caught and punished, but it has little or nothing to do with teaching. Furthermore, as Park argues, "plagiarism by students is a moral maze, because it raises important ethical and moral questions about good/bad or right/wrong behaviour and about acceptable/unacceptable practices" (2003, p. 474), suggesting that 'moral deficiency' is a grey area in itself. However, it is likely that most 'crime and punishment' teachers would rather not be the police force in their own courses. If an external agency from administrators to a plagiarism detection program would sort out the criminals and deal with them, the entire course would be improved.

The teaching and learning paradigm places an act of plagiarism squarely in the middle of the teaching context. An act of plagiarism is direct evidence of the student's failure to meet the learning objectives, and therefore a teachable moment (McGowan, 2005b). Within the teaching and learning paradigm, the teacher needs to be involved in a hands-on manner with the students in detecting plagiarism and needs to do so early enough in the process to be able to correct the behaviour and strengthen the lesson (Carroll, 2002).

A final central difference between these two paradigms that make them difficult or impossible to reconcile can be seen in the emotional implications of each of these paradigms. The crime and punishment paradigm has a central emphasis on justice and fairness. A person who is fully immersed in the crime and punishment paradigm can be outraged at the injustice of someone receiving a benefit without paying the price. This outrage becomes difficult to sustain when applied to natural ability. Some students can produce extremely high quality work with a minimal amount of effort, while others may spend a great deal of time and work and only produce mediocre results. Is it fair to award the higher marks to the minimal effort student? Crime and punishment teachers may gloss over that discrepancy or may convince themselves that the high achieving student has put the effort in earlier in their career to try to reconcile the discrepancy.

Likewise, the teaching and learning paradigm values success and teachers can be very disappointed when students demonstrate their lack of acculturation by plagiarising. This disappointment, however, is easily shifted to feelings of personal failure as the teaching and learning paradigm implies that plagiarism is often the result of poor learning objectives or assessment design (McGowan, 2005a). In other words, it can often be seen to actually be the teacher's fault. However, the emotion involved in the disappointment can cause a 'crime and punishment paradigm' teacher to use plagiarism as a teaching moment action with a student who has worked extremely hard, but has not been able to achieve, and a 'teaching and learning paradigm' teacher to implement punishment schemes rather than examine his course design. It is important to note that these shifts would not necessarily imply shifts in paradigms, but rather the adoption of actions or behaviours that would not normally be valued in the absence of a strong emotional drive.

Both the mutually exclusive, discrete nature of these perspectives on plagiarism and their internal consistencies suggest that they are paradigms, which individuals adopt and tend to maintain even in the face of other evidence, which is borne out in Crisp's (2007) study, and reinforced by Sutherland-Smith (2008). This can be illustrated by a special issue of *IEEE Transactions on Education.* Of nine articles directly related to plagiarism, five could be categorized as coming from a teaching and learning paradigm and four from a crime and punishment paradigm (Beute, et al., 2008; Broeckelman-Post, 2008; Cosma & Joy, 2008; Culwin, 2008; Jian, et al., 2008; Kaner & Fiedler, 2008; McCart & Jarman, 2008; McCuen, 2008; Rosales, et al., 2008). These nine articles give a variety of perspectives and some explicitly describe each of the paradigms; however, in the opening editorial (Kaynak, Braun, & Kennedy, 2008), the guest editors adopt an explicit crime and punishment paradigm to the extent that their call for papers included:

> "Plagiarism is an unacceptable and growing threat to academic integrity and a threat to the very foundations of the academic system. This threat is especially true in a world where Information Technology has made copying information easier. The problem needs to be recognized and tools need to be developed which are readily available to identify plagiarized work" (Kaynak, et al., 2008)

The universal nature of paradigms is another difficulty in understanding paradigms as opposed to actions and policy. For example, the teaching and learning paradigm appears to focus on inadvertent or non-deliberate plagiarism and the crime and punishment paradigm would appear to focus on deliberate or

intentional plagiarism as described in Sutherland-Smith (2008). While the actions taken by those using the different paradigms might be categorized in this way, neither of these paradigms suggest anything about the intentions of the students. Paradigms, as sets of values and assumptions, simply assume that the ultimate goals of academic activities are different and value some kinds of actions to meet those goals over others. Those following the crime and punishment paradigm have no trouble dealing with the unintentional plagiarist. They simply assume that unintentional plagiarism is like someone who has forgotten to pay their credit card bill. They did not mean to steal, but they still did. If they are faced with a strong, but not debilitating punishment, they will remember to pay properly the next time. Likewise, within the teaching and learning paradigm, intentional plagiarism exists as well; however, the intentional plagiarist is seen to be like a foreigner who constantly, if unwittingly, breaks local taboos. The first and best way to deal with them is to 'design' the possibility of plagiarism out of the assessment (Crisp, 2007). In other words, use the theories and principles of teaching and learning to acculturate the taboo behaviour into something more appropriate. If the intentional plagiarist insists on flaunting the cultural norms, they ultimately need to be asked to leave the community.

Self-Plagiarism as a pivotal issue

While most incidents involving academic integrity can be considered from the perspective of a crime and punishment or a teaching and learning paradigm, frequently the decisions made and the actions taken around each incident will be at least superficially acceptable within either paradigm. Plagiarism needs to be prevented, detected, and dealt with in a corrective manner. Likewise, cheating, lying, and falsifying data or analyses would be evaluated differently within the two paradigms, but their similarities allow for tolerance, if not compromise.

Self-plagiarism of assignments by students is a distinctive phenomenon which highlights the differences between the two paradigms. Within a crime and punishment paradigm, self-plagiarism may not be as immoral an act as plagiarism, but the difference would be the difference between stealing and swindling. A student who turns in the same piece of work for two assessment items in different courses is trying to sell the same handmade chair to two customers, and collect from both of them. The student is just hoping that neither teacher realizes that they have only really bought half a chair. The moral disappointment can be felt in realizing that the student received a full payment of a high mark for work that was performed for another assignment. Central to the moral disappointment associated with 'normal' plagiarism is "whether plagiarism is intentional or unintentional" (Sutherland-Smith, 2008, p. 126). In the case of self-plagiarism, the intention to use previous work is obvious, and the crime and punishment paradigm assumes that the intention to 'cheat' is likewise obvious.

Green (2003) wrote a legal analysis of plagiarism and examined self-plagiarism from the concept of causing harm versus the idea of consent. He argues that the act of ghost-writing for politicians or celebrities is not plagiarism, as the original authors have given consent for use of their work without attribution, and "no one is harmed because – unlike students and professors – there is no cultural expectation that such people write their own copy." However, in the case of self-plagiarism, Green says, "third parties, such as the self-plagiarist's readers, are deceived into believing that her work is original." Consequently these third parties

are harmed; therefore self-plagiarism is criminal plagiarism. What Green does not address however is the definition of original. Does original mean never having been written before, or not having been written by anyone else?

Within a teaching and learning paradigm, self-plagiarism does not really exist. The term itself is an oxymoron. How could a student plagiarise her own work? In fact, a student successfully (*i.e.* by receiving high marks) using the same work for two assessments can be seen as evidence that the student sees the interconnectedness of the two assessments and has created a piece of work that can encompass both sets of criteria. Within a teaching and learning paradigm, that student should indeed be rewarded for adopting the academic culture at a higher level than her peers. Thus, if a problem exists with self-plagiarism, it lies within the course and program design (McGowan, 2005b). It points to the learning objectives and assessment criteria being too similar between two assessment items, which suggests poor program design (Carroll, 2002; Salmons, 2008). Crisp's study further showed that "only 38% [of his respondents] design the ability to plagiarise out of [their] assessment" (2007, p. 7-8). Overall then, successful self-plagiarism could be seen as evidence that program coordinators need to evaluate the constructive alignment and coverage of the two courses for which a particular assignment has been submitted (Biggs, 2003).

Questions leading to the academic integrity revolution

Are we in the middle of a paradigm shift? One possible explanation for the two paradigms existing at the same time is that we are in the process of shifting from the crime and punishment paradigm to the teaching and learning paradigm, or what McGowan calls a "welcome leap forward" (2009, p. 35), but have not quite tipped the scales. McCuen's (2008) article appears to be an example of an academic who has been steeped in the crime and punishment paradigm and adopted its discourse by saying that "self-plagiarism and dual publishing are considered fraudulent", while referencing one of his own articles and that of another two academics. At the same time his reference to self-plagiarism deals only with post-graduate students and academics who submit the same article to two different journals and waste the resources of the publishers. When discussing students, McCuen describes the decision-making steps of the potential plagiarist and makes suggestions on how ethics education and other actions by teachers are the primary ways of influencing this process. McCuen could be seen as suggesting where the paradigm shift has occurred, but the discourse of the new paradigm has yet to be adopted.

Another explanation is that neither paradigm clearly explains or deals with academic integrity issues better than the other, so both paradigms are coexisting together within our community, thus forcing the debate down to the level of actions and policies throughout the "plagiarism continuum" (Sutherland-Smith, 2008). In this case, our field of academic integrity could be likened to debates between physicists who argued over whether light is a particle or a wave. Until a unifying or totally new paradigm is discovered which clearly supersedes both plagiarism paradigms, we will continue to debate this issue at the level of actions and policy.

A final explanation would be that these perspectives are not paradigms in the theoretical sense of providing a framework for understanding, but are instead

purely different decision-making systems that we adopt depending on individual differences in moral and ethical values. In the latter case, having a diversity of academics will ensure that we will always have a conflict of paradigms.

By examining many of the key questions faced by academics, we can help to identify which paradigm we are using when thinking about academic integrity issues. For example, if we submit parts of our dissertations as journal articles without acknowledgement, are we guilty of self-plagiarism, or are we properly disseminating our work? Is using previously published articles as chapters in a doctoral dissertation self-plagiarism, or is it an ideal demonstration of the dissemination criteria of our disciplines? Green (2005), in discussing self-plagiarism by academic staff, would suggest that these are examples of academic crimes unless the academics cite their own work. Other authors might see these issues as an indication of changing paradigms, even at the level of academics publishing their work. Most journals do not allow a manuscript to be submitted if it is under review at another journal. Is this a sound ethical rule or simply a corporate attempt at reducing the expenses of reviewing manuscripts that may be accepted by the competition? Indeed, is it the place of universities to be "guardians and legislators of morality" (Horacek, cited in McGowan, 2009, p. 35)? All of these questions can be answered in very different ways if viewed through the filters of crime and punishment or teaching and learning paradigms.

Overall, thinking about these issues using the model of paradigms can help us to reflect on our practices as well as debate the most appropriate policies and actions to take in relation to academic integrity issues. Wilson (1999) examined a variety of policy statements for definitions and comparisons of plagiarism with collaboration, and found that over three-fourths of the institutions examined did not have any discussion of collaboration. Without such definitions, Wilson argues that teachers cannot effectively utilize or teach collaborative writing skills. Price (2002), describes the perspective we have called the crime and punishment paradigm as "a pedagogy whose spirit we might characterize as 'Gotcha!'" She argues that academic integrity policies have improved, but agrees with Crisp (2007) that many ambiguities and contradictions still exist. We have argued that these issues can at least partially be resolved by explicitly stating which paradigm policy-writers are using, which would result in a consistent institution-wide approach, and would ultimately be in everyone's best interest, especially students'.

Acknowledgements

References Cited

Anson, C. M. (2008). We Never Wanted to Be Cops: Plagiarism, Institutional Paranoia and Shared Responsibility. In R. M. H. A. E. Robillard (Ed.), *Pluralizing Plagiarism: Identities, Contexts, Pedagogies* (pp. 140-157). Portsmouth, NH: Boyton/Cook Publishers.

Beute, N., van Aswegen, E. S., & Winberg, C. (2008). Avoiding plagiarism in contexts of development and change. *IEEE Transactions on Education, 51*(2), 201-205.

Bhattacharya, M., & Jorgensen, L. (2008). Minimizing Plagiarism by Redesigning the Learning Environment. In T. S. Roberts (Ed.), *Student Plagiarism in an Online World: Problems and Solutions* (pp. 194-207). Hershey, New York: IGI Global.

Biggs, J. B. (2003). *Teaching for Quality Learning at University: What the Student Does* (2nd ed.). Buckingham: Open University Press.

Blum, S. D. (2009). Academic Integrity and Student Plagiarism: a Question of Education, Not Ethics. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 55*(24), A35-A35.

Broeckelman-Post, M. A. (2008). Faculty and student classroom influences on academic dishonesty. *IEEE Transactions on Education, 51*(2), 206-211.

Carroll, J. (2002). *A Handbook for Deterring Plagiarism in Higher Education*. Oxford: Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning Development.

Cogdell, B., & Aidulis, D. (2008). Dealing with Plagiarism as an Ethical Issue. In T. S. Roberts (Ed.), *Student Plagiarism in an Online World: Problems and Solutions* (pp. 38-59). Hershey, New York: IGI Global.

Cosma, G., & Joy, M. (2008). Towards a definition of source-code plagiarism. *IEEE Transactions on Education, 51*(2), 195-200.

Crisp, G. T. (2007). Staff Attitudes to Dealing with Plagiarism Issues: Perspectives from One Australian University. *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 3*(1), 3-15.

Culwin, F. (2008). A longitudinal study of nonoriginal content in final-year computing undergraduate projects. *IEEE Transactions on Education, 51*(2), 189-194.

England, A. (2008). The Dynamic Nature of Common Knowledge. In C. Eisner & M. Vicinus (Eds.), *Originality, Imitation, and Plagiarism: Teaching Writing in the Digital Age* (pp. 104-113). Michigan: The University of Michigan Press & The University of Michigan Library.

Eriksson, E. J., & Sullivan, K. P. H. (2008). Controlling Plagiarism: A Study of Lecturer Attitudes. In T. S. Roberts (Ed.), *Student Plagiarism in an Online World: Problems and Solutions* (pp. 23-36). Hershey, New York: IGI Global.

Fielden, K., & Joyce, D. (2008). An Analysis of Published Research on Academic Integrity. *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 4*(2), 4-24.

Galles, G., Graves, P. E., Sexton, R. L., & Walton, S. M. (2003). Monitoring costs and tolerance levels for classroom cheating. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology, 62*(4), 713-719.

Green, L. (2005). Reviewing the scourge of self-plagiarism. *M/C Journal, 8*(5). Retrieved from http://journal.media-culture.org.au/0510/07-green.php

Green, S. P. (2003). Plagiarism, Norms, and the Limits of Theft Law: Some Observations on the Use of Criminal Sanctions in Enforcing Intellectual Property Rights. *Hastings Law Journal, 54*, 167-242

Grossberg, M. (2008). History and the Disciplining of Plagiarism. In C. Eisner & M. Vicinus (Eds.), *Originality, Imitation, and Plagiarism: Teaching Writing in the Digital Age* (pp. 159-172). Michigan: The University of Michigan Press & The University of Michigan Library.

Harris, R. A. (2001). *The Plagiarism Handbook: Strategies for Preventing, Detecting, and Dealing with Plagiarism*. Los Angeles, CA: Pyrczak Publishing.

Huijser, H. (2008). Straddling the Continuum between Three Course Meals and Snacks: The Changing Flavour of Knowledge Creation and Dissemination. *Journal of the World Universities Forum, 1*(2), 85-91.

Jamieson, S. (2008). One Size Does Not Fit All: Plagiarism Across the Curriculum. In R. M. Howard & A. E. Robillard (Eds.), *Pluralizing Plagiarism: Identities, Contexts, Pedagogies* (pp. 77-91). Portsmouth, NH: Boyton/Cook Publishers.

Jian, H. L., Sandnes, F. E., Huang, Y. P., Cai, L., & Law, K. M. Y. (2008). On students' strategy-preferences for managing difficult course work. *IEEE Transactions on Education, 51*(2), 157-165.

Kaner, C., & Fiedler, R. L. (2008). A cautionary note on checking software engineering papers for plagiarism. *IEEE Transactions on Education, 51*(2), 184-188.

Kaynak, O., Braun, R., & Kennedy, I. (2008). Plagiarism. *IEEE Transactions on Education, 51*(2), 149-151.

Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

McCart, J. A., & Jarman, J. (2008). A technological tool to detect plagiarized projects in Microsoft Access. *IEEE Transactions on Education, 51*(2), 166-173.

McCuen, R. H. (2008). The plagiarism decision process: The role of pressure and rationalization. *IEEE Transactions on Education, 51*(2), 152-156.

McGowan, U. (2005a). Academic Integrity: An Awareness and Development Issue for Students and Staff. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice* (3a), 48-57.

McGowan, U. (2005b). *Plagiarism detection and prevention: Are we putting the cart before the horse?* Paper presented at the HERDSA Conference: Higher education in a changing world.

McGowan, U. (2009). Review: Pedagogy, not Policing. Positive Approaches to Academic Integrity at the University. *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 5*(1), 35-37.

Omenn, G. S. (2008). On Ethical Issues in Publishing in the Life Sciences. In C. Eisner & M. Vicinus (Eds.), *Originality, Imitation, and Plagiarism: Teaching Writing in the Digital Age* (pp. 27-38). Michigan: The University of Michigan Press & The University of Michigan Library.

Park, C. (2003). In Other (People's) Words: Plagiarism by University Students - Literature and Lessons. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 28*(5), 471-488.

Price, M. (2002). Beyond 'gotcha!': Situating plagiarism in policy and pedagogy. *College Composition and Communication, 54*(1), 88ff.

Robinson-Zanartu, C., Pena, E. D., Cook-Morales, V., Pena, A. M., Afshani, R., & Nguyen, L. (2005). Academic crime and punishment: Faculty members' perceptions of and responses to plagiarism. *School Psychology Quarterly, 20*(3), 318-337.

Rosales, F., Garcia, A., Rodriguez, S., Pedraza, J. L., Mendez, R., & Nieto, M. M. (2008). Detection of plagiarism in programming assignments. *IEEE Transactions on Education, 51*(2), 174-183.

Salmons, J. (2008). Expect Originality! Using Taxonomies to Structure Assignments that Support Original Work. In T. S. Roberts (Ed.), *Student Plagiarism in an Online World: Problems and Solutions* (pp. 208-226). Hershey, NY: IGI Global.

Sutherland-Smith, W. (2008). *Plagiarism, the Internet, and Student Learning: Improving Academic Integrity*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Twomey, T., White, H., & Sagendorf, K. (Eds.). (2009). *Pedagogy, not Policing: Positive Approaches to Academic Integrity at the University*. Syracuse, NY: The Graduate School Press, Syracuse University.

Vatz, R. E. (2009). Is Monitoring Plagiarism Worth the Hassle? *Chronicle of Higher Education, 55*, A28-A28).

Wilson, H. L. (1999). When Collaboration Becomes Plagiarism. In L. Buranen & A. M. Roy (Eds.), *Perspectives on Plagiarism and Intellectual Property in a Postmodern World* (pp. 211-218). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Page 14 of 14

4th Asia Pacific Conference on Educational Integrity (4APCEI) 28–30 September 2009
University of Wollongong NSW Australia
Refereed Paper