

Journal of Management Education

<http://jme.sagepub.com/>

Cheating: Making It a Teachable Moment

Grace Ann Rosile

Journal of Management Education 2007 31: 582 originally published online 9 August 2007

DOI: 10.1177/1052562906289225

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://jme.sagepub.com/content/31/5/582>

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:



[OBTS Teaching Society for Management Educators](#)

Additional services and information for *Journal of Management Education* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://jme.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://jme.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations: <http://jme.sagepub.com/content/31/5/582.refs.html>

CHEATING: MAKING IT A TEACHABLE MOMENT

Grace Ann Rosile
New Mexico State University

The author's PhD training and 25 years of teaching experience did not prepare her for dealing with widespread cheating. Is it better to confront cheaters personally, or just fix the evaluation system and move on? How can the process of failing cheaters be handled in a way that is fair to all? Finally, can a potentially disastrous cheating incident become a teachable moment? Based on the author's personal experience of failing almost a fourth of a class, this article explores both personal and procedural justice issues, and offers a case example and classroom exercise to promote classroom integrity.

Keywords: *cheating; ethics; academic integrity; cell phones; procedural justice; story; restorying*

Cell Phone Cheating: Latest Campus Craze?

In December 2003, I failed 9 out of a class of 40 senior students for cheating on an exam. The availability of a new technology (cell phone text messaging) along with three dangerously false assumptions triggered this tragic case of widespread cheating. It happened in my senior Business

Author's Note: I want to acknowledge the wonderful support of the many people who helped me to stay balanced through this process. My husband, David Boje, and my department head, Peter Dorfman, were never too busy to discuss this topic with me, over what seemed at times to be endless weeks. My counselor Toni Delgado was wonderful as always. Our Dean Garrey Carruthers was a former faculty member and a former governor of the state, and this was his first semester in the role of dean. He told me how politics had made him very sensitive to ethical issues and said, "After Enron, we in the business college must hold ourselves to a higher standard. I support you on this. You do what you need to do." And our Associate Dean Kathy Brook, who dealt with appeals, was perhaps the most rigorous in fairly enforcing policies.

JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT EDUCATION, Vol. 31 No. 5, October 2007 582-613
DOI: 10.1177/1052562906289225
© 2007 Organizational Behavior Teaching Society

Strategy class. I had recently made some changes in this class. The wake of Enron, combined with my own co-authored articles on this scandal (Boje & Rosile, 2002, 2003), led me to incorporate a new-and-improved, beefed-up module on ethics. I used homey personal stories and elicited students' examples of their personal "defining moments." We had in-depth discussions of Enron and group reports on corporate ethics. A year later, I did see a difference in my class—but not in the expected direction! I uncovered a huge cheating problem right under my nose. Furthermore, I was an unwitting accomplice to this cheating, as were the "innocent" students in the class.

I had always assumed that prevention was the best method for dealing with cheating and that my preventive measures were sufficient. When I was rudely awakened from my blissful ignorance, I realized I knew very little about the mechanics of dealing with clear evidence of cheating. Most of my extremely supportive university administration also felt at a loss, without precedents upon which to base many decisions. I am writing this report for three reasons: a) To prepare others both mentally and psychologically for dealing with the myriad decisions involved with processing cheating incidents; b) to suggest ways of turning cheating into a "teachable moment" through various means, including taking it off the list of "taboo" topics between students and faculty as well as among faculty colleagues; and c) to offer classroom tools to prevent cheating through participatively promoting classroom integrity. Topics are discussed in the following sequence:

1. Reach out and touch someone: hi-tech cheating;
2. the cell phone cheating case: parts I, II, and III;
3. dangerous false assumptions;
4. psychological preparation: counseling; emotional side of the "sting";
5. procedural justice: charges, hearings, second wave of charges, decision processes, sanctions;
6. aftermath;
7. next steps;
8. conclusions; and
9. appendix: classroom exercise.

A discussion of cell-phone cheating will provide a background for the three-part case "Reach Out and Touch Someone: The Cell-Phone Cheating Case." This case demonstrates three common assumptions that led to my own complicity in this unfortunate situation. I suggest three better operating premises for proactively promoting integrity in the classroom. I also discuss my own emotional and psychological issues throughout this process. Then the processes of charging, hearing, secondary charging, decision processes, and sanctions are discussed, as each topic raised procedural justice issues during the prosecution of the cell-phone cheating incident.

A brief section addresses continuing and concluding the semester in the aftermath of this traumatic event in the life of the class. Finally, the Next

Steps and Conclusions sections offer suggestions for working with students in class to establish a supportive norm of “It takes a community to raise integrity.” The case example, followed by “mirroring” (verbatim reporting of students’ comments), is recommended as a classroom exercise to establish a classroom culture supporting integrity.

Reach Out and Touch Someone: Hi-Tech Cheating

The University of Maryland, Arizona State University, and New Mexico State University had reports of cell-phone cheating (Read, 2004; Romo, 2003) and “Similar allegations surfaced . . . at a Japanese university last year” (Associated Press, 2003, p. C-1). Widespread classroom cheating has been widely reported (Stephens, 2004), and one wonders how many incidents went undetected. In one 1995 study, a self-reported 67% of undergraduates cheated; yet even among the detected cases, as many as 27% to 39% of those went unreported (McCabe & Trevino, 1995).

Of special concern to business schools is the finding that while business students were more likely to cheat, business faculty were less likely to observe cheating. Furthermore, when cheating was observed, business faculty members were less likely to report it (McCabe & Trevino, 1995). This evidence supports the picture painted in this author’s personal case example offered below: Cheating is common, faculty can do much more to prevent it, and many students are willing to help support a culture of classroom integrity.

The Cell-Phone Cheating Case

PART I

It was the fall of 2003. During an exam, I noticed some suspicious behavior, but nothing I could readily identify as cheating. The next week our department head, Dr. Peter Dorfman, told me he had heard that students were using text messaging on cell phones to cheat on my Business Strategy exams. How was that possible? I explained to him my usual procedure for all exams and quizzes: Shortly after the exam started, I would quickly duck out and tape up two color-coded exam versions with the correct answers filled in, on the wall just outside the classroom. Students got color-coded exams, computer answer sheets, and color-coded 4 × 4 squares on which to copy their 20 to 30 objective answers. After the exam, they would take the 4 × 4 to compare their answers with the ones I posted in the hallway, getting instant reinforcement and feedback for their answers and scores. This was good in terms of learning theory, and students liked the system. Some students discovered they could have an accomplice call them on their cell phones and relay keyed-in answers from the answer sheets posted in the

hall. I had never considered how this new technology could be a threat to my exam security as I have never owned a cell phone and was only vaguely aware of the concept of text messaging.

My initial inclination was to plug up the hole in the system and move on. Those who tried to cheat again by the same method would be thwarted and the resulting poor grade would be punishment enough. However, Dr. Dorfman encouraged (but did not pressure) me to consider a “sting” to clearly identify who had cheated. He cited an article in the *Chronicle* about an almost identical case at the University of Maryland (Read, 2004). Accounting professors there had posted exam answers on a Web site, and students were using cell phones to access the site during the exam. They successfully used a sting (posting false answers to 30 exam questions) to catch the cheaters. A total of 12 of 400 students had the false pattern and all 12 failed the class as a result. Dr. Dorfman told me he would support me in whatever way I chose to deal with the situation and suggested I take the weekend to think about what I wanted to do.

PART II

I did not think that a weekend’s thinking things through would change my views on what to do about the cheating. However, because both my department head and my husband (who is also a member of my department) seemed to like the “sting” idea, I gave it careful consideration.

I had always maintained a sort of “karmic” view of cheating, summarized as follows:

1. Just as virtue is its own reward, cheating is its own punishment (lack of self-esteem, etc.);
2. even if I did not catch a particular cheater, someone else would eventually in this life or the next;
3. punishing cheaters does not convince them of the error of their ways, only of the error of being caught; and
4. as one colleague put it, “We don’t really want to catch our students cheating.” The role of disciplinarian was not always compatible with my self-image as a facilitator of intellectual inquiry who espoused values of openness and honesty and challenging the status quo more than acceptance of social norms.

I surprised myself when I decided to undertake the sting. What shifted my thinking was changing my focus from how to deal with those who cheated to an emphasis on what would be most fair for the entire class. These factors summarized my altered position:

1. By cheating, the students themselves triggered the consequence and/or penalty mechanism agreed to in the syllabus.
2. The decision to cheat was theirs; the decision of whether and how to enforce the consequences was mine. This understanding helped me to stop blaming myself and clarify my role.

TABLE 1
Chronology of Activities, Charges and Dispositions

<i>Date and Instructor's Activity</i>	<i>Number of Students Charged</i>	<i>Disposition of Students Charged</i>
October 17, 2003 Notes suspicious behavior by two students during exam		
October 18–31, 2003 Hears rumor of cheating; begins planning the sting exam		
October 31, 2003 Conducts sting exam		
7 students have the pattern of 18 false answers (does not include the originally suspicious 2 students)	7	7 students fail. Of these 6 also receive temporary transcript notations 1 also receives a permanent transcript notation
October 31 to December 5, 2003 Investigation yields		
3 more students in class accused of cheating on a previous exam (includes the originally suspicious 2)	3	2 fail and receive temporary transcript notations 1 not penalized due to lack of evidence
3 names of University students outside the class who sent the cell-phone text messages with answers to in-class students	3	3 receive temporary transcript notations. Of these 1 loses campus job, which gave them access to faculty computers
November 12, 2003 Address to the class explaining and "restoring" what happened		

- I wanted to avoid rewarding A while hoping for B (Kerr, 1975). I would be rewarding cheaters and punishing honest students if I did not pursue the cheaters and enforce consequences.

I embedded 18 false answers in 24 exam items and gave the exam on October 31. Of the 44 students in the class, 7 had the incriminating pattern of answers. Based on information obtained from those initial 7 students, 6 more were charged. Of these 13 students, 10 from class were charged along with 3 students who were not in the class but were University students. Of the 10 students in the class, I failed a total of 9 (see Table 1 for a summary of charges and dispositions).

I spent countless hours meeting with the 13 charged students in the weeks after the sting. Those who quickly confessed and showed remorse were the easiest. Then there was the student who said, "Yes I did it, but I will not give you the name of the other person (who helped me to cheat). I deserve whatever I get, but this (other person) is a good person, really good, not like me, and they were just trying to help me. I won't tell you who they are." I admired the sentiments and loyalty.

But what kind of friend was it, and what kind of help was it, that would land them in their present predicament? I wanted to say to these students, "This is not the WWII French Resistance!" (but I did not say it) and, "A true friend would support you in doing the right thing" (and this I did say). I realized that most students had bought into a story of cheating as sometimes necessary and, possibly, even honorable resistance with accompanying norms of silence. Worse yet, I realized that although I had never been involved in classroom cheating or faced with such a situation, I believe that I would not want to reveal the name of someone else who cheated. I would not want to be a betrayer. Furthermore, I was uncomfortable in the role of one who encourages and rewards betrayal. Yet these "bad-guy" roles seemed the only options in the students' sense-making or storying of this situation. I asked myself, how could I restore this in a way that offered everyone a hero's role?

I decided to actively intervene with a restorying process (White & Epston, 1990). To prevent students from becoming stuck in their old stories about cheating, I planned to formally address the class. I offered the new story orally, rather than via the standard letter used in restorying (White & Epston, 1990). I allowed questions, but purposely avoided extended open discussion until the next class for two reasons. First, I did not want students to be sucked back into the dominant story lines I had uncovered in my interviews before they had a chance to consider the new story I offered. I structured this process by allowing 15 minutes for them to write down anonymously their reactions to my talk.¹ In addition, I asked for written permission to use their comments in a letter to the editor I would write to the student newspaper (Rosile, 2003). These anonymous written comments might be less subject to group influence, and publishing them gave more weight to the students' voices in the restorying process. The second reason for postponing discussion was that time was very limited in my 50-minute period, and I wanted to be able to have a full discussion with as much closure as possible. This appears to have been a good decision. When I fed back the written verbatim comments in the next class, the ensuing discussion lasted for 40 minutes.

After the first seven students were failed and no longer attending class, I prepared a 20-minute address to this class of senior Business Strategy

students. I wanted to enlist them into my story about why so many of them were not present that day. Following is a condensed version of what I said.

Today I want to talk about something you may have heard about already. Many of your classmates will no longer be attending class. I have failed them for cheating. I am still investigating this situation, but so far it appears 10 students were involved from inside the class, plus several more on the outside who helped those cheating. How did this happen? Why did it happen to me, to our class? I ask for your patience now because instead of our topic for the day which, ironically, is "Corporate Culture and Ethics," I want to speak to you for about 15 to 20 minutes about my feelings about this situation. Then I will ask you for your views.

I have been proud of the fact that in 25 years of teaching, I never needed to do more than give a student a warning look, or go stand in their portion of the classroom to prevent cheating. Today, I realized that there must have been some cheating that I never saw. I ask myself, did I really try to see it? Did I really want to see it? Or did I prefer not to have my orderly world disrupted by unpleasantness? Maybe it is just a case of me being older and behind the technology curve: I do not even own a cell phone, and have never used "text messaging," as some of those cheating had done.

I found evidence this past week of widespread cheating: 10 out of 40 in this class. These students had outside accomplices who text-messaged the exam answers to them. Many more than those 10 specifically-charged people had to know what was going on without speaking about it. But everyone apparently decided "It's not my problem."

There is a dangerous fallacy about cheating, which is "I don't cheat, so it's not my problem." However, cheating destroys the learning environment in our university. When people cheat it affects everyone, those who cheat and those who do not cheat. All of us have an active role in creating, promoting, and allowing cheating through both action and silence. The combination of new technology (cell phones) and the norm of silence of bystanders created this tragic case of widespread cheating.

Why didn't people speak up? Some were too absorbed in their own exams to pay any attention to what others were doing. Some suspected but did not pursue their suspicions, not feeling it was their responsibility. Some knew but felt they should not report anything or mention any names, not wishing to harm another's reputation. Some felt if they were not cheating themselves, that was the extent of their obligation—anything beyond that and "It's not my problem."

There are many reasons why cheating by the few affects the many:

1. One (accused) student claimed, "Those other students who got As were cheating too." This casts doubt on the achievements of the hard-working students who earned their grades honestly.
2. In evaluating graduate program applicants, I have heard reports that faculty have commented "X" (a particular place, school, or country) is known for cheating. How can we trust this candidate's record?
3. When even one person is caught cheating, it leads to suspicion of the legitimacy of all grades.
4. The more who cheat, the more tempting it is for others to do the same.

Those who see cheating and do nothing are allowing those cheating to harm themselves. A true friend would not condone, encourage, or assist a friend to cheat, knowing that friend could be destroying their education and damaging their career.

PART III

I asked the students to write about what they learned from the situation, and to note on their papers whether I could use their comments in a letter to *The Round Up* (Rosile, 2003). Table 2 shows the themes extracted from the written responses. Note that of the 10 students charged with cheating, only 7 were failed and removed from the class at this time, whereas 3 students' charges were still under investigation. These responses are from students who did not cheat but may have known about it, plus the 3 in-class students whose charges were still being investigated.

In spite of my talk, I expected most students to still express variations of the "It's not my problem" theme. Instead, some not only condemned such unethical behaviors but also expressed personal affront. These emotional statements rang true and did not appear contrived for the sake of approval. Some of those less-emotional were resigned to cheating as part of life. Overall, I was surprised that students were overwhelmingly supportive of my role, and five explicitly thanked me. I typed these student comments verbatim but not in their entirety, filling four single-spaced pages loosely grouped by theme. I copied and distributed this document at the start of our next class meeting.

After silently reading their own comments, the students initiated a class-long discussion. One student said, "I was in athletics in high school, and we always cheated." After the gasps and chattering subsided, he continued, "But that was high school. It's different in college. This is more important. I would not cheat in college, and I don't think others should either." This comment, together with the anonymously written comments, seemed to set the standard for the frank and open discussion that followed.

It seems important in this process for students' voices to be heard. Typing verbatim comments, and allowing students time to discuss them, showed respect for the students' voices. Such respect is a good start, and perhaps an essential part, of participatory processes to address cheating (Bauerly & Dobson, 2002) and create a more ethically oriented, self-reflexive (Stablein, 2003), and liberatory pedagogy (Freire, 1970, 1995).

The content of the written comments also underscored the need for attention to voice and power issues in this process, both between students and faculty and among students. Overall, in Table 2, student comment Categories 2 and 3 combine to yield 15/39 comments reflecting passive and/or resigned feelings, whereas Categories 1 and 4 combine to show 20/39 comments reflecting an emotional victim and/or rescuer dynamic. Of the four miscellaneous comments, two are clearly victim-oriented. This

TABLE 2
Student Comments Summary Chart

<i>Theme</i>	<i>Sample Quotes^a</i>	<i>Frequency</i>
1. Feelings expressed: ashamed/angry/hurt/taken advantage of	I feel ashamed; I apologize for my peers; feeling disappointed; I was upset; I feel bad for them but they should be made an example of; This stinks; I feel naive and cheated; I felt unfairly treated; this will catch up to them; they will pay (someday); (they) should be thrown out of the University; a great injustice to the rest of the class	15
2. Oblivious, suspicious, or knew but did nothing	I didn't even hear comments about cheating; wish I was more observant; I too am the oblivious student; I always looked the other way; I did hear things but never anything concrete enough to come to you	9
3. There will always be cheaters	There have always been cheaters and there always will . . . it is everywhere; from 3rd-grade spelling test up to the CEO of Enron; corporations rob people for profit; to many, cheating is a viable option	6
4. Thanked me for my actions	Thank you; my hat's off to you; your speech made a difference; thanks for standing up for us; I support you	5
Miscellaneous/appeared only once	Students' Rights: If . . . by some miracle he guessed the answers . . . that student . . . should not be punished. Prevention: (the university should) ensure students are neither tempted nor able . . . it will lead to lower enrollment (because so many cheat). One Who Cheated: I feel terrible . . . I realize how wrong this was . . . I feel like crying. The Philosopher: Cheating is wrong . . . it hurts the whole, even those that never cheat.	4
Total Excerpts		39

a. Four themes and four unique comments were found, yielding 39 excerpts from 26 comments.

predominance of passivity and powerlessness themes underscores the importance of participative processes to actively engage students in addressing this problem (as recommended below) rather than being passive victims.

To conclude the details of the Cell Phone Cheating Case, when my article reporting the incident appeared as a letter to the editor in the student

newspaper, *The Round Up* printed the full text of 14 student comments I had included along with my closing comments:

Can we change our situation? I believe so, but only if all of us, students and faculty alike, are actively engaged in supporting honesty and integrity. As one student said, "I sit next to the smartest person in this class and even if I thought to cheat, I know he would not let me." It starts one-to-one, and continues up through our entire institution. It has been hard work these past weeks, documenting, writing charges, meeting, confronting, counseling, and delivering, in many cases, the decisions of sanctions. But perhaps it has been the most important teaching I have ever done.

DANGEROUS FALSE ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT CHEATING

The *Albuquerque Journal* and *Las Cruces Sun News* seemed fascinated with the "how" of this case, relating it to other stories of cheating using cell phones and new technology. But I wanted to know "why." Why did this happen? Looking back I can see three false assumptions I made:

1. If cheating is occurring in the university, it is not happening in my class because I take preventive measures;
2. if students are not cheating themselves, that is all I can or should expect of them; and
3. if "ethical issues" (like Enron) are addressed in class, that is the most I could or should do to teach ethics in a class not specifically devoted to ethics.

All three of these assumptions were not only wrong, they were *way* wrong!

Regarding the first assumption, according to the anonymous student comments I collected, cheating is very common. This means that it *must* be happening in some of my classes. Students continually invent ways around the system. It was naive of me, as well as statistically improbable, to think none of it was in my classes.

Regarding the second assumption, I realized those who do not cheat themselves are not absolved of further responsibility. They may still be aiding those who do, either actively or passively, intentionally or not. And they are certainly hurt by those who cheat. Again based on anonymous student comments, when a student who does not cheat observes others cheating successfully, the honest student becomes discouraged. This alienation can be pervasive.

Third, discussions of ethical principles may not carry over to immediate ethical choices about classroom behaviors, as was certainly true for my class. As a teacher, it is my responsibility to demonstrate how ethical principles operate in the way I teach my class. This includes reviewing my classroom policies for fairness and allowing students a voice in the processes. Or as Anderson (2003) put it, it is not so much a question of teaching business ethics, as one of teaching business ethically.

My shattered assumptions have been replaced with very different operating premises:

1. Premise #1: Cheating will probably be attempted, no matter how good my prevention plan.
2. Premise #2: Helping someone else cheat, or ignoring someone else's cheating, is as bad as cheating.
3. Premise #3: I must be more proactive myself, and enlist the aid of the entire class as well, to participatively create fair policies and pedagogies to effectively counteract cheating.

PSYCHOLOGICAL PREPARATION

As I noted earlier, when I first suspected cheating, my initial inclination was to not make a big deal of it, just plug up the hole in the system and move on. Why demoralize an already down group? Why publicize my own gullibility or lack of technological sophistication? Why risk a mob attitude from the class or further loss of respect? Surely there could not be many involved—and if there were, could I even contemplate failing so many? Why exacerbate my own feelings of failure? Did I even have a right to use class time to address this issue, when I had “material” to cover?

I want to acknowledge how important the support of both my department head and dean were, in overcoming my own fears in dealing with this situation. At each step my department head said, “This is really up to you. Here is what I know about similar cases. You can do A. or you can do B., but it is completely your decision; it is your class.” He also said, “I’ve discussed this with Dean Carruthers (our dean) and Dean Brook (our associate dean) and they completely support you in this.”

In spite of the exemplary support from above, and despite my fairly calm progress through the stages of due process, I experienced a last-minute panic before my first student “hearing”: Please, please, please do not make me sit in a room alone with a student and tell them I am failing them in this class in their senior year due to cheating! That was what I felt, but of course I did not say that. Then I remembered how I had learned to stop a charging run-away horse by stepping into their path and stopping them with my presence.² I remembered: I knew how to do this. Just as with a horse, correcting had to be done from a feeling of calmness, centeredness, and self-awareness. I saw suddenly how all my horse-training experience had prepared me for this, and I was ready.

Counseling As Part of the Process

Throughout this process, I continually sought the advice and counsel of family, friends, and colleagues, as well as professionals. This input affected

many of my decisions. For example, in spite of the advice of both my husband (who also teaches in my department) and my department head, I was initially reluctant to use the “sting” to catch the cheaters. Then I had a session with Toni Delgado, M.S., of “A Next Step: A Center for Emotional Healing” (<http://anextstep.org>). She helped me identify and let go of ego issues of hurt, betrayal, and wounded pride, and search for an answer based on what would be best for all concerned. I decided to be more proactive. Instead of merely not posting the answers, I would post a “planted” pattern of false answers (something that usually occurred once a term by accident anyway).

I went into this with a clear sense of acting from a desire to help and support growth in the students and in myself. I wanted my actions, and especially my interactions, with the students to be free of anger and fear. (It is easy for me to avoid fear by jumping right past it into anger). I believe I accomplished this, based on the generally good reactions I got from the accused students. As I told the class, for most of those I failed, I felt that I knew them better and liked and even admired them more after this incident than I did before their cheating was known. Most of those students realized I was on THEIR side, and we helped each other get through a difficult situation.

On the day of my big speech to the class, I told them about “survivor syndrome” and the ill effects of downsizing on those left behind. I told them it was normal to feel sad or depressed over the loss of our classmates and encouraged them to talk to me, to each other, or to a counselor. Taking my own advice, I had another counseling session after it was all over to bring more closure.

The counseling sessions helped me to uncover hidden emotional responses often linked to other past experiences, like not wanting to disappoint my own parents. I discovered hurt feelings due to broken trust, and the broken trust was linked to disappointed expectations. I saw that it was not bad for me to have expectations (goal-setting theory encourages us to do that for our students), but my disappointment and hurt arose from feeling a vested interest in the outcomes related to those expectations.

I saw how destructive to my students it was for me to react with disappointment, how judgmental and demoralizing and demotivating. I even suspected that my attachment to my glowing image of a few especially nice students, widely liked by faculty and staff, might have made it more difficult for them to confess to me. They did not want to disappoint me. I wanted them to know that my regard for them was unconditional.

THE EMOTIONAL SIDE OF THE “STING”

I undertook the “sting” with a firm belief and intent that it would be the most loving thing I could do for my students. It became a question not of

punishment but of consequences. I often said that I did not want to see my students years from now led off in hand-cuffs on national TV like Enron executives (that is the serious part of my comment—but then I always add the part that gets the laugh:) because they got away with cheating in my class! It would be outrageously egocentric to think I could cause others' ("MY" students') behaviors to that extent. At the same time, for those who are ready and willing to learn, this experience might guide them away from a more serious pitfall in the future. Here is an example of what I said to several charged students:

At first I thought, "Not YOU. You are a NICE student, a GOOD student, you would not be involved in this." Then I realized that you are still a NICE student, you are a GOOD person, you just made a bad choice. And my philosophy is that when something bad like this happens, it is often so that we can learn and be prepared for something we will face in the future, so we will not make some worse mistake in the future. Let me give you a simple example: I love my old car, it is a very good and reliable car, a 1989, and I rarely have problems with it. I take care of my car, and my car takes care of me.

One morning I went to my car in the garage and found a flat tire. Instead of being mad that I had a flat, I saw that as more proof that my car takes care of me: Instead of having a blow-out on the highway and potentially causing an accident, or discovering the flat in some remote dark parking lot away from home, my flat was safely in my own garage where I could have it fixed safely. Some day you may be faced with a much greater temptation than cheating on a test. You will remember this experience and you will be able to say, "I already learned that lesson, I won't make that mistake again."

What I did NOT say to any of them was, "Some day you will thank me for this." I did not do it for thanks; my action needed to be unaffected by either praise (which was totally unexpected when it did come) or blame (which also came). I also thought of that classic line of the parent punishing the child, "This hurts me more than it hurts you." And I realized how wrong this was for me in this situation. It was so wrong that the opposite was true, and I found myself wanting to say to several of the especially stubborn students, "This does NOT hurt me more than you. You may not even realize how much you have hurt yourself. And you put yourself in this situation." But I never said this out loud to them.

I remembered how I felt years ago when I closed my own finger in my car door. I could hardly believe I had done that to myself! And realizing I had hurt myself did not make me feel any better—if anything, it added more frustration. My finger was hurting and I was angry and looking for someone to blame it on, but there was only me there. I understood that these students might feel the same: Hurting and angry and looking for someone to blame it on. To them I could look a lot like the cause of their problems! I was ready for that and ready to respond to any hostile reaction from them with calmness, patience, and understanding.

With my psychological preparation, only 1 student in 10 reacted belligerently toward me. I attribute this to my “I’m on your side, how can we get through this bad situation?” attitude. And this attitude was accompanied by my attention to procedural justice in a way that demonstrated my concern. For example, really listening to their side of the story and making appeal procedure information readily available to them were concrete expressions of my concern for their rights.

Procedural Justice

Other research suggests that the perception of likely penalties for cheating is an effective deterrent (McCabe & Trevino, 1995; Nonis, Swift & Owens, 1998, cited in Bauerly & Dobson, 2002). However, proper attention must be paid to due process in prosecuting cheating, including possibilities for appeal. We were concerned that if we made a charge that we could not support we would send a message that students could get away with cheating. On the other hand, we did not want guilty students to “slip through the net” when others had experienced such severe punishment.

We chose a very conservative path, proceeding with charges only when we were sure of our case. For example, we asked students if they knew of anyone else in the class who was cheating, but we did not suggest names to them. Also, anyone accused by others had to be accused by at least two others before we felt the charge was convincing. The following sections consider the procedural-justice implications of issuing initial charges of cheating, holding hearings, subsequent charges, decision processes, and sanctions.

THE INITIAL CHARGES

Uncovering clear and convincing evidence of cheating was just the beginning of weeks of processing the charges. First we had to deliver the charges. We decided I would call the seven suspect students out at the start of the next class, take them into the hall, and give them their charge letters at the same time. Then I realized I had assumed they would take their letters and slink away, but what if they didn’t? What if they wanted to go to class? Would I have seven hostile disgruntled students in my class? Should I or could I bar them from class at this stage, while they were still “presumed innocent”? I decided what I would say:

In this letter I just gave each of you, you will see that you have been charged with cheating on the last exam. I am in the process of investigating these charges. No decision has been made yet. Your letters ask you to set up a time to speak with me about these charges. Right now you may make a choice: You may leave class without penalty for missing the class, to take this time to consider your response to this letter; or, you may attend class.

To my amazement, they all said they wanted to go to class! And they seemed eager and happy to attend class! In fact, the whole class seemed more lively for the duration of the semester.

Not all charges could be delivered in class. The department secretaries, Pam and Renee, were an important link to the students throughout the process. "Renee, did that student show up yet to pick up their charge letter? They were not in class again today. I emailed and left a phone message that they should get it from you." "Professor, if you want to give that last letter back to Pam, she found out what other classes this student has and offered to try to deliver it in a class they should be in tomorrow morning."

THE HEARINGS

"Charged" students were required to see me for a "hearing" within 3 working days of receipt of the charge letter, to present their side of the story. The charge letters included copies of relevant portions of the University's Student Handbook concerning academic misconduct so students could readily assess their rights to appeal. The disposition and punishment-decision letter needed to refer back to the specific date of the student's "hearing" with me. These disposition letters also stipulated time frames and procedures for appeals. Usually, students had 3 working days to appeal a decision to the Associate Dean.

There were daily private meetings with students in my office to discuss charges, sometimes at length and sometimes multiple times in a day. These meetings were often a quick confession (even without specifying the nature of our clear and convincing evidence) with lots of remorse ("This is the stupidest thing I ever did! I'm so sorry!"). Confessions were sometimes followed with a letter of apology and usually a personal apology also. However, there were cases of almost belligerent denial ("I don't know how I got that pattern of wrong answers, really, I just guessed!"). Often the story changed with successive interviews. I kept detailed hand-written notes of each meeting. To those denying the evidence I would say,

It is statistically virtually impossible for you to have come up with the pattern of wrong answers you gave on this exam. Without a better reason for why this pattern of answers appeared on your test I must conclude it was due to cheating. However, I am still investigating this. As soon as I have completed gathering information, you will have my decision by letter. In the meantime, feel free to contact me if you have any other questions. Also, please give me your current phone, e-mail, and mailing address in case I have other questions, and so that I can contact you when I have reached a decision.

THE SECOND WAVE OF CHARGES

During their hearings, some of the first round of charged (accused) students named others they claimed cheated. When more than one student

mentioned the same names this, combined with other evidence such as a pattern of high absenteeism, low grades on other assignments, and a near-perfect exam score, led to three further students being charged. Two of the three students confessed immediately when confronted. I dismissed the charge in the third case because it relied too heavily on the word of only one other student; thus, it did not meet our self-imposed standard of clear and convincing evidence.

In addition to the 10 students in my class who were charged, I also issued charge letters to the 3 hallway accomplices who were University students. Here again new technology played a key role: One accomplice said he or she had intended to relay answers by phone but claimed to have changed his or her mind at the last minute and offered a printed copy of the cell-phone bill as evidence.

Dr. Dorfman eventually uncovered the scam: The two students had plotted from the beginning to erase the records of the incriminating calls from their phone bills. However, Dr. Dorfman contacted the cell phone company supervisor and retrieved the erased records. The exam-time calls were there. We had our clear and convincing evidence on our last outstanding charge.

This process was truly high drama. I was scarcely able to believe some of the things I was saying, lines right out of TV crime shows, like “evidence,” “punishment” and “cooperate,” and “If you can give us the name,” and “Could you describe the person you saw?” I had ended up in the wrong story, in “Cagney and Lacey” instead of “Miss Jean Brodie.” But we all played our parts well.

DECISION PROCESSES: THE STORY BEHIND THE STORY

Perhaps Dr. Dorfman’s prior courtroom experience as an expert witness influenced him, or perhaps it was his scholarly researcher’s desire to gather data to support conclusions—for whatever reason, he was endlessly patient and open to discussing all angles as we decided how to handle each new development. We met almost daily, usually between 4:30 and 5:00 p.m., when we both had time and the office was quiet. Often the secretaries, Pam and Renee, would stay to hear the latest, as they were an important link to the students throughout the process. Table 3 summarizes some of the dilemmas we faced.

I often talked to my department head several times a day regarding the above issues as we discovered new information and the situation changed and evolved. One example is when the first round of charged (accused) students were asked if they knew of others who had cheated, and with no further prompting than that, several names were mentioned. Dr. Dorfman and I both wanted to handle this especially carefully. Our first reaction was that we would issue no charge without absolute proof. We did not want to

TABLE 3
Dilemmas: Level of Aggressiveness Pursuing Cheaters and Standardization of Punishment

<i>Pros</i>	<i>Cons</i>
More aggressive pursuit of cheaters	
1. Greater likelihood of catching all cheaters;	1. Potential damage to an innocent student's reputation if erroneously charged;
2. stronger message sent regarding the seriousness of cheating;	2. reduced trust in the system when cheating is exposed;
3. by default, rewards honest students when cheaters are punished;	3. exposing cheating strengthens the perception that "everyone does it," which fosters more cheating;
4. can offset the greater amount of talk by and about those who get away with cheating; those punished are reluctant to advertise it; and	4. may negatively affect teacher rapport with the entire class; and
5. the perception of strong penalties has been shown to be a deterrent to cheating.	5. "stings" and other aggressive means may have a taint of deception and dishonesty themselves.
More standardization of punishment	
1. Even-handed administration of penalties;	1. Less lee-way in negotiating down of penalties in exchange for cooperation;
2. easier decision-making process for faculty/administrators; and	2. no incentives for confessions; and
3. easier to obtain the appearance of fairness when all receive the same penalties.	3. identical punishments may have widely varying impacts (i.e., failing a student who is continuing on versus the student who had planned to graduate that month with family traveling in and a contingent job-offer awaiting graduation).

set ourselves up for failure, and we did not want to level a serious charge without being sure, because of unwarranted damage to a student's reputation as well as the potential for retaliatory complaints and appeals if our "case" was unconvincing to others.

We discussed the ramifications of our choices on the rest of the class: How would others feel if some were so severely punished, whereas others who were guilty got away with it? If a charge was appealed and overturned, would that be further incentive for others to continue cheating because they could easily "get off"?

We analyzed every decision extensively but not uselessly. We commented on how time-consuming, difficult, and critically important each of our choices was. In the end Dr. Dorfman said, "We did everything right on this one, and yet I still feel somewhat soiled."

SANCTIONS

Sanctions for cheating fall into two categories: Affecting a student's grade on the exam and/or entire course, and transcript notations for academic disciplinary probation.

To make me aware of the options, my department head mentioned alternatives for sanctions: Making up or resubmitting work, taking substitute exams, assigning partial credit, and so on. However, because my syllabus stated that cheating would result in a failing grade for the course, I felt that none of the lesser penalties would be appropriate. Students proved to be cheating would fail the class. Dr. Dorfman supported me in this decision then wisely suggested that I wait a day until he consulted with our new dean as they had not had experience working together on such issues.

Early the next morning, I heard from Dr. Dorfman: The response from the dean was full support for me in enforcing my written policy. What a relief! I had never considered the possibility of higher-ups not supporting stiff penalties for cheating; in subsequent research, I have gathered reports from business faculty whose clear-cut cases against cheaters were swept under the rug by department heads and deans. I appreciated my administrators even more, and my already high opinion of them steadily increased.

As events unfolded, intense discussions had short time-frames in which to yield immediate actions. We needed guidelines for these decisions, so Dr. Dorfman and I quickly devised a series of progressively harsher penalties, both to encourage cooperation and to acknowledge lesser levels of offense. Potentially the most serious penalties were transcript notations regarding academic disciplinary probation. These notations could be temporary or permanent. If temporary, I could stipulate its duration up to the point of graduation. For example, a student might be told in the disposition letter that they would be subject to a temporary transcript notation for academic disciplinary probation lasting 1 year or until graduation, at which time it would be removed. The mildest disciplinary probation was a notation lasting until the end of the current semester, with automatic removal contingent upon no further disciplinary charges occurring.

However, the harshest disciplinary notation was a permanent notation, which remains on the transcript after graduation, with the potential for removal only after graduation and after a written petition to the Dean of the College. Our dean noted that a written petition would not automatically be granted; it was just what the word "petition" indicated: A request. Students quickly realized how potentially damaging a transcript notation could be to their academic and employment futures: A failed class might go unnoticed but an academic disciplinary notation was a clear red flag.

AFTERMATH

I expected a funereal atmosphere over the class as we stumbled through the rest of the term, but I was wrong. Surprisingly, in spite of the trauma of the cheating and sorrow over loss of friends and classmates, the “survivors” were much more cheerful and enthusiastic than they had been. In fact, when two teams who had each lost half their members merged into one team, they humorously called themselves “The Leftovers.” When they met with me to discuss their term project and I asked for a contact person’s name and phone number, there was a tense pause. I said, “What, so now no one wants to even admit to having a cell phone?” and we all laughed. It was important to be able to openly talk and even laugh about this topic. The taboo that a student must never discuss such things as cheating with a faculty member must change. Sometimes laughter is a good way to break through such inhibitions, and it is also wonderfully healing.

Months after this incident, I heard that an executive contacted our dean. His company had just hired several of our graduates and would fire them before they even reported to work if we could not guarantee they had not been involved in the cheating. Our department head wisely realized that academic privacy issues forbade him from giving out such information. This raises issues of societal norms around paying one’s debt for wrongdoing while still maintaining the possibility of remorse, reform, and reconciliation. As one of the students noted, “People deserve a chance at redemption.”

FIVE MINUTES OF FAME

The morning my letter to the editor appeared in *The Round Up*, I got a call from a TV news reporter (in the big city up north). His editor saw the story on the Internet. Could he interview me, perhaps take some footage of me teaching a class, for the nightly news? I said yes, hung up, then wondered if I had time to run home and change into nicer clothes. There was no extra time; my afternoon was busy with more student hearings as my investigations continued.

The reporter and camera technician arrived at 5:30 p.m. for a brief taped interview before the start of my 6:00 p.m. class. They filmed me as I began my Organizational Behavior class, even though it was not the one in which the cheating had occurred. After the taping, I needed to spend some time discussing cheating with that class also.

Later that night, I felt a bit guilty about being excited and even happy to have this media attention. I did not want to benefit from the misfortune of those who had cheated; however, I wanted to continue to prevent such cheating. Publicizing this story would help. Still, I spent most of the next

day with my three horses and then ran errands, out of reach of phones all day. That evening I discovered that another TV news group had been trying to reach me, but by then it was too late for their deadline.

It was quite a contradictory mix of emotions that the publicity engendered: Excitement, pride, self-validation, and also embarrassment, fear of the powerful addictive lure of public notice and the desire to “play to the press,” and fear of disapproval. Would I—and my university—look like heroes, villains, or fools? I was not used to, or prepared for, such attention and needed a downtime day away from the phones to recenter.

Overall, the impact on me was positive: I had support from administration and I received congratulatory e-mails from colleagues and even other students on campus who came across the various news reports. I heard from others (because I got rid of TV more than 10 years ago) that my moment of fame had made CNN’s evening news crawler! (Since then, a 1-hour TV news show also covered the “crisis” of classroom cheating.) However, I know that a different attitude from my superiors could have made this experience as devastating for me as for my students. I have had other colleagues tell me that their administrations frown on such information becoming public, fearing the university might look bad.

Next Steps: Preventive Procedures

Where will exam security take us next? Will we check purses, bags, and bulky jackets at the door? Will we have airport-security-type screening, students removing shoes? A colleague in Australia reported that they scan students with wands to detect electronic devices before allowing them to enter an exam room (Rosile, 2004). There is also the option of video surveillance, which we actually tried in the classroom and hallway, places where we had evidence that cheating was occurring. It was not useful and may entail legal issues.

Since this cell-phone cheating incident, I have gone back to essay exams in my Business Strategy class. More than 50% of their grade already was written case analyses. This is more time-consuming, but students reported in anonymous feedback to me that they felt the essays were very fair and not susceptible to cheating.

The participatory and/or process-oriented approach may be augmented and informed by previous research on preventive measures for reducing cheating on both in- and out-of-class work, nicely summarized in Bauerly and Dobson (2002). Their recommendations, based on their own and previous research, fall into three main categories:

1. Explicitly define cheating: Provide a detailed written definition as well as penalties.
2. Make cheating difficult: Vary exams, proctor carefully, get help with proctoring.

3. Pay attention to process: Ask that they not cheat, reiterate penalties before exams, be accessible for exam preparation reviews, and create assignments not easily plagiarized.

CLASSROOM EXERCISE

My method to create a climate of integrity, where cheating is not a “taboo topic” and peer and faculty support is available to help students maintain integrity, is simple yet powerful. I use a two-part classroom exercise (see appendix). I begin with my story of the cell-phone cheating case and follow up with soliciting and then “mirroring” back to students their verbatim written comments and reactions to the case.

After discussing the case, I ask students to write brief anonymous answers to two or three short questions. The first is a general question concerning their views of cheating on campus; the second and third questions ask about cheating policies in general and then specifically if they think grading policies and procedures in the present class will support fairness and integrity, or if they see problems. The mirroring process allows the students to have voice and power.

Before the next class, I type word-for-word excerpts from students’ comments grouped by theme. I use two to four single-spaced pages of comments, copy them and hand them out to students in class. I allow 5 to 10 minutes for reading the comments, then another 15 to 30 for discussion. After the first exam, I ask for written anonymous feedback on the fairness of the exam. I give them a summary of the responses and discuss potential changes. Midway through the term, I ask for feedback on how well the suggested changes are working and if there are other problems. The total process can be as short as 30 minutes to as long as 3 hours. The case acts as a morality tale as well as a discussion starter, and I find the students love to read their own recorded comments, almost regardless of the triggering questions.

Ironically, during the optional final exam in the infamous class, I saw one student look over at another, and they nodded at each other: Some message of agreement had passed between them. My now-heightened paranoia flared. Then the first student brought his test to me and asked, “What is this?” I had somehow given him a copy of the exam with the answers on it. I laughed at my mistake. I told them my GA was unavailable, I had made the copies myself as I often do, so I could blame no one but myself. Then he laughed, too, as he realized it was not some sort of trap to check their honesty.

The student he had earlier nodded to spoke up and said his test had the answers also. By this time the whole group was laughing. “Just give us all As!” one student called out. I checked everyone’s exam and out of about 15, I had to replace only 3 or 4 of the yellow versions, which had the answers on them.

I could not figure out how I managed to make such a mistake. It was quite early in the exam, but some students may have gotten the benefit of recognizing the correct answers marked on the page. I announced a 10-point bonus for all and everyone cheered and finished their exams.

I must have looked quite chagrined because as they went back to work, one student said, "Don't feel bad, other teachers have done this too!" and the rest voiced agreement. I was touched by their concern, and realized what I had been suspecting and hoping: Dealing openly in class with this issue had brought us all closer together. Maybe I was even escaping, for a while at least, the adversarial role of authority figures and professors that the film *The School of Rock* referred to as "the Man!"

Conclusion: "It Takes a Community . . ."

In this example of classroom cheating, the cheaters clearly had the technological edge. It is also clear that some faculty will be like me—in need of reviewing testing procedures more regularly. However, increased surveillance and counter-terrorism-style security must be balanced with concern for students' rights.

Based on this experience, I believe the best prevention will come from creating an open classroom dialogue on cheating and enlisting the support of the majority of the honest students. These students will not be asked to be "tattletales." They will be recruited to be leaders establishing a new classroom culture that nourishes self-worth and integrity.

When visiting the Maori Management program at the University of Waikato, we learned that these indigenous New Zealanders practice tribal legal traditions. They said one major difference between their system of justice and ours was that when a Maori committed a crime, their entire family was called to account. If it takes a village to raise a child, it also takes a community to raise a cheater. More important, it takes a community to create and support a climate of integrity.

Finally, I offer one cautionary note regarding the above analysis. This article is a narrow view of cheating, its causes, and its effects. It focuses on how to deal with cheating in the classroom; however, the root causes of cheating and the ultimate answers regarding ethics in the classroom are a much broader issue.

Addressing the broader issues requires questioning what Ritzer (2000) calls the McDonaldisation of education, the standardization and massification of education (McNeil, 2000), and even the various capitalisms that pervade our business pedagogy (Stablein, 2003). I have reserved that topic, with its more distributive justice emphasis, for another article. Procedural justice is, however, central to operationalizing participation and respect for students' voices and students' rights in addressing cheating.

As with most aspects of life, we faculty must first look to ourselves, and pay attention to our own psychological and emotional preparation for dealing with potentially traumatic issues like cheating. Then we can design a response that is sensitive to procedural justice issues as it incorporates students' voices, legitimizes taboo topics, and highlights community responsibility in preventing cheating. The good news is you do not need to wait for a cheating incident to create your own "teachable moment." Use my story or create your own (see appendix). Start now and work with your students to build a classroom culture supporting integrity. It takes a community to raise integrity!

Appendix

Classroom Exercise: Building a Classroom Climate of Integrity

Following is a simple yet powerful method to help create a climate where cheating is not a "taboo" topic and peer and faculty support is available to help students maintain integrity. I use a two-part classroom exercise. I begin with the cell-phone cheating case and follow up with soliciting, then "mirroring" back to students their verbatim written comments and reactions to the case.

Step 1: Optional Pre-Preparation or Concluding Follow-Up

To introduce the topic of classroom integrity, the instructor may use one or all of the following activities to initiate discussion. I have used all these methods with lively discussions resulting.

1. Questionnaire on Classroom Integrity
 - a. Devise your own by asking students to write down requests for "help" and "favors" and outright cheating that have made them uncomfortable. Collect and publish their lists, and get small groups or the whole class to rate the frequency and seriousness of each item.
 - b. For 20 questions about specific behaviors that students might consider to be cheating, go to www.integrity.rutgers.edu/rut.asp or www.integrity.rutgers.edu/rutgersfac.asp. This is McCabe's excellent Web site at Rutgers. You might want to get your whole university to participate in his program of ongoing monitoring of cheating!
2. My friend Morgan: An exercise in ethics. This exercise by Nancy Landrum (2001) is a terrific discussion generator! Students are confronted with their own inconsistencies when they rate various ethical infractions according to how serious they are and how frequently they have engaged in them. The students discover that most of them would not recommend for promotion a hypothetical friend who has engaged in the same questionable behaviors that most of them have done! This is a great bridge from the abstract discussion of ethical problems to potential "real-world" consequences.

Step 2: Triggering Activity

REACH OUT AND TOUCH SOMEONE: THE CELL-PHONE CHEATING CASE

The case is broken into three parts to provide stopping points where students could predict the next stages or analyze the causes of the problems stage by stage if time permits. Otherwise the case may be read all at once, followed by discussion questions.

Part I (15-20 minutes).

Part I. It was the fall of 2003. I am Grace Ann Rosile, and I was teaching a senior Business Policy class which I had taught many times before. During an exam I noticed some suspicious behavior, but nothing I could readily identify as cheating. The next week our department head told me he had heard that students were using text messaging on cell phones to cheat on my Business Strategy exams. How was that possible? I explained to him my usual procedure for all exams and quizzes: Shortly after the exam started, I would quickly duck out and tape up two color-coded exam versions with the correct answers filled in, on the wall just outside the classroom. Students got color-coded exams, computer answer sheets, and color-coded 4 × 4 squares on which to copy their 20 to 30 objective answers. After the exam they would take the 4 × 4 to compare their answers with the ones I posted in the hallway, getting instant reinforcement and feedback for their answers and scores. This was good in terms of learning theory, and students liked the system. Some students discovered they could have an accomplice call them on their cell phones and relay keyed-in answers from the answer sheets posted in the hall. I had never considered how this new technology could be a threat to my exam security as I have never owned a cell phone and was only vaguely aware of the concept of text messaging.

My initial inclination was to plug up the hole in the system and move on. Those who tried to cheat again by the same method would be thwarted and the resulting poor grade would be punishment enough. However, Dr. Dorfman encouraged (but did not pressure) me to consider a “sting” to clearly identify who had cheated. He cited an article in the Chronicle about an almost identical case at the University of Maryland (Read, 2004). Accounting professors there had posted exam answers on a Web site, and students were using cell phones to access the site during the exam. They successfully used a sting (posting false answers to 30 exam questions) to catch the cheaters. A total of 12 of 400 students had the false pattern and all 12 failed the class as a result. Dr. Dorfman told me he would support me in whatever way I chose to deal with the situation and suggested I take the weekend to think about what I wanted to do.

Questions for Part I

1. What should the professor do? Why?
2. What are some of the pros and cons of using a sting to catch cheaters?
3. What would you anticipate would be the reactions of the students in the class to more aggressiveness in combating cheating (such as use of a sting)?
4. Our society allows and even encourages anonymous tips from people who want to report child abuse, animal abuse, and tax fraud. Should universities

encourage anonymous tips regarding cheating in the classroom or on homework assignments? Why or why not?

Step 3: Problem Defining (30-45 minutes)

PART II

I did not think that a weekend's thinking things through would change my views on what to do about the cheating. However, because both my department head and my husband (who is also a member of my department) seemed to like the "sting" idea, I gave it careful consideration.

I had always maintained a sort of "karmic" view of cheating, summarized as follows:

1. Just as virtue is its own reward, cheating is its own punishment (lack of self-esteem, etc.).
2. Even if I did not catch a particular cheater, someone else would eventually in this life or the next.
3. Punishing cheaters does not convince them of the error of their ways, only of the error of being caught.
4. As one colleague put it, "We don't really want to catch our students cheating." The role of disciplinarian was not always compatible with my self-image as a facilitator of intellectual inquiry who espoused values of openness and honesty and challenging the status quo more than acceptance of social norms.

I surprised myself when I decided to undertake the sting. What shifted my thinking was changing my focus from how to deal with those who cheated to an emphasis on what would be most fair for the entire class. These factors summarized my altered position:

1. By cheating, the students themselves triggered the consequence and/or penalty mechanism agreed to in the syllabus.
2. The decision to cheat was theirs; the decision of whether and how to enforce the consequences was mine. This understanding helped me to stop blaming myself and clarify my role.
3. I wanted to avoid rewarding A while hoping for B (Kerr, 1975). I would be rewarding cheaters and punishing honest students if I did not pursue the cheaters and enforce consequences.

I embedded 18 false answers in 24 exam items and gave the exam on October 31. Of the 44 students in the class, 7 had the incriminating pattern of answers. Based on information obtained from those initial 7 students, 6 more were charged. Of these 13 students, 10 from class were charged along with 3 students who were not in the class but were university students. Of the 10 students in the class, I failed a total of 9.

I spent countless hours meeting with the 13 charged students in the weeks after the sting. Those who quickly confessed and showed remorse were the easiest. Then there was the student who said, "Yes I did it, but I will not give you the name of the

other person (who helped me to cheat). I deserve whatever I get, but this (other person) is a good person, really good, not like me, and they were just trying to help me. I won't tell you who they are." I admired the sentiments and loyalty.

But what kind of friend was it, and what kind of help was it, that would land them in their present predicament? I wanted to say to these students, "This is not the WWII French Resistance!" (but I did not say it) and, "A true friend would support you in doing the right thing" (and this I did say). I realized that most students had bought into a story of cheating as sometimes necessary and, possibly, even honorable resistance with accompanying norms of silence. Worse yet, I realized that although I had never been involved in classroom cheating or faced with such a situation, I believe that I would not want to reveal the name of someone else who cheated. I would not want to be a betrayer. Furthermore, I was uncomfortable in the role of one who encourages and rewards betrayal. Yet these "bad-guy" roles seemed the only options in the students' sense-making or storying of this situation. I asked myself, how could I restory this in a way that offered everyone a hero's role?

I decided to actively intervene with a restorying process (White & Epston, 1990). To prevent students from becoming stuck in their old stories about cheating, I planned to formally address the class. I offered the new story orally, rather than via the standard letter used in restorying (White & Epston, 1990). I allowed questions, but purposely avoided extended open discussion until the next class for two reasons. First, I did not want students to be sucked back into the dominant story lines I had uncovered in my interviews before they had a chance to consider the new story I offered. I structured this process by allowing 15 minutes for them to write down anonymously their reactions to my talk. In addition, I asked for written permission to use their comments in a letter to the editor I would write to the student newspaper (Rosile, 2003). These anonymous written comments might be less subject to group influence, and publishing them gave more weight to the students' voices in the restorying process. The second reason for postponing discussion was that time was very limited in my 50-minute period, and I wanted to be able to have a full discussion with as much closure as possible. This appears to have been a good decision. When I fed back the written verbatim comments in the next class, the ensuing discussion lasted for 40 minutes.

After the first seven students were failed and no longer attending class, I prepared a 20-minute address to this class of senior Business Strategy students. I wanted to enlist them into my story about why so many of them were not present that day. Following is a condensed version of what I said.

Today I want to talk about something you may have heard about already. Many of your classmates will no longer be attending class. I have failed them for cheating. I am still investigating this situation, but so far it appears 10 students were involved from inside the class, plus several more on the outside who helped those cheating. How did this happen? Why did it happen to me, to our class? I ask for your patience now because instead of our topic for the day which, ironically, is "Corporate Culture and Ethics," I want to speak to you for about 15 to 20 minutes about my feelings about this situation. Then I will ask you for your views.

I have been proud of the fact that in 25 years of teaching, I never needed to do more than give a student a warning look, or go stand in their portion

of the classroom to prevent cheating. Today I realized that there must have been some cheating that I never saw. I ask myself, did I really try to see it? Did I really want to see it? Or did I prefer not to have my orderly world disrupted by unpleasantness? Maybe it is just a case of me being older and behind the technology curve: I do not even own a cell phone, and have never used "text messaging," as some of those cheating had done.

I found evidence this past week of widespread cheating: 10 out of 40 in this class. These students had outside accomplices who text-messaged the exam answers to them. Many more than those 10 specifically charged people had to know what was going on without speaking about it. But everyone apparently decided "It's not my problem."

There is a dangerous fallacy about cheating which is "I don't cheat, so it's not my problem." However, cheating destroys the learning environment in our university. When people cheat it affects everyone, those who cheat and those who do not cheat. All of us have an active role in creating, promoting, and allowing cheating through both action and silence. The combination of new technology (cell phones) and the norm of silence of bystanders created this tragic case of widespread cheating.

Why didn't people speak up? Some were too absorbed in their own exams to pay any attention to what others were doing. Some suspected but did not pursue their suspicions, not feeling it was their responsibility. Some knew but felt they should not report anything or mention any names, not wishing to harm another's reputation. Some felt if they were not cheating themselves, that was the extent of their obligation—anything beyond that and "It's not my problem."

There are many reasons why cheating by the few affects the many:

1. One (accused) student claimed, "Those other students who got As were cheating too." This casts doubt on the achievements of the hard-working students who earned their grades honestly.
2. In evaluating graduate program applicants, I have heard reports that faculty have commented "X" (a particular place, school, or country) is known for cheating. How can we trust this candidate's record?
3. When even one person is caught cheating, it leads to suspicion of the legitimacy of all grades.
4. The more who cheat, the more tempting it is for others to do the same.

Those who see cheating and do nothing are allowing those cheating to harm themselves. A true friend would not condone, encourage, or assist a friend to cheat, knowing that friend could be destroying their education and damaging their career.

Questions for Part II

1. How should cheating be punished? Is failing a class too severe or not severe enough?
2. Research suggests that the perception of more severe punishments reduces cheating. Do you agree? Why or why not?
3. Should there be any mitigating circumstance to reduce punishment (i.e., for first-time offenders, for those about to graduate, for those who would lose

their student aid, for those who confess, for those who give the names of other cheaters)?

4. What do you think will be the students' reactions to the professor's speech?
5. Is there anything else you think the professor should have done, or should have done differently, in handling this situation?

Step 4: Survey Feedback (30-45 minutes)

PART III (NOTE: PROVIDE STUDENTS WITH A COPY OF TABLE 2 AS A HANDOUT.)

Part III. I asked the students to write about what they learned from the situation and to note on their papers whether I could use their comments in a letter to *The Round Up* (Rosile, 2003). Table 2 shows the themes extracted from the written responses. Note that of the 10 students charged with cheating, only 7 were failed and removed from the class at this time, while 3 students' charges were still under investigation. These responses are from students who did not cheat but may have known about it, plus the 3 in-class students whose charges were still being investigated.

In spite of my talk, I expected most students to still express variations of the "It's not my problem" theme. Instead, some not only condemned such unethical behaviors, but expressed personal affront. These emotional statements rang true and did not appear contrived for the sake of approval. Some of those less-emotional were resigned to cheating as part of life. Overall, I was surprised that students were overwhelmingly supportive of my role, and five explicitly thanked me. I typed these student comments verbatim but not in their entirety, filling four single-spaced pages loosely grouped by theme. I copied and distributed this document at the start of our next class meeting.

After silently reading their own comments, the students initiated a class-long discussion. One student said, "I was in athletics in high school, and we always cheated." After the gasps and chattering subsided, he continued, "But that was high school. It's different in college. This is more important. I would not cheat in college, and I don't think others should either." This comment, together with the anonymously written comments, seemed to set the standard for the frank and open discussion which followed.

It seems important in this process for students' voices to be heard. Typing verbatim comments, and allowing students time to discuss them, showed respect for the students' voices. Such respect is a good start, and perhaps an essential part, of participatory processes to address cheating (Bauerly & Dobson, 2003) and create a more ethically oriented, self-reflexive (Stablein, 2003), and liberatory pedagogy (Freire, 1970, 1995).

The content of the written comments also underscored the need for attention to voice and power issues in this process, both between students and faculty and among students. Overall, in Table 2, student comment Categories 2 and 3 combine to yield 15/39 comments reflecting passive and/or resigned feelings, whereas Categories 1 and 4 combine to show 20/39 comments reflecting an emotional victim and/or rescuer dynamic. Of the four miscellaneous comments, two are clearly victim-oriented. This predominance of passivity and powerlessness themes underscores the importance

of participative processes to actively engage students in addressing this problem (as recommended below) rather than being passive victims.

Can we change our situation? I believe so, but only if all of us, students and faculty alike, are actively engaged in supporting honesty and integrity. As one student said, "I sit next to the smartest person in this class and even if I thought to cheat, I know he would not let me." It starts one-to-one and continues up through our entire institution. It has been hard work these past weeks, documenting, writing charges, meeting, confronting, counseling, and delivering, in many cases, the decisions of sanctions. But perhaps it has been the most important teaching I have ever done.

Questions for Reach Out and Touch Someone: The Cell-Phone Cheating Case

1. In what ways was the professor at fault in this incident?
2. In what ways were the students who cheated at fault?
3. In what ways, if any, were the students who did not cheat at fault?
4. What bad assumptions did the professor make about cheating on exams?
5. What percentage of students in your present class, and in your university, do you believe cheat on exams in some way?
6. What, if any, advantages are there to reducing cheating in the classroom?
7. In what ways might you realistically expect the average student to participate in actively supporting integrity and reducing cheating in the classroom? What do the student comments reported in Table 2 tell you about students' attitudes toward cheating and toward reducing cheating in the classroom?
8. What is your opinion of student judicial boards to adjudicate cases of student cheating?
9. What should be done to prevent, or at least reduce, future cheating in college classrooms?
10. Do the grading policies and procedures in your present class support fairness and integrity, or might they contribute to a tendency to cheat? Explain how and/or why, and how you might revise these aspects of your class to better promote integrity.

Step 5: More Survey Feedback (10-15 minutes)

Ask students to write the answers to questions 7, 9, and 10 above, WITHOUT signing their names. Collect responses and compile by theme, indicating frequency of mention for each theme. Prepare this information in a typed report, to be given to students at your next meeting. Note: Use this anonymous method if you think students will be overly influenced by their peers in class.

Alternative Step 5 (30-45 minutes)

Ask students to write the answers to questions 7, 9, and 10 above (10-15 minutes). Ask small groups to collect and compile the responses by theme, indicating the frequency of mention for each theme. Post results on newsprint around the room. Note:

Use this alternative if you think students feel safe enough to be honest with their peers and you, and if you have enough time.

Step 6: Action Planning (20-40 minutes)

Using the data generated in Step 5 (above), students in small groups may develop detailed action plans for questions 7, 9, and 10 (above), and/or for other issues that emerge from the data. Each group may take a different question, or all groups might address all questions, according to instructor preference and time constraints. Pay special attention to question #10.

Step 7: Recommendations

Recommendations based on the action plans developed in Step 6 may be written up and submitted to appropriate bodies within the university. Recommendations relating to question #10 (the student's current class) may result in the professor modifying policies and procedures for the class. If such modifications are undertaken, further feedback on the effectiveness of these modifications might be solicited at appropriate times (after the next exam, at mid-term, etc.). Again, anonymous written comments may yield the greatest candor, and printing and distributing all comments for the class to process will enhance participation and commitment.

TEACHING TIPS

Student feedback. I find that students really want to express themselves and will write quite a lot when I ask for these written anonymous comments. (The same applies for less-sensitive subjects where they sign their names to their comments.) Even when I do this at the end of the class and tell them they may leave when finished, most of them stay for most of the allotted time, and they tend to fill their page with comments. I highly recommend this method!

Impact of these strategies. At the end of the term, I asked my Organizational Behavior class what (if anything) had helped to prevent cheating during the term. This class had objective quizzes every 2 weeks, taken individually and then in groups. Throughout the semester, the students took the McCabe cheating questionnaire, did the cell-phone cheating case and the Landrum (2001) ethics exercise (My Friend Morgan, noted above), received inspiring speeches about integrity and not cheating in class, took quizzes that had scrambled versions in different colors, and were monitored during quizzes by both myself and my teaching assistant. Of a potential 58 students, 34 responded voluntarily and anonymously in writing immediately after their last quiz of the semester. The questions in Table 1A were written on the board for those who chose to answer.

This informal survey suggests that the combination of different quiz versions along with having a second proctor in the room helped to prevent cheating, according to 22/34 respondents. Furthermore, 23/34 respondents said there was less than average or no cheating in this class.

TABLE A1

<i>Question</i>	<i>Number of Student Answers</i>
1. Cheating in this class was	
a. more than average	1
b. less than average	23
c. about the same as other classes	8
d. (did not answer the question)	2
2. What helped to prevent cheating (if anything)?	
a. different quiz versions/colors	11
b. both different quiz version and second proctor walking around	6
c. second proctor walking around, being very attentive	5
d. ethics speeches before a test	2
e. don't know	2
f. miscellaneous comments or not answered	8
3. What contributed to greater cheating (if anything)?	
a. "nothing" or "N/A" or "don't know of any that cheated"	19
b. blank/no answer	3
c. "?" response	3
d. miscellaneous comments or not answered	9

Firm conclusions cannot be drawn from this very informal poll. The timing (right after a quiz) probably contributed to fewer choosing to respond as their energies were spent on the quiz. Also, because they had just experienced the quiz security measures, those may have been foremost in the students' minds to the point of crowding out recollection of the many other ethics-related activities throughout the term. A future survey would benefit from listing all these activities (surveys, exercises, inspiring stories, class discussions) as well as the traditional nuts-and-bolts of exam security, and asking for the relative impact of each on students' attitudes and behaviors regarding cheating. These admittedly flawed results still give reason to be optimistic about our ability as instructors to positively impact the classroom climate toward greater integrity.

Notes

1. I regularly use both anonymous and signed written student comments in my classes, which I feed back to them in an action-research style in the next class. I am always impressed with the range, depth, and quantity of such ideas as compared to open class discussions.

2. Briefly, "presence" means keeping mind, body, and spirit together and focused on a purpose. If I become afraid, I "lose my head" and my abandoned body says "Save yourself!" and throws itself out of the path of the horse. If I stay calm, reassuring, and determined, I can project the message to the horse that I am stronger than it and I represent safety. However, on some occasions the horse may be either so hysterical or so determined that he or she is stronger than I am, and when I am wise enough to recognize those few cases that I cannot change, I jump out of the way. Once an empty horse trailer came loose from the truck hitch and began rolling back down the road's gentle slope. I was out of the truck and half-way to the trailer when I

suddenly realized: What would I do if I caught up with that hunk of iron? Absurd as this was, it demonstrates the mind-set I had developed: I thought I could catch the trailer and somehow stop it. Remembering that training, I realized I could easily transfer that confidence to my academic cheating context. For more about management and leadership skills learned through work with horses, see www.horsesenseatwork.com.

References

- Anderson, J. A. (2003). Ethics in business and teaching. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 17 (1), 155-164.
- Associated Press. (2003, November 23). NMSU catches students cheating with cell phones. *Las Cruces Sun News*, p. C-1.
- Bauerly, R. J., & Dobson, J. J. (2002). Business student and faculty views on cheating. *Journal of Contemporary Business Issues*, 10 (1), 53-59.
- Boje, D. M., & Rosile, G. A. (2002). Enron whodunit? *Ephemer*. 2 (4). Retrieved November 11, 2002, from <http://www.ephemeraweb.org/journal/2-4/2-4bojeandrosile.pdf>
- Boje, D. M., & Rosile, G. A. (2003). Life imitates art: Enron's epic and tragic narration. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 17 (1), 85-125.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (Myra Bergman Ramos, Trans.). New York: Seabury.
- Freire, P. (1995). *Pedagogy of hope*. New York: Continuum.
- Kerr, S. (1975). On the folly of rewarding A, while hoping for B. *Academy of Management Journal*, 18 (4), 769-783.
- Landrum, N. (2001). My friend Morgan: An exercise in ethics. *Journal of Management Education*, 25 (5), 606-616.
- McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (1995). Cheating among business students: A challenge for business leaders and educators. *Journal of Management Education*, 19 (2), 205-218.
- McNeil, L. (2000). *Contradictions of school reform: Educational Costs of Standardized Testing*. New York: Routledge.
- Read, B. (2004). Wired for cheating. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved July 16, 2004, from https://catalog2.nmsu.edu:2058/universe/document?_m=26f55115e0b9e0f61b91dd6e5997fce7&_docnum=2&wchp=dGLzVzz-zSkVb&_md5=8ff820ba92d58ec39ad0e347e86bf104
- Ritzer, G. (2000). *McDonaldization of society: New century edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Romo, R. (2003, November 22). NMSU calls 10 cheaters on the carpet. *Albuquerque Journal*, p. 1.
- Rosile, G. A. (2003, November 17). Ten students caught cheating by text messaging [Letter to the editor]. *The Round Up*. Retrieved November 18, 2003, and March 30, 2006, from <http://www.roundupnews.com/media/storage/paper474/news/2003/11/17/Opinion/TenStudents.Caught.Cheating.By.Text.Messaging559504.shtml?nrewrite200603301541&sourceDomain=www.roundupnews.com>
- Rosile, G. A. (2004, June). *Cheating: Making it a teachable moment*. Paper presented at the Organizational Behavior Teaching Conference, University of Redlands, Redlands, CA.
- Stablein, R. (2003). Teaching business ethics or teaching business ethically? *Management Communication Quarterly*, 17 (1), 151-154.
- Stephens, J. (2004, May). Justice or just us? What to do about cheating. *Carnegie Perspectives*. Retrieved May 1, 2004, from <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org> under "Perspectives" then "May 2004" or <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/perspectives/sub.asp?key=245&subkey=577>
- White, M., & Epston, D. (1990). *Narrative means to therapeutic ends*. New York: Norton.